Spin-based removal of instrumental systematics in 21cm intensity mapping surveys

DOI:

[10.1093/mnras/stab2811](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab2811)

Document Version

Submitted manuscript

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

McCallum, N., Thomas, D. B., Bull, P., & Brown, M. L. (2021). Spin-based removal of instrumental systematics in 21cm intensity mapping surveys. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab2811>

Published in:

Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.

Spin-based removal of instrumental systematics in 21cm intensity mapping surveys

Nialh McCallum,¹ Daniel B. Thomas,² Philip Bull,^{2,3} and Michael L. Brown¹

¹*Jodrell Bank Centre for Astrophysics, School of Physics & Astronomy, The University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK*

²*School of Physics and Astronomy, Queen Mary University of London, London, E1 4NS, UK*

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Western Cape, Cape Town 7535, South Africa*

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

ABSTRACT

Upcoming cosmological intensity mapping surveys will open new windows on the Universe, but they must first overcome a number of significant systematic effects, including polarization leakage. We present a formalism that uses scan strategy information to model the effect of different instrumental systematics on the recovered cosmological intensity signal for ‘single-dish’ (autocorrelation) surveys. This modelling classifies different systematics according to their spin symmetry, making it particularly relevant for dealing with polarization leakage. We show how to use this formalism to calculate the expected contamination from different systematics as a function of the scanning strategy, and we comment on the extent to which changing the scanning strategy can mitigate the systematics. Most importantly, we show how systematics can be disentangled from the intensity signal based on their spin properties via map-making. We illustrate this for some simple instrumental systematics, demonstrating the ability to significantly reduce the contamination to the observed intensity signal. Crucially, unlike existing foreground removal techniques, this approach works for signals that are non-smooth in frequency, e.g. polarized foregrounds. These map-making approaches are simple to apply and represent an orthogonal and complementary approach to existing techniques for removing systematics from upcoming 21cm intensity mapping surveys.

Key words: cosmology: observations – large-scale structure of Universe – radio lines: general – methods: observational

1 INTRODUCTION

Line intensity mapping, particularly of the 21cm line of neutral hydrogen (HI), promises to develop into an exciting new probe of cosmology. This method uses spatial fluctuations in the intensity of spectral line emission to trace fluctuations in the underlying cosmic density field (at low redshift and during the cosmic Dark Ages) and the ionization state of the inter-galactic medium (IGM; during Cosmic Dawn and the Epoch of Reionization). At redshifts where the spectral line intensity acts as a biased tracer of the dark matter distribution, this facilitates the investigation of the large-scale structure through observations of baryon acoustic oscillations and redshift space distortions, while at redshifts where the ionization state of the IGM is evolving, measurements can be made of the optical depth to reionization and the clustering properties of early ionizing radiation sources (e.g. Wyithe & Loeb 2008; Wyithe et al. 2008; Chang et al. 2008; Loeb & Wyithe 2008; Pritchard & Loeb 2008; Mao et al. 2008; Peterson et al. 2009; Bagla et al. 2010; Seo et al. 2010; Lidz et al. 2011; Ansari et al. 2012; Battye et al. 2013; Bull et al. 2015; Kovetz et al. 2019).

A number of experiments have made important advances towards a positive detection of the 21cm line intensity signal, with the most sig-

nificant progress to date coming from detections in cross-correlation with optical data (Chang et al. 2010; Masui et al. 2013; Wolz et al. 2017; Anderson et al. 2018; Wolz et al. 2021). There has not yet been a definitive detection of the HI auto-power spectrum however, although future experiments such as the SKA (Santos et al. 2015), along with pathfinders such as MeerKAT (Santos et al. 2017), have the potential to make a significant first detection.

There are a number of obstacles to tackle in order to definitively measure the HI signal. Foremost is the fact that the 21cm signal is far fainter than many of the foreground sources. Fortunately the unpolarized foreground frequency spectra tend to be relatively smooth, and as such component separation techniques should be capable of isolating the part of the true cosmological signal that resides on smaller radial scales (higher $k_{\parallel}$ modes) (Alonso et al. 2015; Cunningham et al. 2020; Carucci et al. 2020). Foreground removal is further complicated by calibration systematics and the like however; even if the smooth components are successfully removed to a high level of accuracy, foreground emission could still leak into the final data due to modulation and mixing caused by systematic effects that are non-smooth in frequency. In addition, a number of the foreground sources are polarized – for example the Galactic synchrotron emission – and do not have an entirely smooth dependence on frequency due to Faraday rotation and other line-of-sight mixing effects (Rybicki & Lightman 1986; Waelkens et al. 2009; Jelić et al. 2010; Moore et al. 2013; De & Tashiro 2014). Despite the polarized foregrounds be-

* E-mail: nialh.mccallum@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

† E-mail: dan.b.thomas1@gmail.com

ing a weaker signal than the total intensity foregrounds, they are still much larger than the HI cosmological signal, and as such systematics causing polarization to intensity leakage are a concerning issue for upcoming surveys (e.g. [Cunnington et al. 2020](#); [Tauscher et al. 2020, 2021](#)).

Future experiments will require careful control of systematics – especially ones that impart complex spectral structure, such as these – to reach their desired sensitivities. Note that there is also an extensive literature on a variety of other survey systematics, including beam model uncertainties (e.g. [Asad et al. 2021](#)), correlated ($1/f$) receiver noise (e.g. [Harper et al. 2018](#); [Li et al. 2021](#)), and low-level radio-frequency interference (RFI) ([Harper & Dickinson 2018](#)). In this paper, we will focus on a subset of instrumental systematic effects that couple the sky signal to the telescope’s scanning pattern. Our analysis applies specifically to scanning autocorrelation experiments such as GBT, Parkes, MeerKAT, and SKA1-MID, but not to interferometers.

Focusing on polarization, the CMB has the inverse problem to intensity mapping – current experiments are concerned with leakage of the intensity signal into polarization, which is the main target of the current generation of ground-based CMB experiments. Many different techniques and approaches have been used to forecast and address this leakage (e.g. [Shimon et al. 2008](#); [O’Dea et al. 2007](#); [Hivon et al. 2017](#)), some of which might reasonably also be used to characterize the related effect in intensity mapping surveys. In this work, we will attempt to adapt one such approach to single-dish intensity mapping experiments. In particular, we will apply the methods of ([Wallis et al. 2017](#); [McCallum et al. 2020](#); [Thomas et al. 2021](#)), which are designed to characterize instrumental systematics and how they couple to the scan strategy based on their *spin* properties. Here, spin refers to the dependence of the signals (either “on-sky” signals or spurious ones arising from imperfect instrumentation) on the orientation of the instrument with respect to the sky as it scans across a pixel, which we refer to as the crossing angle, ψ . As we shall see, various systematic effects couple to the scanning strategy in different and particular ways, producing contamination that has different spin structure. By decomposing the observed data into different spin components, we can effectively separate certain instrumental systematic effects from the target cosmological signal more cleanly than would be possible using their angular and spectral structure alone.

In intensity mapping, the targeted cosmological signal is a spin-zero quantity. The spin-zero component of the data can be calculated simply by averaging the data points within a pixel, $\langle S \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j S(\psi_j, \theta, \phi)$ where N is the number of hits (unique observations) in a pixel, and $S(\psi, \theta, \phi)$ is the measured signal. However, in the presence of instrumental systematics, e.g. dishes that are not ideal, there will be leakage that contaminates the cosmological signal. If this leakage is classified according to its spin, several advantages arise. A key one is the ability to remove the systematics directly with map-making, using the crossing angle information in an analogous way to that used in some CMB map-making processes (e.g. [Sutton et al. 2010](#); [Polarbear Collaboration et al. 2014](#); [McCallum et al. 2020](#)).

This paper is organized as follows. We introduce the spin-based map-making formalism in the context of intensity mapping in Section 2, and then focus on two case studies of instrumental systematics important in intensity mapping surveys, including the troublesome polarization leakage. We show how to model the case studies for this approach in the context of intensity mapping (Section 3), finding that using crossing angle information in map-making can effectively remove these systematics (Section 4). We conclude in Section 5.

Figure 1. Schematic showing the orientation of the linearly polarized feeds d_A and d_B of the instrument with respect to the sky. The crossing angle ψ gives the orientation of the scan direction of the instrument with respect to North.

2 SPIN FORMALISM FOR INTENSITY MAPPING

In this section we present the spin formalism from [Wallis et al. \(2017\)](#); [McCallum et al. \(2020\)](#), adapting it to apply to single-dish intensity mapping surveys. For clarity, we will present just enough detail for a self-consistent account of how the formalism applies to intensity mapping, while directing to reader to [McCallum et al. \(2020\)](#) for full details of conventions and more detailed derivations – including the leakage of arbitrary spin fields sourced by systematics to the intensity signal at both map and angular power spectrum level.

We model the signal seen by a single dish at a single frequency from a single observation (scan) as the sum of two orthogonal linearly polarized feeds, d_A and d_B , following (e.g.) Eq. 23 of [Wang et al. \(2020\)](#). In the case of an ideal dish, for any intensity, $I(\theta, \phi)$, and polarization, $Q(\theta, \phi)$ and $U(\theta, \phi)$, fields on the sky, the measured signal at location θ, ϕ with crossing angle ψ is

$$\begin{aligned} S(\psi, \theta, \phi) &= \frac{1}{2} [d_A + d_B] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(I(\theta, \phi) + Q(\theta, \phi) \cos(2\psi) + U(\theta, \phi) \sin(2\psi) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(I(\theta, \phi) + Q(\theta, \phi) \cos(2\psi + \pi) + U(\theta, \phi) \sin(2\psi + \pi) \right) \right] \\ &= I(\theta, \phi). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

As expected, the measured signal for an ideal dish has no ψ dependence – the linearly polarized feeds are perfectly orthogonal regardless of the direction of the scan, and there is therefore no polarization leakage. As we will show in Section 3, once we include non-idealities of the dish, the lack of ψ dependence ceases. As well as leaking polarized emission into the unpolarized channel, this can also cause problems in the absence of a polarized sky; our two later case studies include one example of each. Note that all polarization leakage in these surveys is caused by non-idealities of the instrument, so we expect any source of polarization leakage to be amenable to this approach.

For the more general case of a non-ideal dish, we can write the

measured signal as a function of the crossing angle ψ and location on the sky θ, ϕ as

$$S(\psi, \theta, \phi) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{2} \left({}_k\tilde{S}^*(\theta, \phi) e^{ik\psi} + {}_k\tilde{S}(\theta, \phi) e^{-ik\psi} \right) \quad (2)$$

where the ${}_k\tilde{S}$ represent a decomposition of the signal into its different spin components,¹ where we recall that the true cosmological intensity signal contributes only to $k = 0$. The detected spin zero signal will now be a combination of the scan strategy and the different spin signals seen by a single dish,

$$\begin{aligned} {}_0\tilde{S}^d(\theta, \phi) &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{h}_{0-k}(\theta, \phi) {}_k\tilde{S}(\theta, \phi); \\ \tilde{h}_n &= \frac{1}{N_{\text{hits}}} \sum_j \{ \cos(n\psi_j) + i \sin(n\psi_j) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the $\tilde{h}_n$ functions encode the scan strategy within a pixel, N_{hits} is the number of hits within that pixel, and $\{\psi_j\}$ are the set of crossing angles associated with those hits. For an ideal scan these quantities will be zero, while in the worst case they are unity, which corresponds to just one distinct crossing angle in a pixel. We should note here that the signals ${}_k\tilde{S}(\theta, \phi)$ will in general be frequency dependent, while the $\tilde{h}_{0-k'}(\theta, \phi)$ will not as these are a function only of the orientation of the telescope.

We will show specific examples of how two instrumental systematics manifest in this formalism in section 3. First, we wish to emphasise some important consequences of the formalism for map-making and the scan strategy. These apply to any instrumental systematic for which one can write the signal seen by an individual measurement as a function of the crossing angle ψ as in Eq. 2, and therefore compute the contamination of the targeted spin zero signal using Eq. 3. Note that throughout this work we consider a single dish for simplicity, but that the formalism is readily extendable to a multi-dish experiment operating in “single-dish” mode; in this case, the ${}_0\tilde{S}^d$ and $\tilde{h}_n$ will vary between dishes, and the final observed maps can be obtained by averaging the maps made by each dish.

2.1 Map-making

If we know the spin k of the contaminating components of $S(\psi, \theta, \phi)$, then we can use the knowledge of the experiment’s scan strategy, $\tilde{h}_n$, to solve for spin- k quantities at the same time as constructing ${}_0\tilde{S}^d$, by calculating the quantity $\frac{1}{N} \sum_j S(\psi_j, \theta, \phi) e^{ik\psi_j}$. This is no different in principle to the simple binning map-making used by some CMB experiments (e.g. Sutton et al. 2010; Tegmark 1997). As standard CMB experiments will wish to solve for spin-0 and spin-2 fields when map-making in order to separate the temperature and polarization signals. Extensions to this in order to map-make for systematics signals of other spin have also been considered (Wallis et al. 2015; McCallum et al. 2020). In the intensity mapping case one will always solve for the spin-0 signal at map-making; the choice of which additional spins to include in map-making depends on which dish non-idealities are contributing to $S(\psi, \theta, \phi)$, and what their spins are.

Furthermore, we note that in order to work well, the map-making must be performed on data over timescales which allow little variation in the signature of the systematic effect. If there is significant

evolution of the effect between revisits of a pixel then the leaked signals would lose their pure spin dependence and the extended map-making would fail to remove them. In order to combat this case where systematics drift over the time of a full survey, the time ordered data (TOD) would need to be split into shorter timescales over which the systematic is stable – extended map-making performed on the split data would then remove the systematics. The resulting observed intensity maps would finally be stacked before applying foreground removal.

We will demonstrate this extended map-making technique explicitly for two case studies in Section 4. We will show that this technique can effectively remove systematics that are not removed by standard intensity mapping filtering techniques which do not use the crossing angle information from the scanning strategy.

Due to the discrete number of spins that might reasonably be expected to manifest in the data, it may also be possible to use this approach as a “blind” way to diagnose systematics. To do this, one would make maps including a further spin field in addition to zero successively. One could then examine the resulting reconstructed spin fields for any signs of systematic signatures that could be corrupting the cosmological signal. For an intensity mapping survey setup the non-zero spin signals should in principle not be present (likely noise dominated for a realistic survey) and as such systematics would be identifiable by these signals having a larger than expected contribution along with potential presence of structure emanating from the scanning strategy. We leave it to further work to examine this diagnostic approach in detail.

2.2 Scan strategy

We can use Eq. 3 to calculate the effect that particular instrumental systematics will have on a survey. This is achieved by specifying appropriate forms for the $\tilde{h}_n$ terms for each choice of scan strategy. This also allows us to calculate the extent to which changing the scan strategy can reduce systematics, without requiring any additional analysis steps (Wallis et al. 2017).

There are a number of factors that influence scan strategy design, e.g. control of elevation- and azimuth-dependent contributions to the system temperature, or avoiding orbital and terrestrial sources of RFI. These considerations usually dictate that ground-based CMB and intensity mapping surveys should use constant elevation scans (CESs). CESs restrict the range of crossing angles that can occur in the data, placing a fundamental limit on how well the $\tilde{h}_n$ values can be optimized (Thomas et al. 2021). It is nevertheless possible to provide an idea of the best choices of field and elevation to suppress systematics, for example the polarization leakage. We show how this kind of optimization can be done in Appendix A, but a basic summary is that one should choose a strategy that minimizes the value of $|h_n|^2$, averaged over the pixels in the survey, for all $n \geq 1$. This effectively minimizes the coupling of higher-spin components of the observations into the spin-0 map.

In the case of the MeerKAT scanning strategy that was used in Wang et al. (2020), it is possible to obtain closer-to-optimal systematics suppression with only a few small changes. In Table 1 we present the values of $|h_n|^2$ averaged across the map for the scan strategy used by MeerKAT. We also show the new value when a single extra elevation (39°, slightly lower than the elevations already used) is included in the strategy, with scans performed when the target field is both rising and setting. This extra elevation was calculated to be optimal for $|h_2|^2$ based on the approach presented in Appendix A. In this case there is a modest improvement to the $\tilde{h}_n$ values, but not enough to significantly reduce the effects of the corresponding systematics.

¹ This can equivalently be written as $S_k^Q \cos(k\psi) + S_k^U \sin(k\psi)$ with ${}_k\tilde{S} = S_k^Q + iS_k^U$.

Table 1. $|\tilde{h}_n|^2$ values averaged over the observed pixels for the MeerKAT scan strategy of Wang et al. (2020), and an enhanced scan strategy which includes additional observations at an elevation of 39° . These quantities control the leakage of different instrumental systematics into the cosmological signal; smaller values of $|\tilde{h}_n|^2$ are desirable for systematics suppression.

	$ \tilde{h}_1 ^2$	$ \tilde{h}_2 ^2$	$ \tilde{h}_3 ^2$	$ \tilde{h}_4 ^2$
MeerKAT strategy	0.94	0.78	0.64	0.59
Enhanced strategy	0.92	0.72	0.54	0.50

3 CASE STUDIES

In this section we illustrate the approach by constructing Eqs. 2 and 3 for two specific instrumental systematics.

We assume that the signal observed is solely a function of RA, Dec, and crossing angle, that maps are made at each frequency separately, and that at each frequency the observed signal does not mix with other frequencies. Both of our case studies will assume that the dish architecture and other instrumental factors lead to effective mismatches between the two polarized feeds, introducing ψ -dependent signals into Eq. 1.

3.1 Polarization leakage from effective gain mismatch

An effective mismatch in the receiver gains between the two feeds can cause polarization leakage, due to the polarization signal no longer cancelling when Stokes I maps are formed. For a simple two feed example we may model the effect of gains on the observed signal as

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(\psi, \theta, \phi) &= \frac{1}{2} ((1 + g^A)d_A + (1 + g^B)d_B) \\
 &= \left(1 + \frac{g^A + g^B}{2}\right) I + \left(\frac{g^A - g^B}{2}\right) (Q \cos(2\psi) + U \sin(2\psi)) \\
 &= \left(1 + \frac{g^A + g^B}{2}\right) I + \left(\frac{g^A - g^B}{2}\right) \frac{1}{2} (P e^{-2i\psi} + P^* e^{2i\psi})
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where g^X is the gain offset of feed $X \in \{A, B\}$, and $P = Q + iU$. We may thus write the observed spin-0 signal as

$${}_0\tilde{S}^d = \tilde{h}_0 \left(1 + \frac{g^A + g^B}{2}\right) I + \left(\frac{g^A - g^B}{4}\right) (\tilde{h}_{-2}P + \tilde{h}_2P^*). \tag{5}$$

The first term represents the amplification of the intensity signal itself, the second term represents the leakage of the polarization signal due to any gain mismatch ($g^A - g^B$) between the feeds. The polarization leakage is typically more troublesome as it is not so easily calibrated out.

3.2 Beam squint

Beam squint is a frequency-dependent offset of the beam centre from the nominal pointing centre. The squint will be different for each of the linearly polarized feeds of each antenna and will also vary in frequency (Asad et al. 2021; Uson & Cotton 2008; Harp et al. 2011). We model beam squint according to this definition as a frequency-dependent pointing error of each linearly polarized feed.

Assuming that the beam squint is a constant in the instrument frame, for a boresight pointing (x, y) , the actual pointing of feeds A, B is $(x + \delta x_A, y + \delta y_A)$ and $(x + \delta x_B, y + \delta y_B)$, which will depend on the crossing angle ψ . The signals from a feed can be expressed in terms of the instrument frame polar offsets ρ and χ , the magnitude

and direction of the pointing error as $\delta x_X = \rho_X \sin(\psi + \chi_X)$ and $\delta y_X = \rho_X \cos(\psi + \chi_X)$ where $X \in \{A, B\}$ (see Section 2.1 of Wallis et al. 2017). Following Wallis et al. (2017) and McCallum et al. (2020), and considering the case with an offset of magnitude ρ_A in direction χ_A for feed A, and ρ_B in direction χ_B for feed B, summing the two feeds shows the observed signal is contaminated as

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(\psi, \theta, \phi) &= \frac{1}{2} (d_A + d_B) = I + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2} (\zeta e^{i\psi} \tilde{\delta} I + \zeta^* e^{-i\psi} \tilde{\delta} I) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4} (\zeta e^{i3\psi} \tilde{\delta} P^* + \zeta^* e^{i\psi} \tilde{\delta} P^* + \zeta e^{-i\psi} \tilde{\delta} P + \zeta^* e^{-3i\psi} \tilde{\delta} P) \right],
 \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where we use the spin raising operator $\tilde{\delta} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ and its conjugate (the spin lowering operator, denoted by a bar), and where we have set $\zeta = \rho_A e^{i\chi_A} + \rho_B e^{i\chi_B}$, which represents the total combined beam squint having summed the two linearly polarized feeds. We may thus write the observed spin-0 signal as

$$\begin{aligned}
 {}_0\tilde{S}^d &= \tilde{h}_0 I + \frac{1}{4} (\tilde{h}_1 \zeta \tilde{\delta} I + \tilde{h}_{-1} \zeta^* \tilde{\delta} I) \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{8} (\tilde{h}_3 \zeta \tilde{\delta} P^* + \tilde{h}_1 \zeta^* \tilde{\delta} P^* + \tilde{h}_{-1} \zeta \tilde{\delta} P + \tilde{h}_{-3} \zeta^* \tilde{\delta} P).
 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

This represents a simple model of the beam squint systematic constructed according to our formalism. We note that in the simulations presented in section 4.3 to explore beam squint we set $\rho_B = 0$ and $\chi_A = 0$ such that $\zeta = \rho_A$ – this allows the results to be presented more clearly but does not affect the bottom line conclusions of this work.

4 DEMONSTRATION OF EXTENDED MAP-MAKING

Having identified the spins that are relevant for each of our two case studies in the previous section, we now show how this allows the use of map-making to remove these systematics. Given we know the spin of the systematics, in principle it is possible to solve for them along with the intensity signal using information from the scanning strategy.

The standard procedure in intensity mapping is to take the TOD and generate a map at each frequency band. These maps will ideally contain only the spin-0 intensity signal, which will include both the cosmological signal and foregrounds. Foreground removal is then applied to the output maps using a chosen component separation method (e.g. Wolz et al. 2014; Alonso et al. 2015; Olivari et al. 2016; Cunnington et al. 2020; Carucci et al. 2020; Soares et al. 2021; Irfan & Bull 2021). However foregrounds with a non-smooth frequency-dependent response introduced by the systematics prove difficult to remove using the standard approaches.

The techniques we present in this section offer a way to remove certain systematic-induced leakage at the map-making stage, isolating the spin-0 sky signal from systematic signals of other spin, e.g. spin-2 polarization contamination. The observed signal should then be closer to a pure spin-0 intensity field whose foregrounds are smooth in frequency. This would allow for the foreground removal procedures to progress without the worry of spurious signals of other spin.

4.1 Simulations

In order to assess the impact of solving for multiple spin signals during map-making we produce some simple simulations as follows. We adopt the MeerKAT scanning strategy summarised in Tables 1 and 2 of Wang et al. (2020) to generate telescope pointing data targeting the WiggleZ 11hr field. A couple of slight differences should

Figure 2. Maps of the simulated foregrounds and HI Cosmological signal at ~ 915.5 MHz used as input to the simulations. The full sky input maps have been masked appropriately to include only the region of sky that the scanning strategy covers. Left column reading downwards: Total intensity signal, point sources, extragalactic free-free emission, and polarized Galactic synchrotron emission (Stokes Q). Right column reading downwards: HI cosmological signal, Galactic free-free emission, unpolarized Galactic synchrotron emission, and polarized galactic synchrotron emission (Stokes U).

Figure 3. The absolute value of the input signals as a function of frequency plotted for data from a single pixel at R.A. = 155° and Dec. = 3° – roughly corresponding to the centre of the MeerKAT field that we consider. The negative data is indicated by point markers. The unpolarized foregrounds all have smooth frequency dependence – whereas the polarized galactic synchrotron varies non-smoothly with frequency due to frequency dependent Faraday rotation.

be noted: we do not include the diode injection, and consider only a single dish. A TOD simulation is then used to sample simulated sky maps with either a beam squint or an effective gain mismatch systematic applied, which we take to be stable in time for the extent of the survey.

The simulated sky maps include the HI intensity signal, along with both polarized and unpolarized foregrounds. We generate the signals in 150 frequency bands ranging from 355–945 MHz using the CRIME² software’s “Fast” simulations (Alonso et al. 2014). Note that this frequency range is more similar to an SKA1-MID Band 1 or MeerKAT UHF band survey than the higher-frequency MeerKAT L-band survey in Wang et al. (2020). We use the same input cosmology and foregrounds as in Alonso et al. (2014), including the cosmological HI intensity signal, along with the following foregrounds: synchrotron emission, point sources, extra-galactic and galactic free-free emission, and polarized synchrotron emission. An example of these is shown for a single frequency channel in Fig. 2.

In Fig. 3 we show the input signals as a function of frequency for data from a single pixel at R.A. = 155° and Dec. = 3° – roughly corresponding to the centre of the field considered. The unpolarized foregrounds have smooth frequency dependence, whereas the polarized galactic synchrotron varies non-smoothly with frequency. This non-smooth variation stems from the frequency-dependent Faraday rotation. Alonso et al. (2014) include this by using the statistical properties of the synchrotron emission in the line of sight space of Faraday depths. The angular structure of the field is based on the unpolarized counterpart, and the structure in frequency is injected according to a correlation length in Faraday depth space which is derived from the complex models of Hammurabi (Waelkens et al. 2009) (see Alonso et al. (2014) for more detail on the foreground simulations).

We use HEALPY (Zonca et al. 2019) maps with a resolution of NSIDE=128 which we smooth using a 1° Gaussian beam, the width corresponding to the size of the MeerKAT primary beam (Wang et al. 2020). For simplicity, the beam model we use is independent of frequency, but note that this should not significantly affect the bottom line results since the map-making is performed separately for each frequency band. To aid in the proof of concept, we implement

² <http://intensitymapping.physics.ox.ac.uk/CRIME.html>

a noiseless setup, allowing for a clearer elucidation of the effects the different map-making approaches have on the systematics. We note that the inclusion of noise in map-making is a well-understood process (e.g. Tegmark 1997), and its absence should not affect the bottom line results of the techniques we explore.

We apply a simple binned map-making procedure to the TOD to derive our observed maps, treating each frequency band separately. A spin-0 map-making approach is applied as an example of that used as standard in intensity mapping, which amounts to simply averaging the signal within each pixel. In addition we apply an extended map-making approach solving for both the spin-0 signal and further spin-dependent signals chosen to match the spin of the systematic.³

Solving for additional signals of different spin makes the map-making slightly more complicated, requiring a matrix inversion based on the crossing angles to disentangle the signals (see Eq. 9 below). This matrix inversion is well behaved for a sufficiently redundant scan strategy, however less well sampled pixels may result in issues with the inversion (Hamilton 2003; Kurki-Suonio et al. 2009; McCallum et al. 2020). We thus impose a data cut to remove pixels where the inversion is found to be ill-conditioned. This cut comes at the expense of losing some of the observed field, the pixels that tend to have the most issues being those at the field edges which are visited relatively few times, and with few distinct crossing angles. This should be less of an issue for a larger scale survey, as the scanning strategies will likely contain further redundancies – i.e. further hits at more crossing angles. Consequently in the case of the beam squint simulations we also incorporate an additional elevation of 39° into the scanning strategy for one rising and one setting scan in order that we retain more survey area at map-making – see Appendix A for more information.

Following this, in order to separate the HI cosmological signal from the foregrounds, we apply a blind component separation technique. These foreground removal techniques, for the most part, use the high dynamic range between the cosmological and foreground signals to derive spectral templates, e.g. by performing an eigenvalue decomposition on the frequency-frequency covariance matrix of the data. After selecting a number of modes n_s with the highest SNR (largest eigenvalues), these are then subtracted from the observed maps. These modes tend to be smooth in frequency, like the dominant foreground emission. This means that any systematic contributions that are stable in time and that are also smooth in frequency will be absorbed into the foreground contribution that is removed by the component separation process. This does not apply to any systematic contributions which are non-smooth in frequency however, which should mostly survive foreground removal. In this case, other cleaning procedures are required. The technique that we demonstrate here removes these systematics *prior* to the usual foreground removal process, i.e. at the map-making stage.

For this study, we use the component separation software *gmca4im*⁴ (Carucci et al. 2020), which applies the sparsity-based Generalised Morphological Component Analysis (GMCA) algorithm of Bobin et al. (2007) to intensity mapping. We apply this technique to the observed maps from both the spin-0 dependent map-making and the extended map-making with additional spins.

³ We avoid complications such as destripping for the moment; however these types of techniques are “orthogonal” to the processes we are advocating and so could be included without detriment.

⁴ <https://github.com/isab311a/gmca4im>

4.2 Removing polarization leakage

The non-smooth frequency dependence of the polarization leakage in HI surveys is a result of Faraday rotation and other line of sight mixing effects. It has been noted that current methods that deal with polarization leakage suffer due to the Faraday rotation effect, and when they are applied can also lead to the loss of the cosmological signal itself (Cunnington et al. 2020). The method we present provides a way to disentangle the leaked polarization signal while incurring less loss of the HI signal itself.

We use a map-making approach that removes the polarization leakage for each frequency individually, meaning the frequency dependence of the Faraday rotation does not affect the ability of the method to remove the polarization signal and safely extract the intensity signal. Provided the Faraday rotation is roughly the same throughout the extent of a pixel over the time scale of the data being used then the method we advocate is robust to its effects – the linear polarization will still transform as a spin-2 field regardless of this rotation, and our pixel by pixel approach to map-making means that the variation in the Faraday rotation across the sky will not affect the ability of the map-making to retrieve the signal.

In the case of effective gain mismatch, there will be an amplification of the intensity signal usually dealt with by careful calibration. However there will also be leakage of polarization due to any difference in the gain offset between the feeds as in Eq. 4.

For the case of simple binned map-making, since we have summed the two feeds, this means in principle we can directly map-make for the intensity signal as

$$I = \langle d_j \rangle \quad (8)$$

where the angle brackets $\langle \rangle$ denote an average over the j measurements in a pixel, and d_j is the TOD signal summed from the two linearly polarized feeds. However this will result in the spin-2 polarization signal, present due to the gain mismatch, leaking into the observed intensity signal. In order to avoid this we may include spin-2 signals into map-making as

$$\begin{pmatrix} I \\ Q \\ U \end{pmatrix} = R_2^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \langle d_j \rangle \\ \langle d_j \cos(2\psi_j) \rangle \\ \langle d_j \sin(2\psi_j) \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where

$$R_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \langle \cos(2\psi_j) \rangle & \langle \sin(2\psi_j) \rangle \\ \langle \cos(2\psi_j) \rangle & \langle \cos^2(2\psi_j) \rangle & \langle \cos(2\psi_j) \sin(2\psi_j) \rangle \\ \langle \sin(2\psi_j) \rangle & \langle \sin(2\psi_j) \cos(2\psi_j) \rangle & \langle \sin^2(2\psi_j) \rangle \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since we know that the gain-leaked polarization is spin-2, this means that solving for a spin-2 signal in addition to the spin-0 intensity at map-making will disentangle the two and remove the leakage. We should note here that this technique is not specific to gain-leaked polarization; it would in fact disentangle any direct leakage of the spin-2 polarization signal regardless of the systematic sourcing it, provided it is stable for the time-span of the data included in the map-making. We also note that this map-making process also reconstructs the spin-2 signal itself. As such one could also plot maps of the systematic signal, in this case polarization leakage.

To demonstrate the ability of map-making to remove the contaminating signal we use a simulation with a 1% effective gain mismatch ($g^A - g^B = 0.01$). In order to concentrate on the polarization leakage we have also assumed that we can perfectly calibrate out the intensity amplification due to the gain systematic.

In principle the effective gain mismatch itself could vary with frequency, however we choose not to implement this in the simulations as its introduction would not alter the bottom line results;

Figure 4. Comparing panels 4a and 4b we see that when an effective gain mismatch is present, the retrieved signal is dominated by polarization leakage when applying standard spin-0 map-making. However in the extended spin-0 and 2 map-making case we see that the retrieved signal is no longer contaminated by polarization as the map-making has removed the leakage prior to the foreground extraction – allowing the HI signal to be retrieved successfully.

the systematic already has non-smooth frequency dependence due to the leakage of the polarized synchrotron foreground into the observed intensity signal and as such would already escape the standard component separation procedures.

4.2.1 Effect on foreground removal

Fig. 4 shows the output intensity maps, from the simulation including polarization leakage via effective gain mismatch, after the application of the blind foreground removal procedure where we set the number of ‘sources’ $n_s = 5$ (for further detail on the effect of varying n_s , see Carucci et al. 2020). All of the output maps have had the same mask applied to allow for simple comparison. We have restricted the demonstration to a single frequency of ~ 915.5 MHz here, however the behaviour is much the same at different frequency bands since map-making to remove the systematic is done for each frequency band individually.

Fig. 4a shows the input HI cosmological signal which ideally our output maps would exactly match. In Fig. 4b we see the output from the simulation where an effective gain mismatch systematic is present. The right panel shows that after blind foreground removal has been applied the retrieved signal is dominated by polarization leakage when applying standard spin-0 map-making – the foreground removal does not remove the polarization due to its non-smooth in frequency nature. The left panel shows that when using the extended spin-0 and 2 map-making procedure the retrieved signal is no longer contaminated by polarization; the map-making has removed the leakage prior to the foreground extraction, allowing the HI signal to be retrieved successfully.

Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 show, post foreground removal, the angular power

Figure 5. Foreground-cleaned angular power spectra at ~ 915.5 MHz. We see that the spectra output in the absence of systematics (red circles and pink dots) matches the input HI cosmological signal well for both types of map-making. The slight disagreement at low- l is a consequence of some loss of the cosmological signal at large angular scales during the foreground removal process. An effective gain mismatch systematic leaks polarization into the observed signal, so when implementing the standard spin-0-only map-making, this results in a large contamination to the retrieved HI angular power spectrum (green crosses). However, in the case where we apply the extended map-making process, solving for both spin-0 and spin-2 signals, we see that the contamination is almost completely removed (blue +s).

Figure 6. Foreground cleaned radial power spectra. The spectra output in the absence of systematics (red circles and pink dots) matches the input HI cosmological signal well for both cases of map-making. The slight discrepancy at low- k_v is a consequence of some loss of the cosmological signal during the foreground removal procedure. Since the effective gain mismatch systematic leaks polarization into the observed signal, when implementing the standard spin-0 map-making used in intensity mapping there is a large contamination to the retrieved HI signal (green crosses). However, when implementing the extended map-making process including both spin-0 and 2 signals, we see that the contamination is removed (blue +s).

spectra at ~ 915.5 MHz and the radial power spectra respectively. In both figures the output spectra of the simulations with no systematics are shown as red circles (spin-0 and 2 map-making) and pink dots (spin-0 map-making) and they match the input HI cosmological signal well for both cases of map-making. In Fig. 5 there is a slight disagreement at low- ℓ which is a consequence of some loss of the cosmological signal at large angular scales during the foreground removal process. Similarly in Fig. 6 a loss of the cosmological signal stemming from the foreground removal procedure causes a discrepancy at low- k_v (Carucci et al. 2020).

In both Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 the green crosses show the output of the simulation including the effective gain mismatch systematic when employing the standard spin-0 map-making usually used in intensity

mapping surveys – clearly the observed intensity signal is dominated by the polarization leakage in this case. The foreground removal has removed the smooth foregrounds but the non-smooth systematic leaked signal has survived the removal process. In the case where we apply the extended map-making process solving for both spin-0 and spin-2 signals, shown as blue +s, we see that the polarization contamination has been removed. The map-making has removed the polarization leakage which subsequently allowed the foreground removal process to successfully isolate the HI cosmological signal.

4.2.2 Summary

This case study has shown an example of how to deal with effective gain mismatch leading to leakage of the polarization into the observed intensity at the map-making step. We emphasise that this approach will work for any stable systematic that directly leaks the spin-2 polarization signal. In the standard approach of spin-0 map-making employed in intensity mapping this systematic leakage of the polarized foregrounds would heavily contaminate the observed intensity signal. We have shown here that this contamination can be controlled by a relatively simple extension to map-making.

We have demonstrated that the polarization leakage due to systematics can be removed via map-making prior to the application of the foreground removal process – when an additional spin-2 signal is solved for at map-making, the contamination is removed from the observed intensity signal. Polarization leakage can be a significant issue for intensity mapping surveys, and so consequently this extended map-making method could prove to be a useful option for removing this type of systematic contamination that can escape the standard foreground removal methods.

4.3 Removing leakage from beam squint

In the case of beam squint a spurious signal will manifest as a leakage of the derivative of the intensity and polarization signals as in Eq. 6.

For simple binned map-making, since we have summed the two feeds, we should be able to directly map-make for the intensity signal according to Eq. 8. However this will result in the contamination of the spin-0 intensity signal by spin-1 and spin-3 signals stemming from the beam squint systematic. We can avoid this by the inclusion of spin-1 and 3 signals into map-making as

$$\begin{pmatrix} I \\ Z_1^Q \\ Z_1^U \\ Z_3^Q \\ Z_3^U \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \langle \cos(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \sin(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \cos(3\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \sin(3\psi_i) \rangle \\ \langle \cos(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \cos^2(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \cos(\psi_i) \sin(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \cos(\psi_i) \cos(3\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \cos(\psi_i) \sin(3\psi_i) \rangle \\ \langle \sin(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \sin(\psi_i) \cos(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \sin^2(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \sin(\psi_i) \cos(3\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \sin(\psi_i) \sin(3\psi_i) \rangle \\ \langle \cos(3\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \cos(3\psi_i) \cos(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \cos(3\psi_i) \sin(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \cos^2(3\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \cos(3\psi_i) \sin(3\psi_i) \rangle \\ \langle \sin(3\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \sin(3\psi_i) \cos(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \sin(3\psi_i) \sin(\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \sin(3\psi_i) \cos(3\psi_i) \rangle & \langle \sin^2(3\psi_i) \rangle \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \langle d_i \rangle \\ \langle d_i \cos(\psi_i) \rangle \\ \langle d_i \sin(\psi_i) \rangle \\ \langle d_i \cos(3\psi_i) \rangle \\ \langle d_i \sin(3\psi_i) \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

where $(Z_1^Q + iZ_1^U)$ and $(Z_3^Q + iZ_3^U)$ are spin-1 and spin-3 fields. Solving for spin-1 and 3 signals in addition to the spin-0 intensity at map-making will disentangle them and remove the leakage from the observed signal. We should also note that in this map-making process we will also reconstruct and study the spin-1 and 3 signals themselves.

This approach requires a scanning strategy with sufficient redundancies such that the map-making is well behaved. As before, in our examples we impose a cut on the data when the map-making matrix is ill-conditioned to avoid issues. This results in loss of coverage of

certain parts of the field however, as is evident from Fig. 8. The ill-conditioning of the matrix roughly scales with the number of signals being solved for; solving for several signals simultaneously necessitates careful scan strategy design to avoid a large loss of survey area. We comment further on this in Appendix A.

Fig. 7 shows that $\delta I \gg \delta P$, and as such the systematic leakage will likely be dominated by the spin-1 signal. If that is the case, it may be possible to remove the bulk of the contamination through a relatively simple inclusion of only one additional spin-1 signal at map-making

as

$$\begin{pmatrix} I \\ Z^Q \\ Z^U \end{pmatrix} = R_1^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \langle d_j \rangle \\ \langle d_j \cos(1\psi_j) \rangle \\ \langle d_j \sin(1\psi_j) \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$R_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \langle \cos(1\psi_j) \rangle & \langle \sin(1\psi_j) \rangle \\ \langle \cos(1\psi_j) \rangle & \langle \cos^2(1\psi_j) \rangle & \langle \cos(1\psi_j) \sin(1\psi_j) \rangle \\ \langle \sin(1\psi_j) \rangle & \langle \sin(1\psi_j) \cos(1\psi_j) \rangle & \langle \sin^2(1\psi_j) \rangle \end{pmatrix}.$$

This simpler approach would allow for the retention of much more survey area than the extended approach of Eq. 10.

4.3.1 Smoothness of the leakage

As mentioned in Section 4.2, a foreground removal procedure is applied after the map-making process. This makes use of the fact that the unpolarized foregrounds are bright and have a smooth spectral structure to separate them from the HI cosmological signal. Nevertheless, the systematic leakage could still persist after foreground removal, as systematics can introduce a non-smooth frequency dependence.

Part of the beam squint systematic causes leakage of δI into the observed intensity. Since the unpolarized foregrounds are smooth in frequency, in principle the foreground contribution to δI is smooth in frequency also. As such, provided that the beam squint scaling ζ is constant or smooth in frequency, as illustrated in Fig. 7a, the leakage will be possible to extract with standard blind foreground removal techniques. However if, as in Fig. 7b, ζ varies non-smoothly in frequency, the leakage of δI will no longer vary smoothly in frequency, making it difficult to cleanly disentangle from the cosmological HI signal using standard blind foreground removal techniques.

In contrast to the δI contamination, the contamination from δP would be non-smooth with frequency, since the polarized foregrounds are non-smooth in frequency. As such, even in the case where the beam squint scaling ζ is constant or smooth in frequency, as seen in Fig. 7a, the δP component of the leakage would still evade the standard blind foreground removal techniques. In this case one could choose to remove the leakage through the inclusion of additional spins at map-making. However since δP is a much weaker signal than δI , the leakage will be less drastic in this scenario, which means that standard foreground removal alone may suffice.

The beam squint is associated with deviations from the ideal parabolic shape of a dish, leading to an effective misalignment of the observed signal. This leads to a frequency-dependent effect that also depends on instrumental parameters, as described in (e.g. Uson & Cotton 2008; Harp et al. 2011). This effect is usually expected to be smooth in frequency, but will vary between the two polarized feeds (Asad et al. 2021). Under some circumstances, deformations in the dish architecture can lead to a non-smooth in frequency effect however (Uson & Cotton 2008; Harp et al. 2011).

For completeness we therefore simulate both the case of a smooth in frequency squint, and the ostensibly less common scenario of a non-smooth in frequency squint to show that our approach can deal with either case. In order to investigate these cases, we run two sets of simulations:

- A beam squint varying linearly ($\zeta = -0.2'$ to $0.6'$) across the 150 frequency bands. This produces a smooth frequency dependence of the δI leakage along with a non-smooth δP component (see Fig. 7a).

(a) A smooth in frequency beam squint systematic, plotted for data from a single pixel at R.A.= 155° and Dec.= 3°. Upper Panel: $\zeta \delta I$ vs frequency. Centre Panel: $\zeta \delta P$ vs frequency. Lower Panel: ζ vs frequency.

(b) A non-smooth in frequency beam squint systematic, plotted for data from a single pixel at R.A.= 155° and Dec.= 3°. Upper Panel: $\zeta \delta I$ vs frequency. Centre Panel: $\zeta \delta P$ vs frequency. Lower Panel: ζ vs frequency.

Figure 7. The δI foreground signal is smooth in frequency and as such provided that the beam squint scaling ζ is constant or smooth (as in panel 7a) in frequency the leakage of δI will remain smooth and possible to extract with standard blind foreground removal techniques. However δP is non-smooth in frequency and as such even with a ζ that is constant or smooth in frequency (as in panel 7a) the leakage of this signal may evade usual foreground removal techniques. Furthermore if, as in panel 7b, ζ varies non-smoothly in frequency the leaked δI signal will no longer vary smoothly in frequency – as such becoming inaccessible to standard blind foreground removal techniques.

- A beam squint randomly varying in frequency, sampled from a uniform distribution between $\zeta = -0.3'$ and $0.3'$. This produces non-smooth frequency dependence of the δI and δP leakage (see Fig. 7b).

These representative offsets ζ were chosen based on Fig. 3 of Asad et al. (2021), in order to be broadly realistic for the MeerKAT system.

(a) Input HI cosmological signal at $\sim 915.5\text{MHz}$.

(b) Random beam squint systematic simulation.

(c) Linear beam squint systematic simulation.

Figure 8. [8b](#) and [8c](#) show foreground cleaned maps at $\sim 915.5\text{MHz}$ – Left Panels: Spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making – Right Panels: Spin-0 map-making. Comparing panels [8a](#) and [8b](#) we see that for a beam squint non-smooth in frequency in the spin-0 map-making case the retrieved signal is dominated by the beam squint leakage – however when applying the extended spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making procedure the leakage is removed prior to the foreground extraction and the HI signal is retrieved successfully. In contrast panel [8c](#) shows that if the systematic is smooth in frequency the foreground removal will deal almost equally well with the contamination for both types of map-making – retrieving the HI signal successfully with only a slight difference visible in the spin-0 case due to the enduring small δP leakage.

4.3.2 Effect on foreground removal

Fig. 8 shows the output intensity maps after the application of the blind foreground removal procedure where we set the number of sources $n_s = 5$. The output maps include the beam squint simulations generated using the MeerKAT survey. Also plotted in Fig. [8a](#) is the input HI cosmological signal for comparison. All of the maps have had the same mask applied to allow for simple comparison. The maps plotted here are for the $\sim 915.5\text{MHz}$ frequency band, but the results are generally similar for all frequency bands.

In Fig. [8b](#) we see the output of the simulation where a beam squint systematic that is non-smooth in frequency is present. The right

panel shows that in the spin-0 map-making case the retrieved signal is clearly dominated by the beam squint leakage, and particularly by the δI signal. Despite the fact that the δI is smooth in frequency, the non-smooth ζ offset prevents the foreground removal from being able to remove this signal. The left panel shows that when using the extended spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making procedure, the retrieved signal is no longer subject to contamination by the systematic; the map-making has removed the leakage prior to the foreground extraction, allowing the HI cosmological signal to be retrieved successfully.

In contrast Fig. [8c](#) shows that if the beam squint systematic is smooth in frequency, standard foreground removal can deal with the contamination, at least for the representative values of beam squint

taken from Fig. 3 of [Asad et al. \(2021\)](#). The contamination is dominated by the δI leakage, however as shown in Fig. 7a this component of the systematic is smooth, and so standard blind component separation methods can successfully remove it. As can be seen in Fig. 7a, the δP leakage is non-smooth in frequency, and as such can evade the standard foreground cleaning techniques. As expected, its contribution is very small compared to that of δI , and so the remaining contamination after the standard foreground removal procedure is insignificant. (Note that while this statement is true for the representative beam squint ζ systematic we have input, it is dependent on its size.) Consequently both the standard spin-0 and the extended spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making cases show successful recovery of the HI cosmological signal.

In Fig. 8 there is clearly a heavy loss of sky area, which stems from the cut made at the map-making stage based on how well-conditioned the map-making matrix is. As we are attempting to solve for several spin signals simultaneously, the conditioning becomes more sensitive to the crossing angle coverage. The large loss in sky area here is in part due to the scanning strategy being for a relatively small pathfinder survey, resulting in sparser crossing angle coverage, and also due to our choice to only consider a single dish. A natural benefit from a larger scale survey with additional dishes considered will be increased coverage, provided the scan strategy is designed to maximise crossing angle coverage given other constraints. We discuss this more in Appendix A.

A given experiment will need to quantify its expected beam squint distribution in frequency. In most cases this will be smooth, and so the loss in survey coverage from performing the extended spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making likely outweighs the benefits, given that foreground removal should deal with the worst of the contamination in this case. Instead, the standard spin-0 map-making, which would retain the full survey area, would suffice without much detriment from the beam squint in this scenario. In some less common cases, a non-smooth in frequency beam squint can manifest, and in this case the leakage would be large enough that its removal via extended map-making would be a benefit that could outweigh the loss in survey area.

Fig. 9 and Fig. 10 show, post foreground removal, the angular power spectra at ~ 915.5 MHz and the radial power spectra respectively. In all panels the output spectra of the simulations in the absence of systematics, shown as red circles (spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making) and pink dots (spin-0 map-making), match the input HI cosmological signal well. In Fig. 9 the slight disagreement at low- ℓ is due to loss of the cosmological signal at large angular scales during the foreground removal process. Similarly in Fig. 10 the slight discrepancy at low- k_ν stems from some loss of the HI cosmological signal during the foreground removal process ([Carucci et al. 2020](#)).

Fig. 9a and Fig. 10a show the case for a beam squint systematic that is non-smooth in frequency. The green crosses show the output of the simulation including the beam squint systematic when employing standard spin-0 map-making. The observed intensity signal is dominated by the systematic contamination in this case, and the beam squint systematic leaked signal has not been removed by the foreground cleaning due to its non-smooth dependence on frequency. However when implementing the extended map-making process, solving for spin-0, 1 and 3 signals prior to foreground removal, the output spectra (shown as blue +s) matches the input cosmological signal (blue solid line) well. The extended map-making again removes the systematic contamination, allowing the foreground removal to successfully recover the HI cosmological signal.

In contrast Fig. 9b and Fig. 10b illustrate that, in the case where we have a beam squint systematic that is smooth in frequency, the standard foreground removal will deal with most of the contamination.

(a) Random Beam Squint Simulation.

(b) Linear Beam Squint Simulation.

Figure 9. Foreground cleaned angular power spectra at ~ 915.5 MHz. In both panels we see that the spectra output in the absence of systematics (red circles and pink dots) matches the input HI cosmological signal well for both cases of map-making. The slight disagreement at low- ℓ is a consequence of some loss of the cosmological signal during the foreground removal process. From panel 9a we see that for a beam squint systematic non-smooth in frequency implementing the standard spin-0 map-making used in intensity mapping will result in a large contamination to the retrieved HI angular power spectrum (green crosses) – however when implementing an extended map-making process solving for spin-0, 1 and 3 signals we see that the contamination is removed (blue +s). Panel 9b illustrates that in the case of systematics smooth in frequency the standard foreground removal will deal well with the contamination.

This is shown by the fact that in both the spin-0 and the spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making cases, the output spectra for the simulations including the systematic line up well with the output spectra from the simulations with no systematics. The spin-0 map-making case deviates slightly due to the non-smooth in frequency δP leakage, however it is close to insignificant for the representative levels of beam squint used for the smooth linear variation in frequency.

4.3.3 Summary

In summary, we know that there is a dependence of beam squint on frequency and it is important to understand how smooth that dependence is to know whether the contamination will be removed by standard blind foreground removal, or whether extended map-making is required. We expect that in most cases the squint will vary smoothly with frequency, and have demonstrated that the standard foreground removal will deal with the contamination without requiring the extended map-making in this case. This is despite the systematic having a non-smooth component from the δP leakage, due to its contribution being sufficiently small that there is very little contamination remaining after the foreground cleaning.

We have also demonstrated that in the less common scenario where the systematic is non-smooth in frequency, the standard approach of spin-0 map-making will result in the systematic heavily contaminating the observed intensity signal. We have shown that this systematic leakage can be removed via map-making prior to the application of the foreground removal process. When additional spin-1 and 3 signals

(a) Random Beam Squint Simulation.

(b) Linear Beam Squint Simulation.

Figure 10. Foreground cleaned radial power spectra. In both panels we see that the spectra output in the absence of systematics (red circles and pink dots) matches the input HI cosmological signal well for both cases of map-making. The slight discrepancy at low- k_v is a consequence of some loss of the cosmological signal during the foreground removal process. From panel 10a we see that for a beam squint systematic non-smooth in frequency implementing the standard spin-0 map-making results in a large contamination to the retrieved HI signal (green crosses) – however when implementing the extended map-making process we see that the contamination is removed (blue +s). Panel 10b show that a beam squint systematic that varies smoothly in frequency will be dealt with well by the foreground removal process itself.

are solved for at map-making, the contamination is removed from the observed intensity signal. As such, if the beam squint systematic is non-smooth in frequency for an experiment, then the extended map-making method could prove an important technique for removing the resulting contamination.

4.4 General application

We have shown that the inclusion of additional spins in simple binned map-making is a viable technique to remove systematics from intensity mapping surveys. This offers a simple extension to the map-making techniques already employed by autocorrelation intensity mapping experiments, but requires careful thought about scanning strategies to ensure sufficient redundancy in crossing angle coverage. Importantly, this technique allows us to exploit the spin structure of troublesome systematics that leak signals such as the polarized foregrounds, which are non-smooth in frequency and so are not removed effectively by blind component separation methods.

The choice of which additional spin(s) to include in the map-making process will depend on the systematics that one is attempting to remove. Table 2 gives some examples of systematics that could potentially be disentangled from the cosmological signal by this technique, provided the map-making is performed on the data over timescales on which the systematic is stable. This list is not exhaustive; any systematics which are stable in time and have a well defined spin dependence could be included in this list. The choice

Table 2. A set of systematics which can be modelled and mitigated by the methods presented. The column labelled “ $\tilde{h}_n$ Coupling” gives the orientation quantity of interest that could be suppressed with a well designed scanning strategy. The column labelled “Spin” corresponds to the additional spin that could be solved for during the map-making process to disentangle the systematic from the true signal. This list is by no means exhaustive, but gives an indication of the systematics these techniques are appropriate for.

Systematic	$\tilde{h}_n$ Coupling	Spin
Beam Squint (Intensity derivative leakage)	$\tilde{h}_{\pm 1}$	1
Beam Squint (Polarization derivative leakage)	$\tilde{h}_{\pm 1}$ and $\tilde{h}_{\pm 3}$	1 and 3
Gain Mismatch (Polarization leakage)	$\tilde{h}_{\pm 2}$	2
Imperfect Alignment (Polarization leakage)	$\tilde{h}_{\pm 2}$	2

of additional spins to include in the map-making will be dictated by whichever systematics are of most concern to a given experiment. As such, the technique can be tailored to be most useful to a specific survey.

Note that if the systematics drift over the time of a full survey, then map-making to remove them would need to be performed on TOD split into shorter timescales over which the systematic is stable. The resulting observed intensity maps could then be stacked before applying foreground removal.

Another important feature is that this process is agnostic to the source of the systematic. For instance, regardless of the cause, if the spin-2 on-sky polarization signal is leaked into the observed intensity, then it may be disentangled in this way. Provided one has sufficient redundancies in the scanning strategy, and that the systematic is stable in time, then making use of Eq. 9 to solve for both a spin-0 and spin-2 signal in the map-making process will isolate the intensity signal from the polarization leakage.

5 CONCLUSIONS

We have adapted the formalism from Wallis et al. (2017); McCallum et al. (2020); Thomas et al. (2021) and applied it in the context of autocorrelation (‘single-dish’) intensity mapping surveys. This formalism classifies instrumental systematics according to their spin properties, and therefore acts as a framework for studying and mitigating these systematics, including those that cause polarization leakage. The key results are as follows:

(i) We have provided a simple approach to modelling systematics with well-defined spin dependence. The key equation, Eq. 3, gives a general description of an observed spin-0 field and how signals of other spin can leak into it. Combining this with the simple intensity mapping setup of Section 2 allows for the leakage into the observed intensity signal due to a number of systematics to be described. This can be used in conjunction with prior knowledge of the scanning strategy and instrumental parameters to estimate the expected level of certain systematics, and how well they are mitigated through the crossing angle coverage achieved by the scan.

(ii) We showed that a straightforward extension of the simple binned map-making method – solving for additional spin fields – provides a method that disentangles such systematics from the cosmological signal. The spins to include in map-making should be tailored to the systematic of most concern to a given instrument. Alternatively, blind searches can be performed to find the spin of the systematics that are most contaminating the data. We have shown that this map-making is complementary to and compatible with ex-

isting foreground removal techniques, at least to the level of realism incorporated in our simulations so far.

(iii) We have shown that polarization leakage contaminating the intensity signal can be removed by map-making for both spin-0 and spin-2 signals simultaneously, using an effective gain mismatch systematic as an example.

(iv) We have also shown a case study where contamination of the intensity signal can be sourced by systematics of different spin, even in the case where there is no polarization leakage. This technique removes the systematic even when the contaminating signals are non-smooth in frequency – signals that are not readily removed by blind component separation methods.

We have shown a proof of concept here for how a spin-based map-making technique can be used to deal with systematics in intensity mapping surveys that would otherwise be difficult to filter out. The general processes outlined here, particularly the map-making, should be beneficial to a number of planned intensity mapping surveys, e.g. with MeerKAT and SKA1-MID, and their relative simplicity should facilitate their implementation for future experiments. Crucially, we expect the tools shown here to work for any kind of polarization leakage that is caused by instrumental non-idealities, providing they can be written in the form of Eq. 2. These tools now need to be applied to increasingly realistic and complex simulations, in order to understand the full ramifications of using them on real data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to J. Wang for useful comments and help with the MeerKAT survey specifications. NM is supported by a STFC studentship. DBT acknowledges support from Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC) grants ST/P000649/1, ST/T000414/1 and ST/T000341/1. This result is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 948764; PB). PB also acknowledges support from STFC Grant ST/T000341/1. The authors acknowledge Jingying Wang, Mario Santos, Yi-Chao Li, Stuart Harper, Laura Wolz, Richard Battye, Keith Grange, and the MeerKAT collaboration for helpful discussions.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author. The codes used will be made available at https://github.com/Nium14/Spin-Based_Map-Making_IM.

REFERENCES

- Alonso D., Ferreira P. G., Santos M. G., 2014, *MNRAS*, **444**, 3183
- Alonso D., Bull P., Ferreira P. G., Santos M. G., 2015, *MNRAS*, **447**, 400
- Anderson C. J., et al., 2018, *MNRAS*, **476**, 3382
- Ansari R., et al., 2012, *A&A*, **540**, A129
- Asad K. M. B., et al., 2021, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, **502**, 2970
- Bagla J. S., Khandai N., Datta K. K., 2010, *MNRAS*, **407**, 567
- Battye R. A., Browne I. W. A., Dickinson C., Heron G., Maffei B., Pourtsidou A., 2013, *MNRAS*, **434**, 1239
- Bobin J., Starck J.-L., Fadili J., Moudden Y., 2007, *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, **16**, 2662
- Bull P., Ferreira P. G., Patel P., Santos M. G., 2015, *ApJ*, **803**, 21
- Carucci I. P., Irfan M. O., Bobin J., 2020, *MNRAS*, **499**, 304
- Chang T.-C., Pen U.-L., Peterson J. B., McDonald P., 2008, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **100**, 091303
- Chang T.-C., Pen U.-L., Bandura K., Peterson J. B., 2010, *Nature*, **466**, 463
- Cunnington S., Irfan M. O., Carucci I. P., Pourtsidou A., Bobin J., 2020, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:2010.02907](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.02907)
- De S., Tashiro H., 2014, *Phys. Rev. D*, **89**, 123002
- Hamilton J. C., 2003, arXiv e-prints, [pp astro-ph/0310787](https://arxiv.org/abs/ppastro-ph/0310787)
- Harp G. R., et al., 2011, *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, **59**, 2004
- Harper S. E., Dickinson C., 2018, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, **479**, 2024
- Harper S. E., Dickinson C., Battye R. A., Roychowdhury S., Browne I. W. A., Ma Y. Z., Olivari L. C., Chen T., 2018, *MNRAS*, **478**, 2416
- Hivon E., Mottet S., Ponthieu N., 2017, *A&A*, **598**, A25
- Irfan M. O., Bull P., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:2107.02267](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.02267)
- Jelić V., Zaroubi S., Labropoulos P., Bernardi G., de Bruyn A. G., Koopmans L. V. E., 2010, *MNRAS*, **409**, 1647
- Kovetz E., et al., 2019, *Bulletin of the American Astronomical Society*, **51**, 101
- Kurki-Suonio H., Keihänen E., Kesitalo R., Poutanen T., Sirviö A. S., Maino D., Burigana C., 2009, *A&A*, **506**, 1511
- Li Y., Santos M. G., Grainge K., Harper S., Wang J., 2021, *MNRAS*, **501**, 4344
- Lidz A., Furlanetto S. R., Oh S. P., Aguirre J., Chang T.-C., Doré O., Pritchard J. R., 2011, *ApJ*, **741**, 70
- Loeb A., Wyithe J. S. B., 2008, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **100**, 161301
- Mao Y., Tegmark M., McQuinn M., Zaldarriaga M., Zahn O., 2008, *Phys. Rev. D*, **78**, 023529
- Masui K. W., et al., 2013, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, **763**, L20
- McCallum N., Thomas D. B., Brown M. L., Tessore N., 2020, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:2008.00011](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.00011)
- Moore D. F., Aguirre J. E., Parsons A. R., Jacobs D. C., Pober J. C., 2013, *ApJ*, **769**, 154
- O'Dea D., Challinor A., Johnson B. R., 2007, *MNRAS*, **376**, 1767
- Olivari L. C., Remazeilles M., Dickinson C., 2016, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, **456**, 2749
- Peterson J. B., et al., 2009, in *astro2010: The Astronomy and Astrophysics Decadal Survey*, p. 234 ([arXiv:0902.3091](https://arxiv.org/abs/0902.3091))
- Polarbear Collaboration et al., 2014, *ApJ*, **794**, 171
- Pritchard J. R., Loeb A., 2008, *Phys. Rev. D*, **78**, 103511
- Rybicki G. B., Lightman A. P., 1986, *Radiative Processes in Astrophysics*. Wiley-VCH
- Santos M., et al., 2015, in *Advancing Astrophysics with the Square Kilometre Array (AASKA14)*, p. 19 ([arXiv:1501.03989](https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.03989))
- Santos M. G., et al., 2017, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:1709.06099](https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.06099)
- Seo H.-J., Dodelson S., Marriner J., McGinnis D., Stebbins A., Stoughton C., Vallinotto A., 2010, *ApJ*, **721**, 164
- Shimon M., Keating B., Ponthieu N., Hivon E., 2008, *Phys. Rev. D*, **77**, 083003
- Soares P. S., Watkinson C. A., Cunnington S., Pourtsidou A., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:2105.12665](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.12665)
- Sutton D., et al., 2010, *MNRAS*, **407**, 1387
- Tauscher K., Rapetti D., Burns J. O., 2020, *ApJ*, **897**, 175
- Tauscher K., et al., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:2105.01672](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.01672)
- Tegmark M., 1997, *ApJ*, **480**, L87
- Thomas D. B., McCallum N., Brown M. L., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:2102.02284](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.02284)
- Uson J. M., Cotton W. D., 2008, *A&A*, **486**, 647
- Waelkens A., Jaffe T., Reinecke M., Kitaura F. S., Enßlin T. A., 2009, *A&A*, **495**, 697
- Wallis C. G. R., Bonaldi A., Brown M. L., Battye R. A., 2015, *MNRAS*, **453**, 2058
- Wallis C. G. R., Brown M. L., Battye R. A., Delabrouille J., 2017, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, **466**, 425
- Wang J., et al., 2020, arXiv e-prints, p. [arXiv:2011.13789](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.13789)
- Wolz L., Abdalla F. B., Blake C., Shaw J. R., Chapman E., Rawlings S., 2014, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, **441**, 3271

- Wolz L., et al., 2017, *MNRAS*, **464**, 4938
 Wolz L., et al., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2102.04946
 Wyithe J. S. B., Loeb A., 2008, *MNRAS*, **383**, 606
 Wyithe J. S. B., Loeb A., Geil P. M., 2008, *MNRAS*, **383**, 1195
 Zonca A., Singer L., Lenz D., Reinecke M., Rosset C., Hivon E., Gorski K., 2019, *Journal of Open Source Software*, **4**, 1298

APPENDIX A: SCANNING STRATEGY

We adopt the scanning strategy put forth in Wang et al. (2020) in this paper, however this was in fact a path finder survey and a full survey design would likely have both increased integration time as well as exploit further redundancies in the scanning strategy. We have demonstrated in this work that the extended map-making procedure can remove systematic leakage, but with an associated loss of coverage area due to cutting pixels with ill-conditioned map-making matrices. This is particularly evident in the case of the beam squint systematic where we use Eq. 10 to solve for spin-0, 1, and 3 signals simultaneously.

This is mainly due to the poor crossing angle coverage (particularly in the edge pixels) born out of this being a relatively small path finder survey. This should be naturally remedied with the more complex scanning strategy which would likely be in place for a full survey e.g. MeerKLASS (Santos et al. 2017).

The $|\tilde{h}_n|^2$ act as a metric of the crossing angle coverage and give an indication both of how well the scan strategy should suppress systematics of spin- n – they are also tied to how well including a spin- n signal in map-making should perform. These quantities can even act as an indicator of what elevation or field would be useful to include in a scanning strategy. If one calculates the integral of these quantities over the planned observed patch and minimises them by varying either the field location or elevation of the telescope this will give an indication of the best setup to suppress systematics.

The introduction of additional spins to map-making makes the process far more dependent on having a well designed scanning strategy. For a given scan the more spins that are introduced into map-making the less well conditioned the inversion of the map-making matrix is likely to be. However provided the scan has sufficient crossing angle coverage the map-making should behave well enough even when solving for multiple spins. There will also be a dependence on the chosen pixel size, coarser pixels will naturally incorporate more hits for a given scanning strategy. This will allow more data to be included

in the map-making step allowing for improved conditioning although with a sacrifice to the angular resolution of the output maps.

Fig. A1 demonstrates that with slight modifications to the MeerKAT scanning strategy of Wang et al. (2020) the crossing angle coverage required for the extended map-making to be well conditioned can be achieved in most of the field. This supports the fact that the coverage issues for the spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making are due to the pathfinder nature of the survey, and should be fixed by a larger survey design.

Fig. A1a shows that the MeerKAT scan strategy is already close to optimal for the spin-0 and 2 map-making with most pixels in the field surviving the map-making cut. The optimal elevation to minimise the $|h_2|^2$ quantity for the field is 39.0° and when implementing an extra two scans at rising and setting using this elevation we see a modest improvement in the number of pixels that survive the cut.

Fig. A1b shows that the MeerKAT scan strategy is sub-optimal for spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making with many pixels being removed during the map-making cut. We also show the case where an additional two scans are performed at rising and setting at an elevation of 49.0° – this was calculate to be optimal for minimising the $|h_3|^2$ quantity for the field. In this case we see a large improvement in the number of pixels that survive the cut. The edges of the field are still cut in this case due to a sparse crossing angle coverage in those regions.

The crossing angle coverage achieved by the scanning strategy at the field edges is worse than at the centre and as such the map-making is less well conditioned there. Incorporating further elevations could help improve the crossing angle coverage as they would provide a scanning strategy with greater redundancies.

In contrast to $|h_3|^2$ the $|h_1|^2$ quantity for the field is minimised for extremely low elevations. This is the other quantity which is important to suppress for spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making, given the spin-1 dependence. In Fig. A1c we show the effects of including a relatively low elevation of 39.0° on the spin-0, 1 and 3 map-making – though this elevation is still not optimal for the suppression of $|h_1|^2$ we see that its inclusion to the scanning strategy still vastly improves the number of pixels that survive the map-making cut. As such when including multiple additional spins at map-making it is important to examine each relevant $|h_n|^2$ quantity together to see what scanning strategy design will best aid in map-making overall.

This paper has been typeset from a $\text{\LaTeX}$ file prepared by the author.

Figure A1. Panel A1a shows the resulting hitmaps following the cut made based on the conditioning of the map-making for spin-0 and 2 signals. Comparing the coverage attained using the MeerKAT survey of Wang et al. (2020) and the case where two further observations of the field are made at rising and setting with the telescope elevation set to 39.0° we see a slight increase in the number of pixels that survive the cut. Panel A1b shows the resulting hitmaps following the cut made based on the conditioning of the map-making for spin-0, 1 and 3 signals. Comparing the coverage attained using the MeerKAT survey and the case where two further observations of the field are made at rising and setting with the telescope elevation set to 49.0° we see a large increase in the number of pixels that survive the cut. Panel A1c shows the resulting hitmaps following the cut made based on the conditioning of the map-making for spin-0, 1 and 3 signals. Comparing the coverage attained using the MeerKAT survey and the case where two further observations of the field are made at rising and setting with the telescope elevation set to 39.0° we see the number of pixels that survive the cut increases even more.