

Smooth maps from clumpy data: Covariance analysis

M. Lombardi and P. Schneider

Institut für Astrophysik und Extraterrestrische Forschung, Universität Bonn, Auf dem Hügel 71, 53121 Bonn, Germany

Received 23 January 2002 / Accepted 27 June 2002

Abstract. Interpolation techniques play a central role in Astronomy, where one often needs to smooth irregularly sampled data into a smooth map. In a previous article (Lombardi & Schneider 2001, hereafter Paper I), we have considered a widely used smoothing technique and we have evaluated the expectation value of the smoothed map under a number of natural hypotheses. Here we proceed further on this analysis and consider the variance of the smoothed map, represented by a two-point correlation function. We show that two main sources of noise contribute to the total error budget and we show several interesting properties of these two noise terms. The expressions obtained are also specialized to the limiting cases of low and high densities of measurements. A number of examples are used to show in practice some of the results obtained.

Key words. methods: statistical – methods: analytical – methods: data analysis – gravitational lensing

1. Introduction

Raw astronomical data are very often discrete, in the sense that measurements are performed along a finite number of directions on the sky. In many cases, the discrete data are believed to be single measurements of a smooth underlying field. In such cases, it is desirable to reconstruct the original field using interpolation techniques. A typical example of the general situation just described is given by weak lensing mass reconstructions in clusters of galaxies. In this case, thousands of noisy estimates of the tidal field of the cluster (shear) can be obtained from the observed shapes of background galaxies whose images are distorted by the gravitational field of the cluster. All these measurements can then be combined to produce a smooth map of the cluster shear, which in turn is subsequently converted into a projected density map of the cluster mass distribution.

One of the most widely used interpolation techniques in Astronomy is based on a weighted average. More precisely, a positive weight function, describing the relative weight of a datum at the position $\theta + \phi$ on the point θ , is introduced. The weight function is often chosen to be of the form $w(|\phi|)$, i.e. depends only on the separation $|\phi|$ of the two points considered. Normally, w is also a decreasing function of $|\phi|$ in order to ensure that the largest contributions to the interpolated value at θ comes from nearby measurements. Then, the data are averaged using a weighted mean with the weights given by the function w . More precisely, calling \hat{f}_n the n th datum obtained at the position θ_n , the smooth map is defined as

$$\tilde{f}(\theta) \equiv \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N \hat{f}_n w(\theta - \theta_n)}{\sum_{n=1}^N w(\theta - \theta_n)}, \quad (1)$$

where N is the total number of objects. In a previous paper (Lombardi & Schneider 2001, hereafter Paper I) we have evaluated the expectation value for this expression under the following hypothesis:

- The measured values $\{\hat{f}_n\}$ are independent random variables with expectation value

$$\langle \hat{f}_n \rangle = f(\theta_n). \quad (2)$$

In other words, the $\{\hat{f}_n\}$ are *unbiased* measurements of a field $f(\theta)$.

- The positions $\{\theta_n\}$ are independent random variables with uniform distribution and density ρ . In Paper I we initially considered a fixed number N of positions inside a field Ω of finite area A ; then, we took the *continuous limit* letting N go to infinity with $\rho = N/A$ constant. Equivalently, we considered N to be a Poisson random variable with average ρA :

$$p_N(N) = e^{-\rho A} \frac{(\rho A)^N}{N!}, \quad (3)$$

Send offprint requests to: M. Lombardi,
e-mail: lombardi@astro.uni-bonn.de

and each location θ_n to be uniformly distributed inside A :

$$p_{\theta}(\theta_n) = \frac{1}{A}. \quad (4)$$

In Paper I we have shown that

$$\langle \tilde{f}(\theta) \rangle = \int f(\theta') w_{\text{eff}}(\theta - \theta') d^2\theta'. \quad (5)$$

Thus, $\langle \tilde{f} \rangle$ is the convolution of the unknown field f with an *effective weight* w_{eff} which, in general, differs from the weight function w . We also have shown that w_{eff} has a ‘‘similar’’ shape as w and converges to w when the object density ρ is large; however for finite ρ , w_{eff} is broader than w .

Here we proceed further with the statistical analysis by obtaining an expression for the two-point correlation function (covariance) of this estimator. More precisely, given two points θ_A and θ_B , we consider the two-point correlation function of \tilde{f} , defined as

$$\text{Cov}(\tilde{f}; \theta_A, \theta_B) \equiv \langle \tilde{f}(\theta_A) \tilde{f}(\theta_B) \rangle - \langle \tilde{f}(\theta_A) \rangle \langle \tilde{f}(\theta_B) \rangle. \quad (6)$$

In our calculations, similarly to Paper I, we assume that \hat{f}_n are *unbiased and mutually independent* estimates of $f(\theta_n)$ (cf. Eq. (2)). We also assume that the $\{\hat{f}_n\}$ have fixed variance σ^2 , so that

$$\langle [\hat{f}_n - f(\theta_n)] [\hat{f}_m - f(\theta_m)] \rangle = \sigma^2 \delta_{nm}. \quad (7)$$

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2 we summarize the results obtained in this paper. In Sect. 3 we derive the general expression for the covariance of the interpolating techniques and we show that two main noise terms contribute to the total error. These results are then generalized in Sect. 4 to include the case of weight functions that are not strictly positive. A useful expansion at high densities ρ of the covariance is obtained in Sect. 5. Section 6 is devoted to the study of several interesting properties of the expressions obtained in the paper. Finally, in Sect. 7 we consider three simple weight functions and derive (analytically or numerically) the covariance for these cases. Four appendixes on more technical topics complete the paper.

2. Summary

As mentioned in the introduction, the primary aim of this paper is the evaluation of the covariance (two-point correlation function) of the smoothing estimator (1) under the hypotheses that measurements \hat{f}_n are unbiased estimates of a field $f(\theta)$ (Eq. (2)) and that location measurements $\{\theta_n\}$ are independent, uniformly distributed variables with density ρ . Hence, we do not allow for angular clustering on the positions $\{\theta_n\}$, and we also do not include the effects of a finite field in our calculations (these effects are expected to play a role on points close to the boundary of the region where data are available). Moreover, we suppose that the noise on the measurements $\{\hat{f}_n\}$ is uncorrelated with the signal (i.e., that variance σ^2 is constant on the field), and that measurements are uncorrelated to each other. Finally, we stress that in the whole paper we assume a non-negative (i.e., positive or vanishing) weight function $w(\theta) \geq 0$. Surprisingly, weight functions with arbitrary sign cannot be studied in our framework (see discussion at the end of Sect. 4).

The results obtained in this paper can be summarized in the following points.

1. We evaluate analytically the two-point correlation function of $\tilde{f}(\theta)$, showing that it is composed of two main terms:

$$\text{Cov}(\tilde{f}; \theta_A, \theta_B) \equiv \langle \tilde{f}(\theta_A) \tilde{f}(\theta_B) \rangle - \langle \tilde{f}(\theta_A) \rangle \langle \tilde{f}(\theta_B) \rangle = T_{\sigma} + T_{\text{P}}. \quad (8)$$

The term T_{σ} is proportional to σ^2 and can thus be interpreted as the contribution to the covariance from measurement errors; the term T_{P} depends on the signal $f(\theta)$ and can be interpreted as Poisson noise. These terms can be evaluated using the following set of equations:

$$Q(s_A, s_B) = \int_{\Omega} [e^{-s_A w_A(\theta) - s_B w_B(\theta)} - 1] d^2\theta, \quad (9)$$

$$Y(s_A, s_B) = \exp[\rho Q(s_A, s_B)]. \quad (10)$$

$$C(w_A, w_B) = \rho^2 \int_0^{\infty} ds_A \int_0^{\infty} ds_B e^{-s_A w_A - s_B w_B} Y(s_A, s_B) = \rho^2 \mathcal{L}[Y](w_A, w_B), \quad (11)$$

$$T_{\sigma} = \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta w_A(\theta) w_B(\theta) C(w_A(\theta), w_B(\theta)), \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T_P &= \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta [f(\theta)]^2 w_A(\theta) w_B(\theta) C(w_A(\theta), w_B(\theta)) \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 f(\theta_1) f(\theta_2) w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_2) \left[C(w_A(\theta_1) + w_A(\theta_2), w_B(\theta_1) + w_B(\theta_2)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - C_A(w_A(\theta_1)) C_B(w_B(\theta_2)) \right]. \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

In the last two equations we used the notation $w_A(\theta) = w(\theta_A - \theta)$, and similarly for $w_B(\theta)$; moreover the two functions C_A and C_B can be obtained from the following limits:

$$C_A(w_A) = \frac{1}{\rho} \lim_{w_B \rightarrow \infty} w_B C(w_A, w_B), \quad C_B(w_B) = \frac{1}{\rho} \lim_{w_A \rightarrow \infty} w_A C(w_A, w_B). \tag{14}$$

2. We show that the quantity $C(w_A, w_B)$ of Eq. (11), in the limit of high density ρ , converges to

$$C(w_A, w_B) \simeq \frac{\rho^2}{(\rho + w_A)(\rho + w_B)} + \frac{\rho^3 S_{20}}{(\rho + w_A)^3 (\rho + w_B)} + \frac{\rho^3 S_{11}}{(\rho + w_A)^2 (\rho + w_B)^2} + \frac{\rho^3 S_{02}}{(\rho + w_A)(\rho + w_B)^3}, \tag{15}$$

where S_{ij} are the moments of the functions (w_A, w_B) :

$$S_{ij} \equiv \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta [w_A(\theta)]^i [w_B(\theta)]^j. \tag{16}$$

3. We derive a number of properties for the noise terms and the function $C(w_A, w_B)$. In particular, we show (1) that $w_A(\theta) w_B(\theta) C(w_A(\theta), w_B(\theta)) \leq \rho^2$ in every point θ ; (2) that the measurement error has as upper bound $T_\sigma \leq \sigma^2$; (3) that the same error has as lower bound the convolution $\sigma^{-1} \int w_{\text{eff}A}(\theta) w_{\text{eff}B}(\theta) d^2\theta$ of the two *effective weights* $w_{\text{eff}A}(\theta) = w_A(\theta) C(w_A(\theta), \infty)$ and $w_{\text{eff}B}(\theta) = w_B(\theta) C(\infty, w_B(\theta))$ (cf. Lombardi & Schneider 2001); (4) that the measurement noise converges to $T_\sigma \simeq \sigma^2$ at low densities ($\rho \rightarrow 0$) and to $T_\sigma \simeq \sigma^2 S_{11}/\rho$ at high densities ($\rho \rightarrow \infty$).

3. Evaluation of the covariance

3.1. Preliminaries

Before starting the analysis, let us introduce a simpler notation. In the following we will often drop the arguments θ_A and θ_B in $\text{Cov}(\tilde{f}; \theta_A, \theta_B)$ and other related quantities. Note, in fact, that the problem is completely defined with the introduction of the two ‘‘shifted’’ weight functions $w_A(\theta) \equiv w(\theta_A - \theta)$ and $w_B(\theta) \equiv w(\theta_B - \theta)$. We also call $\tilde{f}_A \equiv \tilde{f}(\theta_A)$ and $\tilde{f}_B \equiv \tilde{f}(\theta_B)$ the values of \tilde{f} at the two points of interest θ_A and θ_B , so that

$$\tilde{f}_X = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N \hat{f}_n w_X(\theta_n)}{\sum_{n=1}^N w_X(\theta_n)}. \tag{17}$$

Hence, Eq. (6) can be rewritten in this notation as

$$\text{Cov}(\tilde{f}) = \langle \tilde{f}_A \tilde{f}_B \rangle - \langle \tilde{f}_A \rangle \langle \tilde{f}_B \rangle. \tag{18}$$

Note that, using this notation, we are not taking advantage of the invariance upon translation of $w(\theta)$ in Eq. (1); in other words, we are not using the fact that w_A and w_B are basically the same function shifted by $\theta_A - \theta_B$. Actually, all calculations can be carried out without using this property; however, we will explicitly point out simplifications that can be made using the invariance upon translation.

We would also like to spend a few words about averages. Note that, as anticipated in Sect. 1, we need to carry out two averages, one with respect to $\{\hat{f}_n\}$ (Eqs. (2) and (7)), and one with respect to $\{\theta_n\}$ (Eqs. (3) and (4)). Taking $\{\theta_n\}$ to be random variables is often reasonable because in Astronomy one does not have a direct control over the positions where observations are made (this happens because measurements are normally performed in the direction of astronomical objects such as stars and galaxies, and thus at ‘‘almost random’’ directions); it also has the advantage of letting us obtain general results, independent of any particular configuration of positions. Note, however, that taking $\{\theta_n\}$ to be *independent* variables is a strong simplification which might produce inaccurate results in some context (e.g., in case of a direction dependent density, or in case of clustering; see Lombardi et al. 2001). Finally, since the number of observations N is itself a random variable, we need to perform first the average on $\{\hat{f}_n\}$ and then the one on $\{\theta_n\}$.

In closing this section, we observe that in this paper, similarly to Paper I, we will almost always consider the smoothing problem on the plane, i.e. we will assume that the positions $\{\theta_n\}$ are vectors of \mathbb{R}^2 . We proceed this way because in Astronomy the smoothing process often takes places on small regions of the celestial sphere, and thus on sets that can be well approximated with subsets of the plane. However, we stress that all the results stated here can be easily applied to smoothing processes that takes places on different sets, such as the real axis \mathbb{R} or the space \mathbb{R}^3 .

3.2. Analytical solution

Let us now focus on the first term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (18). We have

$$\langle \tilde{f}_A \tilde{f}_B \rangle = \frac{1}{A^N} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 \dots \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_N \frac{\langle [\sum_n \hat{f}_n w_A(\theta_n)] [\sum_m \hat{f}_m w_B(\theta_m)] \rangle}{[\sum_n w_A(\theta_n)] [\sum_m w_B(\theta_m)]}. \quad (19)$$

Note that the average in the r.h.s. of this equation is only with respect to $\{\hat{f}_n\}$. Expanding the numerator in the integrand of this equation, we obtain N^2 terms, N of which have $n = m$ and $N(N - 1)$ have $n \neq m$. We can then rewrite Eq. (19) above as

$$\langle \tilde{f}_A \tilde{f}_B \rangle = T_1 + T_2, \quad (20)$$

where

$$T_1 \equiv \frac{1}{A^N} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 \dots \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_N \frac{\sum_n \langle \hat{f}_n^2 \rangle w_A(\theta_n) w_B(\theta_n)}{[\sum_n w_A(\theta_n)] [\sum_m w_B(\theta_m)]}, \quad (21)$$

$$T_2 \equiv \frac{1}{A^N} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 \dots \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_N \frac{\sum_{n \neq m} \langle \hat{f}_n \hat{f}_m \rangle w_A(\theta_n) w_B(\theta_m)}{[\sum_n w_A(\theta_n)] [\sum_m w_B(\theta_m)]}. \quad (22)$$

Despite the apparent differences, these two terms can be simplified in a similar manner. Let us consider first T_1 . Using Eq. (7), we can evaluate the average $\langle \hat{f}_n^2 \rangle = \sigma^2 + [f(\theta_n)]^2$. Since the positions $\{\theta_n\}$ appear as “dummy variables” in Eq. (21), we can relabel them as follows

$$T_1 = \frac{N}{A^N} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 \dots \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_N \frac{[f^2(\theta_1) + \sigma^2] w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_1)}{[\sum_n w_A(\theta_n)] [\sum_m w_B(\theta_m)]}. \quad (23)$$

In order to simplify this equation, we use a technique similar to the one adopted in Paper I. More precisely, we split the two sums in the denominator of the integrand of Eq. (23), taking away the terms $w_A(\theta_1)$ and $w_B(\theta_1)$. Hence, we write

$$T_1 = \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 [f^2(\theta_1) + \sigma^2] w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_1) C(w_A(\theta_1), w_B(\theta_1)), \quad (24)$$

where $C(w_A, w_B)$ is a *corrective factor* given by

$$C(w_A, w_B) \equiv \frac{N^2}{A^{N+1}} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 \dots \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_N \frac{1}{[w_A + \sum_{n=2}^N w_A(\theta_n)] [w_B + \sum_{m=2}^N w_B(\theta_m)]}. \quad (25)$$

The additional factor $\rho = N/A$ has been introduced to simplify some of the following equations. Note that in the definition of C w_A and w_B are formally taken to be two real variables (instead of two real functions of argument θ_1).

The definition of C above suggests to define two new random variables y_A and y_B :

$$y_X \equiv \sum_{n=2}^N w_X(\theta_n), \quad \text{with } X = \{A, B\}. \quad (26)$$

Note that the sum runs from $n = 2$ to $n = N$. If we could evaluate the *combined* probability distribution function $p_y(y_A, y_B)$ for y_A and y_B , we would have solved our problem: In fact we could use this probability to write $C(w_A, w_B)$ as follows

$$C(w_A, w_B) = \rho^2 \int_0^{\infty} dy_A \int_0^{\infty} dy_B \frac{p_y(y_A, y_B)}{(w_A + y_A)(w_B + y_B)}. \quad (27)$$

To obtain the probability distribution $p_y(y_A, y_B)$, we need to use the combined probability distribution $p_w(w_A, w_B)$ for w_A and w_B . This distribution is implicitly defined by saying that the probability that $w_A(\theta)$ be in the range $[w_A, w_A + dw_A]$ and $w_B(\theta)$ be in the range $[w_B, w_B + dw_B]$ is $p_w(w_A, w_B) dw_A dw_B$. We can evaluate $p_w(w_A, w_B)$ using

$$p_w(w_A, w_B) = \frac{1}{A} \int_{\Omega} \delta(w_A - w_A(\theta)) \delta(w_B - w_B(\theta)) d^2\theta. \quad (28)$$

Turning back to (y_A, y_B) , we can write a similar expression for p_y :

$$p_y(y_A, y_B) = \frac{1}{A^{N-1}} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 \dots \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_N \delta(y_A - w_{A2} - \dots - w_{AN}) \delta(y_B - w_{B2} - \dots - w_{BN}), \quad (29)$$

where for simplicity we have called $w_{X_n} = w_X(\theta_n)$. Note that inserting this equation into Eq. (27) we recover Eq. (25), as expected. Actually, for our purposes it is more useful to consider y_X to be the sum of N random variables $\{w_{X_n}\}$. In other words, we consider the set of couples $\{(w_{A_n}, w_{B_n})\}$, made of the two weight functions at the various positions, as a set of N independent two-dimensional random variables (w_A, w_B) with probability distribution $p_w(w_A, w_B)$. (Hence, similarly to Eq. (25), we consider the weight functions w_X to be real variables instead of real functions; the independence of the positions θ_n then implies the independence of the couples (w_{A_n}, w_{B_n})). Taking this point of view, we can rewrite Eq. (29) as

$$p_y(y_A, y_B) = \int_0^\infty dw_{A2} \int_0^\infty dw_{B2} p_w(w_{A2}, w_{B2}) \dots \int_0^\infty dw_{AN} \int_0^\infty dw_{BN} p_w(w_{AN}, w_{BN}) \times \delta(y_A - w_{A2} - \dots - w_{AN}) \delta(y_B - \dots - w_{BN}). \quad (30)$$

It is well known in Statistics that the sum of independent random variables with the same probability distribution can be better studied using Markov's method (see, e.g., Chandrasekhar 1989; see also Deguchi & Watson 1987 for an application to microlensing studies). This method is based on the use of Fourier transforms for the probability distributions p_w and p_y . However, since we are dealing with non negative quantities (we recall that we assumed $w(\theta) \geq 0$), we can replace the Fourier transform with Laplace transform which turns out to be more appropriate in for our problem (see Appendix D for a summary of the properties of Laplace transforms). Hence, we define $W(s_A, s_B)$ and $Y(s_A, s_B)$ to be the Laplace transforms of $p_w(w_A, w_B)$ and $p_y(w_A, w_B)$, respectively. Note that, since both functions p_w and p_y have two arguments, we need two arguments for the Laplace transforms as well:

$$W(s_A, s_B) \equiv \mathcal{L}[p_w](s_A, s_B) = \int_0^\infty dw_A \int_0^\infty dw_B e^{-s_A w_A - s_B w_B} p_w(w_A, w_B), \quad (31)$$

$$Y(s_A, s_B) \equiv \mathcal{L}[p_y](s_A, s_B) = \int_0^\infty dy_A \int_0^\infty dy_B e^{-s_A y_A - s_B y_B} p_y(y_A, y_B). \quad (32)$$

We use now in these expressions the Eq. (28) for p_w and Eq. (30) for p_y , thus obtaining

$$W(s_A, s_B) = \frac{1}{A} \int_\Omega e^{-s_A w_A(\theta) - s_B w_B(\theta)} d^2\theta, \quad (33)$$

$$Y(s_A, s_B) = \frac{1}{A^{N-1}} \int_\Omega d^2\theta_2 \dots \int_\Omega d^2\theta_N \exp\left[-s_A \sum_{n=2}^N w_{An} - s_B \sum_{m=2}^N w_{Bm}\right] = [W(s_A, s_B)]^{N-1}. \quad (34)$$

Hence, p_y can in principle be obtained from the following scheme. First, we evaluate $W(s_A, s_B)$ using Eq. (33), then we calculate $Y(s_A, s_B)$ from Eq. (34), and finally we back-transform this function to obtain $p_y(y_A, y_B)$.

Actually, another, more convenient, technique is viable. Following the path of Paper I, we now take the ‘‘continuous limit’’ and treat N as a random variable. As explained in Sect. 1, we can take this limit using two equivalent approaches:

- We keep the area A fixed and consider N to be a random variable with Poisson distribution given by Eq. (3). We then average over all possible configurations obtained.
- We take the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ taking the density $\rho = N/A$ fixed.

The equivalence of the two methods can be shown as follows. Let us consider a large area $A' \supset A$, and let us suppose that the number $N' = \rho A'$ of objects inside A' is fixed. Since objects are randomly distributed inside A' , the probability for each object to fall inside A is just A/A' . Hence N , the number of objects inside A , follows a binomial distribution:

$$p_N(N) = \binom{N'}{N} \left(\frac{A}{A'}\right)^N \left(\frac{A' - A}{A'}\right)^{N' - N}. \quad (35)$$

If we now let N' go to infinity with $N'/A' = \rho$ fixed, the probability distribution for N converges (see, e.g. Eadie et al. 1971) to the Poisson distribution in Eq. (3).

We will follow here the second strategy, i.e. we will take the limit $N, A \rightarrow \infty$ keeping $\rho = N/A$ constant. In the limit $A \rightarrow \infty$ the quantity $W(s_A, s_B)$ goes to unity and thus is not useful for our purposes. Instead, it is convenient to define

$$Q(s_A, s_B) \equiv \int_\Omega \left[e^{-s_A w_A(\theta) - s_B w_B(\theta)} - 1 \right] d^2\theta = A [W(s_A, s_B) - 1]. \quad (36)$$

This definition is sensible because, this way, Q remains finite for $A \rightarrow \infty$. In the continuous limit, Eq. (34) becomes

$$Y(s_A, s_B) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[1 + \frac{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)}{N} \right]^{N-1} = e^{Q(s_A, s_B)}. \quad (37)$$

In order to evaluate $C(w_A, w_B)$, we rewrite its definition (27) as

$$C(w_A, w_B) = \rho^2 \int_0^\infty dx_A \int_0^\infty dx_B \frac{\zeta_w(x_A, x_B)}{x_A x_B}, \quad (38)$$

where $x_X \equiv y_X + w_X$ and

$$\zeta_w(x_A, x_B) \equiv \mathbf{H}(x_A - w_A)\mathbf{H}(x_B - w_B)p_y(x_A - w_A, x_B - w_B). \quad (39)$$

Here $\mathbf{H}(x_X - w_X)$ are Heaviside functions at the positions w_X , i.e.

$$\mathbf{H}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x < 0, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

Note that ζ_w is basically a “shifted” version of p_y . Looking back at Eq. (38), we can interpret the integration present in this equation as a *very* particular case of Laplace transform with vanishing argument. In other words, we can write

$$C(w_A, w_B) = \rho^2 \mathcal{L}[\zeta_w/x_A x_B](0, 0). \quad (41)$$

Thus our problem is solved if we can obtain the Laplace transform of $\zeta_w/x_A x_B$ evaluated at $s_A = s_B = 0$. From the properties of Laplace transform (cf. Eq. (D.7)) we find

$$\mathcal{L}[\zeta_w(x_A, x_B)/x_A x_B](s_A, s_B) = \int_{s_A}^{\infty} ds'_A \int_{s_B}^{\infty} ds'_B Z_w(s'_A, s'_B), \quad (42)$$

where Z_w is the Laplace transform of ζ_w :

$$Z_w(s_A, s_B) \equiv \mathcal{L}[\zeta_w](s_A, s_B) = e^{-s_A w_A - s_B w_B} Y(s_A, s_B). \quad (43)$$

Combining together Eqs. (41)–(43) we finally obtain

$$C(w_A, w_B) = \rho^2 \int_0^{\infty} ds_A \int_0^{\infty} ds_B e^{-s_A w_A - s_B w_B} Y(s_A, s_B) = \rho^2 \mathcal{L}[Y](w_A, w_B). \quad (44)$$

In summary, the set of equations that can be used to evaluate T_1 are

$$Q(s_A, s_B) = \int_{\Omega} [e^{-s_A w_A(\theta) - s_B w_B(\theta)} - 1] d^2\theta, \quad (45)$$

$$Y(s_A, s_B) = \exp[\rho Q(s_A, s_B)], \quad (46)$$

$$C(w_A, w_B) = \rho^2 \int_0^{\infty} ds_A \int_0^{\infty} ds_B e^{-s_A w_A - s_B w_B} Y(s_A, s_B) = \rho^2 \mathcal{L}[Y](w_A, w_B), \quad (47)$$

$$T_1 = \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta [f^2(\theta) + \sigma^2] w_A(\theta) w_B(\theta) C(w_A(\theta), w_B(\theta)). \quad (48)$$

These equations solve completely the first part of our problem, the determination of T_1 .

Let us now consider the second term of Eq. (20), namely T_2 (see Eq. (22)). We first evaluate the average in $\{\hat{f}_n\}$ that appears in the numerator of the integrand of Eq. (22), obtaining $\langle \hat{f}_n \hat{f}_m \rangle = f(\theta_n) f(\theta_m)$ (cf. Eq. (7) with $n \neq m$). Then we relabel the “dummy” variables $\{\theta_n\}$ similarly to what has been done for T_1 , thus obtaining

$$T_2 = \frac{N(N-1)}{A^N} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 \dots \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_N \frac{f(\theta_1) w_A(\theta_1) f(\theta_2) w_B(\theta_2)}{[\sum_n w_A(\theta_n)] [\sum_m w_B(\theta_m)]}. \quad (49)$$

We now split, in the two sums in the denominator, the terms $w_A(\theta_1) + w_A(\theta_2)$ and $w_B(\theta_1) + w_B(\theta_2)$ and define the new random variables

$$z_X \equiv \sum_{n=3}^N w_X(\theta_n), \quad \text{with } X = \{A, B\}. \quad (50)$$

Again, if we know the *combined* probability distribution $p_z(z_A, z_B)$ of z_A and z_B our problem is solved, since we can write (cf. Eqs. (24) and (27))

$$T_2 = \frac{N(N-1)}{A^2} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 f(\theta_1) f(\theta_2) w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_2) \int_0^{\infty} dz_A \int_0^{\infty} dz_B p_z(z_A, z_B) \frac{1}{w_A(\theta_1) + w_A(\theta_2) + z_A} \times \frac{1}{w_B(\theta_1) + w_B(\theta_2) + z_B}. \quad (51)$$

Actually, in the continuous limit, z_X is indistinguishable from y_X (z_X differs from y_X only on the fact that it is the sum of $N - 2$ “weights” instead of $N - 1$; however, N goes to infinity in the continuous limit and thus y_X and z_X converge to the same quantity). Thus we can rewrite Eq. (51) as

$$T_2 = \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 f(\theta_1) f(\theta_2) w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_2) C(w_A(\theta_1) + w_A(\theta_2), w_B(\theta_1) + w_B(\theta_2)), \quad (52)$$

where C is still given by Eq. (47).

Finally, in order to evaluate $\text{Cov}(\tilde{f})$, we still need the simple averages $\langle \tilde{f}_A \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{f}_B \rangle$. These can be obtained directly using the technique described in Paper I, where we have shown that the set of equations to be used is

$$Q_X(s_X) \equiv \int_{\Omega} [e^{-s_X w_X(\theta)} - 1] d^2\theta, \quad (53)$$

$$Y_X(s_X) \equiv \exp[\rho Q_X(s_X)], \quad (54)$$

$$C_X(w_X) \equiv \rho \int_0^{\infty} ds_X e^{-s_X w_X} Y_X(s_X), \quad (55)$$

$$\langle \tilde{f}_X \rangle = \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta f(\theta) w_X(\theta) C_X(w_X(\theta)). \quad (56)$$

We recall that in Paper I we called the combination $w_{\text{eff}X}(\theta) = w_X(\theta) C_X(w_X(\theta))$ *effective weight* (cf. Eq. (5) in the introduction). Alternatively, we can use the quantities $Y(s_A, s_B)$ and $C(w_A, w_B)$ to calculate the correcting factors C_A and C_B . From Eqs. (53) and (54) we immediately find

$$Q_A(s_A) = Q(s_A, 0), \quad Y_A(s_A) = Y(s_A, 0), \quad (57)$$

$$Q_B(s_B) = Q(0, s_B), \quad Y_B(s_B) = Y(0, s_B). \quad (58)$$

Then, using the properties of Laplace transforms (cf. Eq. (D.10)), and comparing the definition of $C(w_A, w_B)$ (Eq. (44)) with the one of $C_X(w_X)$ (Eq. (55)) we find

$$C_A(w_A) = \frac{1}{\rho} \lim_{w_B \rightarrow \infty} w_B C(w_A, w_B), \quad C_B(w_B) = \frac{1}{\rho} \lim_{w_A \rightarrow \infty} w_A C(w_A, w_B). \quad (59)$$

We now have at our disposal the complete set of equations that can be used to determine the covariance of \tilde{f} .

In closing this subsection we make a few comments on the translation invariance for w_X (see Sect. 3.1). Since $w_A(\theta)$ and $w_B(\theta)$ differ by an angular shift only, the two functions Q_A and Q_B are the same, so that C_A coincides with C_B . Not surprisingly, the two effective weights $w_{\text{eff}A}$ and $w_{\text{eff}B}$ differ also only by a shift.

3.3. Noise contributions

A simple preliminary analysis of the Eqs. (48) and (52) allows us to recognize two main sources of noise. In fact, a term in Eq. (48) is proportional to σ^2 , and is clearly related to measurement errors of f , namely

$$T_{\sigma} \equiv \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta w_A(\theta) w_B(\theta) C(w_A(\theta), w_B(\theta)). \quad (60)$$

Other factors entering $\text{Cov}(\tilde{f})$ can be interpreted as Poisson noise. Hence, we call $T_{P1} \equiv T_1 - T_{\sigma}$, $T_{P2} \equiv T_2$, and $T_{P3} \equiv \langle \tilde{f}_A \rangle \langle \tilde{f}_B \rangle$, so that the total Poisson noise is $T_P \equiv T_{P1} + T_{P2} - T_{P3}$. Note that the Poisson noise T_P , in contrast with the measurement noise T_{σ} , strongly depends on the signal $f(\theta)$.

The noise term T_{σ} is quite intuitive and does not require a long explanation. We note here only that this term is independent of the field $f(\theta)$ because we assumed measurements \hat{f}_n with fixed variance σ^2 (see Eq. (7)).

The Poisson noise T_P can be better understood with a simple example. Suppose that $f(\theta)$ is *not* constant and let us focus on a point where this function has a strong gradient. Then, when measuring \tilde{f} in this point, we could obtain an excess of signal because of an overdensity of objects in the region where $f(\theta)$ is large; the opposite happens if we have an overdensity of objects in the region where $f(\theta)$ is small. This noise source, called Poisson noise, vanishes if the function $f(\theta)$ is flat.

In the rest of this paper we will study the properties of the two-point correlation function. Before proceeding, however, we need to consider an important generalization of the results obtained here to the case of vanishing weights.

4. Vanishing weights

So far we have implicitly assumed that both w_A and w_B are always positive. In some cases, however, it might be interesting to consider vanishing weight functions (for example, functions with finite support). We need then to modify accordingly our equations.

When using vanishing weights, we might encounter situations where the denominator of Eq. (1) vanishes because all weight functions $w(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_n)$ vanish as well. In this case, the estimator $\tilde{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ cannot be even defined (we encounter the ratio 0/0), and any further statistical analysis is meaningless. In practice, when smoothing data using a vanishing weight function, one could just ignore the points $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ where the smoothed function $\tilde{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is not defined, i.e. the points $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ for which $w(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_n) = 0$ for every n . This simple approach leads to smoothed maps with “holes”, i.e. defined only on subsets of the plane. Hence, if we choose this approach we need to modify accordingly the statistical analysis that we carry out in this paper.

This problem was already encountered in Paper I, where we used the following prescription. When using a finite-field weight function, we discard, for every configuration of measurement points $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_n\}$, the points $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ on the plane for which the smoothing $\tilde{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is not defined. Then, when taking the average with respect to all possible configurations $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_n\}$ of $\tilde{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, we just exclude these configurations. We stress that, this way, the averages $\langle \tilde{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}') \rangle$ of the smoothing (1) at two different points $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ are effectively carried out using different ensembles: In one case we exclude the “bad configurations” for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, in the other case the “bad configurations” for $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$.

The same prescription is also adopted here to evaluate the covariance of our estimator. Hence, when performing the ensemble average to estimate the covariance $\text{Cov}(\tilde{f}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_A, \boldsymbol{\theta}_B)$, we explicitly exclude configurations where either \tilde{f}_A or \tilde{f}_B cannot be evaluated. This is implemented with a slight change in the definition of p_y , which in turn implies a change in Eq. (46) for Y . A rigorous generalization of the relevant equations can now be carried out without significant difficulties. However, the equations obtained are quite cumbersome and present some technical peculiarities. Hence, we prefer to postpone a complete discussion of vanishing weights until Appendix A; we report here only the main results.

As mentioned above, the basic problem of having vanishing weights is that in some cases the estimator is not defined. Hence, it is convenient to define three probabilities, namely P_A and P_B , the probabilities, respectively, that \tilde{f}_A and \tilde{f}_B are not defined, and P_{AB} , the probability that both quantities are not defined. Note that, because of the invariance upon translation for w , we have $P_A = P_B$. These probabilities can be estimated without difficulties. In fact, the quantity \tilde{f}_X is not defined if and only if there is no object inside the support of w_X . Since the number of points inside the support of w_X follows a Poisson probability, we have $P_X = \exp(-\rho\pi_X)$, where π_X is the area of the support of w_X . Similarly, calling $\pi_{A \cup B}$ the area of the union of the supports of w_A and w_B , we find $P_{AB} = \exp(-\rho\pi_{A \cup B})$. Using Eqs. (45) and (46) we can also verify the following relations

$$P_{AB} = \lim_{\substack{s_A \rightarrow \infty \\ s_B \rightarrow \infty}} Y(s_A, s_B), \quad 1 = \lim_{\substack{s_B \rightarrow 0^+ \\ s_B \rightarrow 0^+}} Y(s_A, s_B), \quad (61)$$

$$P_A = \lim_{\substack{s_A \rightarrow 0^+ \\ s_B \rightarrow \infty}} Y(s_A, s_B), \quad P_B = \lim_{\substack{s_B \rightarrow \infty \\ s_B \rightarrow 0^+}} Y(s_A, s_B). \quad (62)$$

Appendix A better clarifies the relationship between the limiting values of Y and the probabilities defined above. In the following we will use a simplified notation for limits, and we will write something like $P_A = Y(0^+, \infty)$ for the left equation in (62).

The only significant modification to the equations obtained above for vanishing weights is an overall factor in Eq. (47), which now becomes

$$C(w_A, w_B) = \frac{\rho^2}{1 - P_A - P_B + P_{AB}} \mathcal{L}[Y](w_A, w_B). \quad (63)$$

The factor $1/(1 - P_A - P_B + P_{AB})$ is basically a renormalization; more precisely, it is introduced to take into account the fact that we are discarding cases where either \tilde{f}_A or \tilde{f}_B are not defined. Note, in fact, that in agreement with the inclusion-exclusion principle, $(1 - P_A - P_B + P_{AB})$ is the probability that the both \tilde{f}_A and \tilde{f}_B are defined. Since the combination $(1 - P_A - P_B + P_{AB})$ enters several equations, we define

$$v \equiv \frac{1}{1 - P_A - P_B + P_{AB}}. \quad (64)$$

Equation (63) is the most important correction to take into account for vanishing weights. Actually, there are also a number of peculiarities to consider when dealing with the probability p_y and its Laplace transform Y . Fortunately, however, these peculiarities have no significant consequence for our purpose and thus we can still safely use Eqs. (45) and (46). Again, we refer to Appendix A for a complete explanation.

In closing this section, we spend a few words on weight functions with arbitrary sign (i.e., functions $w(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ that can be positive, vanishing, or positive depending on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$). As mentioned in Sect. 2, in this case a statistical study of the smoothing (1) cannot be carried out using our framework. In order to understand why this happens, let us consider the weight function

$$w(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (1 - |\boldsymbol{\theta}|^2) \exp(-|\boldsymbol{\theta}|^2). \quad (65)$$




Fig. 1. The moment expansion of $C(w_A, w_B)$ for 1-dimensional Gaussian weight functions $w_A(x) = w_B(x)$ centered on 0 and with unit variance. The plot shows the various order approximations obtained using the method described in Sect. 5 (equations for the orders $n = 3$ and $n = 4$ are not explicitly reported in the text; see however Table B.1 in Appendix B). The density used is $\rho = 1$.




Fig. 2. The function $C(w_A, w_B)$ is monotonically decreasing with w_A and w_B , while $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ (scaled in this plot) is monotonically increasing. The parameters used for this figure are the same as Fig. 1. Note that, since $P_A = P_B = 0$, we have $\lim_{w_A \rightarrow 0^+} w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B) = \lim_{w_B \rightarrow 0^+} w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B) = 0$ in agreement with Eqs. (82) and (83); moreover $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B) < \rho^2 = 1$ as expected from Eq. (84).

This function is continuous, positive for $|\theta| < 1$, and quickly vanishes for large $|\theta|$. Let us then consider separately the numerator and denominator of Eq. (1). The denominator can clearly be positive or negative; more precisely, the denominator is positive for points θ close to at least one of the locations θ_n , and negative for points θ which are in “voids” (i.e., far away from the locations $\{\theta_n\}$). Hence, the lines where the denominator vanishes separate the regions of high density of locations from the regions of low density. Note that, even for very large average densities ρ , we still expect to find “voids” of arbitrary size (in other words, for every finite density ρ , there is a non-vanishing probability of having no point inside an arbitrarily large region). As a result, there will be always regions where the denominator vanishes. The discussion for the numerator is similar but, in this case, we also need to take into account the field $f(\theta)$. Hence, we still expect to have regions where the numerator is positive and regions where it is negative but, clearly, these regions will in general be different from the analogous regions for the denominator. As a result, when evaluating the ratio between the numerator and the denominator, we will obtain arbitrarily large values close to the lines where the denominator vanishes. Note also that these lines will change for different configurations of locations $\{\theta_n\}$. In summary, if the weight function is allowed to be negative, the denominator of Eq. (1) is no longer guaranteed to be positive, and infinities are expected when performing the ensemble average.

5. Moments expansion

In most applications, the density of objects is rather large. Hence, it is interesting to obtain an expansion for $C(w_A, w_B)$ valid at high densities.

In Paper I we already obtained an expansion for $C_A(w_A)$ (or, equivalently, $C_B(w_B)$) for $\rho \rightarrow \infty$:

$$C_A(w_A) \simeq \frac{\rho}{\rho + w_A} + \frac{\rho^2 S_{20}}{(\rho + w_A)^3} - \frac{\rho^2 S_{30}}{(\rho + w_A)^4} + \frac{\rho^2 S_{40} + 3\rho^3 S_{20}^2}{(\rho + w_A)^5}. \quad (66)$$

In this equation, S_{ij} are the moments of the functions (w_A, w_B) , defined as

$$S_{ij} \equiv \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta [w_A(\theta)]^i [w_B(\theta)]^j. \quad (67)$$

Clearly, in Eq. (66) enter only the moments S_{i0} , since the form of w_B is not relevant for $C_A(w_A)$. Similarly, the expression for $C_B(w_B)$ contains only the moments S_{0j} . Note that for weight functions invariant upon translation we have $S_{ij} = S_{ji}$.

A similar expansion can be obtained for $C(w_A, w_B)$. Calculations are basically a generalization of what was done in Paper I for $C(w)$ and can be found in Appendix B. Here we report only the final result obtained:

$$C(w_A, w_B) \simeq \frac{\rho^2}{(\rho + w_A)(\rho + w_B)} + \frac{\rho^3 S_{20}}{(\rho + w_A)^3(\rho + w_B)} + \frac{\rho^3 S_{11}}{(\rho + w_A)^2(\rho + w_B)^2} + \frac{\rho^3 S_{02}}{(\rho + w_A)(\rho + w_B)^3}. \quad (68)$$

We note that using this expansion and Eqs. (59) we can recover the first terms of Eq. (66), as expected. Figure 1 shows the results of applying this expansion to a Gaussian weight. For clarity, we have considered in this figure (and in others shown below) a 1-dimensional smoothing instead of the 2-dimensional case discussed in the text, and we have used x as spatial variable instead of θ . The figure refers to two identical Gaussian weight functions with vanishing average and unit variance. A comparison of this figure with Fig. 2 of Paper I shows that the convergence here is much slower. Nevertheless, Eq. (68) will be very useful to investigate some important limiting cases in the next section.

6. Properties

In this section we will study in detail the two noise terms T_σ and T_P introduced in Sect. 3.3, showing their properties and considering several limiting cases. The results obtained are of clear interest of themselves; for example, we will derive here upper and lower limits for the measurement error T_σ that can be used at low and high densities. Moreover, this section helps us understand the results obtained so far, and in particular the peculiarities of vanishing weights.

6.1. Normalization

A simple normalization property for $C(w_A, w_B)$ can be derived, similarly to what we have already done for the average of \tilde{f} in Paper I. Suppose that $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1$ and that no errors are present on the measurements, so that $\sigma^2 = 0$. In this case we will always measure $\tilde{f}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1$ (see Eq. (1)), so that $\langle \tilde{f}_A \rangle = \langle \tilde{f}_B \rangle = 1$, $\langle \tilde{f}_A \tilde{f}_B \rangle = 1$, and no error is expected on \tilde{f} . This result can be also recovered using the analytical expressions obtained so far. Let us first consider the simpler case of non-vanishing weights.

Using Eqs. (47) and (48), we can write the term T_{P1} in the case $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1$ as

$$T_{P1} = \rho \int_0^\infty ds_A \int_0^\infty ds_B e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} \int_\Omega d^2\theta w_A(\boldsymbol{\theta}) w_B(\boldsymbol{\theta}) e^{-s_A w_A(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - s_B w_B(\boldsymbol{\theta})}. \quad (69)$$

The last integrand in this equation can be rewritten as $\partial^2 Q / \partial s_A \partial s_B$ (cf. the definition of Q , Eq. (45)):

$$T_{P1} = \rho \int_0^\infty ds_A \int_0^\infty ds_B e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} \frac{\partial^2 Q(s_A, s_B)}{\partial s_A \partial s_B}. \quad (70)$$

Analogously, for T_{P2} we obtain (cf. Eq. (52))

$$\begin{aligned} T_{P2} &= \rho^2 \int_0^\infty ds_A \int_0^\infty ds_B e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} \int_\Omega d^2\theta_1 w_A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) e^{-s_A w_A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) - s_B w_B(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)} \int_\Omega d^2\theta_2 w_B(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2) e^{-s_A w_A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2) - s_B w_B(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2)} \\ &= \rho^2 \int_0^\infty ds_A \int_0^\infty ds_B e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} \frac{\partial Q(s_A, s_B)}{\partial s_A} \frac{\partial Q(s_A, s_B)}{\partial s_B}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

We can integrate this expression by parts taking $\rho e^{\rho Q} (\partial Q / \partial s_B) = [\partial \exp(\rho Q) / \partial s_B]$ as differential term:

$$T_{P2} = \rho \int_0^\infty ds_A \left\{ \left[e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} \frac{\partial Q(s_A, s_B)}{\partial s_A} \right]_{s_B=0}^\infty - \int_0^\infty ds_B e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} \frac{\partial^2 Q(s_A, s_B)}{\partial s_A \partial s_B} \right\}. \quad (72)$$

We now observe that the last term in Eq. (72) is identical to what we founded in Eq. (70). Hence, the sum $T_{P1} + T_{P2}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} T_{P1} + T_{P2} &= \left[\rho \int_0^\infty ds_A e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} \frac{\partial Q(s_A, s_B)}{\partial s_A} \right]_{s_B=0}^\infty = \left[\left[\rho e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} \right]_{s_A=0}^\infty \right]_{s_B=0}^\infty \\ &= Y(\infty, \infty) - Y(\infty, 0^+) - Y(0^+, \infty) + Y(0^+, 0^+) = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

The last equation holds because, for non-vanishing weights, $Y(0^+, 0^+) = 1$ and all other terms vanishes (cf. Eqs. (61)–(62)). Hence, as expected, $\langle \tilde{f}_A \tilde{f}_B \rangle = T_{P1} + T_{P2} = 1 = \langle \tilde{f}_A \rangle \langle \tilde{f}_B \rangle$.

In case of vanishing weights, we can still use Eqs. (70) and (72) with an additional factor ν (due to the extra factor in Eq. (63)). The last step in Eq. (73) thus now becomes

$$T_{P1} + T_{P2} = \nu \left[Y(\infty, \infty) - Y(\infty, 0^+) - Y(0^+, \infty) + Y(0^+, 0^+) \right] = 1. \quad (74)$$

The last equality holds since now Y does not vanishes for large (s_A, s_B) (see again Eqs. (61)–(62)).

6.2. Scaling

Similarly to what was already shown in Paper I, for all expressions encountered so far some scaling invariance properties hold.

First, we note that, although we have assumed that the weight functions w_A and w_B are normalized to unity, all results are clearly independent of their actual normalization. Hence, a trivial scaling property holds: All results (and in particular the final expression for $\text{Cov}(\tilde{f})$) are left unchanged by the transformation $w(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mapsto kw(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ or, equivalently,

$$w_A(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mapsto kw_A(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad w_B(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mapsto kw_B(\boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (75)$$

A more interesting scaling property is the following. Consider the transformation

$$w(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mapsto k^2 w(k\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad \rho \mapsto k^2 \rho, \quad (76)$$

where both factors k^2 must be changed according to the dimension of the θ vector space. If we apply this transformation, then the expression for $\text{Cov}(\tilde{f})$ is transformed according to

$$\text{Cov}(\tilde{f}; \theta_A, \theta_B) \mapsto \text{Cov}(\tilde{f}; k\theta_A, k\theta_B). \quad (77)$$

This invariance suggests that the shape of $\text{Cov}(\tilde{f})$ is controlled by the expected number of objects for which the two weight functions are significantly different from zero. Hence, similarly to what done in Paper I, we define the two weight areas \mathcal{A}_A and \mathcal{A}_B as

$$\mathcal{A}_X \equiv \left[\int_{\Omega} [w_X(\theta)]^2 d^2\theta \right]^{-1} = \begin{cases} S_{20}^{-1} & \text{if } X = A, \\ S_{02}^{-1} & \text{if } X = B. \end{cases} \quad (78)$$

For weight functions invariant upon translation we have $\mathcal{A}_A = \mathcal{A}_B$. We call $N_X \equiv \rho\mathcal{A}_X$ the *weight number of objects* (again, $N_A = N_B$ because of the invariance upon translation). Note that this quantity is left unchanged by the scaling (76). Similar definitions hold for the *effective weight* $w_{\text{eff}X}(\theta) \equiv w_X(\theta)C_X(w_X(\theta))$ and the *effective number of objects* $N_{\text{eff}X} \equiv \rho\mathcal{A}_{\text{eff}X}$.

6.3. Behavior of C

In order to better understand the properties of C , it is useful to briefly consider its behavior as a function of the weights w_A and w_B .

We observe that, since $Y(s_A, s_B) > 0$ for every (s_A, s_B) (see Eq. (46)), $C(w_A, w_B)$ decreases if either w_A or w_B increase. In order to study the behavior of the quantity $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ that enters the noise term T_1 , we consider the quantity $w_A C(w_A, w_B)$:

$$w_A C(w_A, w_B) = \nu\rho^2 \int_{0^-}^{\infty} ds_B \left[Y(0^-, s_B) + \int_{0^-}^{\infty} ds_A \left(\frac{\partial Y(s_A, s_B)}{\partial s_A} \right) e^{-s_A w_A} \right] e^{-s_B w_B}. \quad (79)$$

This equation can be shown by integrating by parts the integral over s_A . The partial derivative required in Eq. (79) can be evaluated from Eq. (46):

$$\frac{\partial Y(s_A, s_B)}{\partial s_A} = \rho \frac{\partial Q(s_A, s_B)}{\partial s_A} e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} \leq 0. \quad (80)$$

Since this derivative is negative, we can deduce that the integral over s_A in Eq. (79) increases with w_A , and thus $w_A C(w_A, w_B)$ also increases as w_A increases. Similarly, it can be shown that $w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ increases as w_B increases. In summary, the quantity $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ behaves as $w_A w_B$, in the sense that its partial derivatives have the same sign as the partial derivatives of $w_A w_B$ (see Fig. 2). Also, since $C(w_A, w_B)$ decreases if either w_A or w_B increase, we can deduce that $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ is ‘‘broader’’ than $w_A w_B$.

Since $C(w_A(\theta), w_B(\theta))$ is positive, the function $w_A(\theta)w_B(\theta)C(w_A(\theta), w_B(\theta))$ shares the same support as $w_A(\theta)w_B(\theta)$. It is also interesting to study the limits of $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ at high and low values for w_A and w_B . From the properties of Laplace transform (see Eq. (D.10)), we have

$$\lim_{\substack{w_A \rightarrow 0^+ \\ w_B \rightarrow 0^+}} w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B) = \nu\rho^2 \lim_{\substack{s_A \rightarrow \infty \\ s_B \rightarrow \infty}} Y(s_A, s_B) = \nu\rho^2 P_{AB}, \quad (81)$$

where Eq. (61) has been used in the second equality. Hence, the quantity $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ goes to zero only if $P_{AB} = 0$. In other cases, we expect a discontinuity at $w_A = w_B = 0$. Similarly, using Eqs. (61)–(62) we find

$$\lim_{\substack{w_A \rightarrow \infty \\ w_B \rightarrow 0^+}} w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B) = \nu\rho^2 \lim_{\substack{s_A \rightarrow 0^+ \\ s_B \rightarrow \infty}} Y(s_A, s_B) = \nu\rho^2 P_A, \quad (82)$$

$$\lim_{\substack{w_A \rightarrow 0^+ \\ w_B \rightarrow \infty}} w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B) = \nu\rho^2 \lim_{\substack{s_A \rightarrow \infty \\ s_B \rightarrow 0^+}} Y(s_A, s_B) = \nu\rho^2 P_B, \quad (83)$$

$$\lim_{\substack{w_A \rightarrow \infty \\ w_B \rightarrow \infty}} w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B) = \nu\rho^2 \lim_{\substack{s_A \rightarrow 0^+ \\ s_B \rightarrow 0^+}} Y(s_A, s_B) = \nu\rho^2. \quad (84)$$

Since $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ increases with both w_A and w_B , the last equation above puts a superior limit for this quantity:

$$w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B) \leq \nu\rho^2. \quad (85)$$

6.4. Large separations

Suppose that the two points θ_A and θ_B are far away from each other, so that $w_A(\theta)w_B(\theta)$ is very close to zero everywhere. In this situation we can greatly simplify our equations.

If θ_A is far away from θ_B , then $w_A(\theta)$ and $w_B(\theta)$ are never significantly different from zero at the same position θ . In this case, the integral in the definition of $Q(s_A, s_B)$ (see Eq. (45)) can be split into two integrals that corresponds to Q_A and Q_B (Eq. (53)):

$$Q(s_A, s_B) \simeq Q_A(s_A) + Q_B(s_B), \quad Y(s_A, s_B) \simeq Y_A(s_A)Y_B(s_B), \quad C(w_A, w_B) \simeq C_A(w_A)C_B(w_B). \quad (86)$$

Hence, if the two weight functions w_A and w_B do not have significant overlap, the function $C(w_A, w_B)$ reduces to the product of the two correcting functions C_A and C_B .

In general, it can be shown that $C(w_A, w_B) \geq C_A(w_A)C_B(w_B)$. In fact, we have

$$C(w_A, w_B) - C_A(w_A)C_B(w_B) = \rho^2 \int_0^\infty ds_A \int_0^\infty ds_B e^{-s_A w_A - s_B w_B} [e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} - e^{\rho Q_A(s_A) + \rho Q_B(s_B)}]. \quad (87)$$

We now observe that

$$Q(s_A, s_B) - Q_A(s_A) - Q_B(s_B) = \int_\Omega [e^{-s_A w_A(\theta)} - 1][e^{-s_B w_B(\theta)} - 1] \geq 0. \quad (88)$$

Hence, $Q(s_A, s_B) \geq Q_A(s_A) + Q_B(s_B)$ and the difference between the two terms of this inequality is an indication of overlap between the two weight functions w_A and w_B . Since the exponential function is monotonic, we find $Y(s_A, s_B) \geq Y_A(s_A)Y_B(s_B)$ and thus

$$C(w_A, w_B) \geq C_A(w_A)C_B(w_B). \quad (89)$$

6.5. Upper and lower limits for T_σ

The normalization property shown in Sect. 6.1 can also be used to obtain an upper limit for T_σ . We observe, in fact, that T_σ is indistinguishable from $\sigma^2 T_{P1}$ for a constant function $f(\theta) = 1$. This case, however, has already been considered above in Sect. 6.1: There we have shown that $T_{P1} + T_{P2} = 1$. Since $T_{P2} \geq 0$, we find the relation $T_\sigma \leq \sigma^2$.

The property just obtained has a simple interpretation. As shown by Eq. (60), T_σ is proportional to $1/\rho$ and thus we would expect that this quantity is unbounded superiorly. In reality, even when we are dealing with a very small density of objects, the estimator (1) ‘‘forces’’ us to use at least one object. This point has already been discussed in Paper I, where we showed that the number of effective objects, \mathcal{N}_{eff} , is always larger than unity. The upper limit found for T_σ can be interpreted using the same argument. Note that this result also holds for weight functions with finite support.

A lower limit for T_σ , instead, can be obtained from the inequality (89):

$$T_\sigma \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho} \int_\Omega w_A(\theta)w_B(\theta)C_A(w_A(\theta))C_B(w_B(\theta)) d^2\theta = \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho} \int_\Omega w_{\text{eff}A}(\theta)w_{\text{eff}B}(\theta) d^2\theta. \quad (90)$$

Hence, the error T_σ is larger than a convolution of the two effective weight functions. In case of finite-field weight functions, the limit just obtained must be corrected with a factor ν . The argument to derive Eq. (90) is then slightly more complicated because of the presence of the P_X probabilities. However, using the relation $P_A P_B \leq P_{AB}$, we can recover Eq. (90) with the aforementioned corrective factor.

6.6. Limit of low and high densities

In the limit $\rho \rightarrow 0$ we can obtain simple expressions for the noise terms. If ρ vanishes, we have $Y(s_A, s_B) = 1$ (cf. Eq. (46)) and thus

$$C(w_A, w_B) \simeq \frac{\nu \rho^2}{w_A w_B}. \quad (91)$$

In this equation we have assumed $w_A w_B > 0$. Note that we have reached here the superior limit indicated by Eq. (85). In the same limit, $\rho \rightarrow 0$, $P_X \simeq 1 - \pi_X \rho$ and $\nu \simeq 1/\rho \pi_{A \cap B}$, where $\pi_{A \cap B} = \pi_A + \pi_B - \pi_{A \cup B}$ is the area of the intersection of the supports of w_A and w_B . Hence we find

$$C(w_A, w_B) \simeq \frac{\rho}{\pi_{A \cap B} w_A w_B}. \quad (92)$$

Analogously, in the same limit, we have found in Paper I

$$C_X(w_X) \simeq \frac{1}{\pi_X w_X}, \quad (93)$$

where $w_X > 0$ has been assumed. We can then proceed to evaluate the various terms. For T_σ we obtain the expression

$$T_\sigma \simeq \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho} \int_{\pi_{A \cap B}} \frac{\rho}{\pi_{A \cap B}} d^2\theta = \sigma^2. \quad (94)$$

Note that the integral has been evaluated only on the subset of the plane where $w_A w_B > 0$; the case where this product vanishes, in fact, need not to be considered because the quantity $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ vanishes as well. Exactly the same result holds for weight functions with infinite support. Hence, when $\rho \rightarrow 0$ we reach the superior limit discussed in Sect. 6.5 for T_σ .

Equation (94) can be better appreciated with the following argument. As the density ρ approaches zero, the probability of having two objects on $\pi_{A \cup B}$ vanishes. Because of the prescription regarding vanishing weights (cf. beginning of Sect. 4), the ensemble average in our limit is performed with one and only one object in $\pi_{A \cap B}$. Since we have only one object, this is basically used with unit weight in the average (17), and thus the measurement noise is just given by $T_\sigma = \sigma^2$.

Let us now consider the limit at low densities of the Poisson noise, which, we recall, has been split into three terms, T_{P1} , T_{P2} , and T_{P3} (see Sect. 3.3). Inserting Eq. (92) into Eq. (24), we find for T_{P1}

$$T_{P1} \simeq \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{\pi_{A \cap B}} f^2(\theta) \frac{\rho}{\pi_{A \cap B}} d^2\theta = \langle f^2 \rangle_{\pi_{A \cap B}}, \quad (95)$$

where $\langle f^2 \rangle_{\pi_{A \cap B}}$ denotes the simple average of f^2 on the set $\pi_{A \cap B}$. Hence, T_{P1} converges to the average of f^2 on the intersection of the supports of w_A and w_B . Again, we can explain this result using an argument similar to the one used for Eq. (94). Regarding $T_{P2} \equiv T_2$, we observe that this term is of first order in ρ because $C(w_A, w_B)$ is of first order (cf. Eqs. (92) and (52)). We can then safely ignore this term in our limit $\rho \rightarrow 0$. Finally, as shown in Paper I, at low densities the expectation value for \tilde{f}_X is a simple average of f on the support of w_X , i.e. $\langle \tilde{f}_X \rangle \simeq \langle f \rangle_{\pi_X}$. Hence, $T_{P3} = \langle f \rangle_{\pi_A} \langle f \rangle_{\pi_B}$ and the Poisson noise in the limit of small densities is given by

$$T_P = \langle f^2 \rangle_{\pi_{A \cap B}} - \langle f \rangle_{\pi_A} \langle f \rangle_{\pi_B}. \quad (96)$$

In case of a constant function $f(\theta)$, this expression vanishes as expected. Surprisingly, in general, we cannot say that $T_P \geq 0$. Rather, if $w_A \neq w_B$, and if in particular the two weight functions have different supports, we might have a negative T_P . Suppose, for example, that f vanishes on the intersection of the two supports $\pi_{A \cap B}$, but is otherwise positive. In this case, the first term in the r.h.s. of Eq. (96) vanishes, while the second term contributes with a negative sign, and thus $T_P < 0$. On the other hand, if $w_A = w_B$ then T_P has to be non-negative.

We now consider the opposite limiting case, namely high density. In this case, it is useful to use the moment expansion (68). Since T_σ and T_{P1} have an overall factor $1/\rho$ in its definition (cf. Eq. (60)), we can simply take the 0th order for $C(w_A, w_B)$, thus obtaining

$$T_\sigma \simeq \frac{\sigma^2}{\rho} \int w_A(\theta) w_B(\theta) d^2\theta = \frac{\sigma^2 S_{11}}{\rho}. \quad T_{P1} \simeq \frac{1}{\rho} \int w_A(\theta) w_B(\theta) f^2(\theta) d^2\theta. \quad (97)$$

For T_{P2} and T_{P3} , instead, we need to use a first order expansion in $1/\rho$ for $C(w_A, w_B)$. This can be done by using the first terms in series (66), and by expanding all fractions in terms of powers of $1/\rho$. Inserting the result into the definitions of T_{P2} and T_{P3} we obtain

$$T_{P2} \simeq \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 f(\theta_1) f(\theta_2) w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_2) \left[1 - \frac{w_A(\theta_1)}{\rho} - \frac{w_A(\theta_2)}{\rho} - \frac{w_B(\theta_1)}{\rho} - \frac{w_B(\theta_2)}{\rho} + \frac{S_{20} + S_{11} + S_{02}}{\rho} \right], \quad (98)$$

$$T_{P3} \simeq \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 f(\theta_1) f(\theta_2) w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_2) \left[1 - \frac{w_A(\theta_1)}{\rho} - \frac{w_B(\theta_2)}{\rho} + \frac{S_{20} + S_{02}}{\rho} \right]. \quad (99)$$

Note that we have dropped, in these equations, terms of order higher than $1/\rho$. The difference $T_{P2} - T_{P3}$ is

$$T_{P2} - T_{P3} \simeq \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 f(\theta_1) f(\theta_2) w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_2) [S_{11} - w_A(\theta_2) - w_B(\theta_1)]. \quad (100)$$

Using Eqs. (100) and (97), we can verify that T_P vanishes if f is constant, as expected:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{P1} + T_{P2} - T_{P3} &\simeq \frac{S_{11}}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{\Omega} d\theta_1 \int_{\Omega} d\theta_2 [S_{11} w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_2) - w_A(\theta_1) w_A(\theta_2) w_B(\theta_2) - w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_2) w_B(\theta_1)] \\ &= \frac{S_{11}}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho} [S_{11} - S_{11} - S_{11}] = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

where the normalization of w has been used. Also, it is apparent that all noise sources, including Poisson noise, are proportional to $1/\rho$ at high densities.

In order to further investigate the properties of Poisson noise at high densities, we write it in a more compact form. Let us define the average of a function $g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ weighted with $q(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ as

$$\langle g \rangle_q \equiv \left[\int_{\Omega} g(\boldsymbol{\theta}) q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d^2\boldsymbol{\theta} \right] / \left[\int_{\Omega} q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d^2\boldsymbol{\theta} \right]. \quad (102)$$

Using this definition we can rearrange Eqs. (97) and (100) in the form

$$T_P = \frac{S_{11}}{\rho} \left[\langle f^2 \rangle_{w_A w_B} - \langle f \rangle_{w_A w_B} \langle f \rangle_{w_A w_B} + \left(\langle f \rangle_{w_A w_B} - \langle f \rangle_{w_A} \right) \left(\langle f \rangle_{w_A w_B} - \langle f \rangle_{w_B} \right) \right]. \quad (103)$$

This expression suggests that the Poisson noise is actually made of two different terms, $\langle f^2 \rangle_{w_A w_B} - \langle f \rangle_{w_A w_B} \langle f \rangle_{w_A w_B}$ and $\left(\langle f \rangle_{w_A w_B} - \langle f \rangle_{w_A} \right) \left(\langle f \rangle_{w_A w_B} - \langle f \rangle_{w_B} \right)$. The first term is proportional to the difference between two averages of f^2 and f ; both averages are performed using $w_A w_B$ as weight. Hence, this term is controlled by the ‘‘internal scatter’’ of f on points where both weight functions are significantly different from zero; it is always positive. The second term is made of averages f using different weight functions. It can be either positive or negative if $w_A \neq w_B$. Actually, as already seen in the limiting case $\rho \rightarrow 0$, the overall Poisson noise does not need to be positive, and anti-correlation can be present in some cases.

6.7. Limit of high and low frequencies

The strong dependence of the Poisson noise on the function $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ makes an analytical estimate of this noise contribution extremely difficult in the general case. However, it is still possible to study the behavior of T_P in two important limiting cases, that we now describe.

Suppose that the function $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ does not change significantly on the scale length of the weight functions $w_A(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $w_B(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ (or, in other words, that the power spectrum of f has a peak at significantly lower frequencies than the power spectra of w_A and w_B). In this case, we can take the function f as a constant in the integrals of Eq. (13), and apply the results of Sect. 6.1. Hence, in the limit of low frequencies, the Poisson noise vanishes.

Suppose now, instead, that the function $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ does not have any *general* trend on the scale length of the weight functions, but that instead changes at significantly smaller scales (again, this behavior is better described in terms of power spectra: We require here that the power spectrum of f has a peak at high frequencies, while it vanishes for the frequencies where the power spectra of w_A and w_B are significantly different from zero). In this case, we can assume that integrals such as

$$\int_{\Omega} f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) w_X(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d^2\boldsymbol{\theta} \simeq 0 \quad X = \{A, B\} \quad (104)$$

vanish approximately, because the average of f on large scales vanishes (remember that we are assuming that f has no general trend on large scales). Similarly, the integrals that appear in T_{P2} and T_{P3} vanish as well. In this case, then, the only contribution to the Poisson noise arises from T_{P1} . This can be easily evaluated

$$T_P \simeq T_{P1} \simeq \frac{\langle |f|^2 \rangle}{\rho} \int_{\Omega} d^2\boldsymbol{\theta} w_A(\boldsymbol{\theta}) w_B(\boldsymbol{\theta}) C(w_A(\boldsymbol{\theta}), w_B(\boldsymbol{\theta})), \quad (105)$$

where we have denoted with $\langle |f|^2 \rangle$ the average of $|f|^2$ on large scales. Hence we finally obtain

$$T_P \simeq \frac{\langle |f|^2 \rangle}{\sigma^2} T_{\sigma}. \quad (106)$$

The results discussed in this section can also be numerically verified in simple cases. Figure 8, for example, shows the Poisson noise expected in the measurement of a periodic field when using two Gaussian weight functions (see Sect. 7.2 for details). From this figure, we see that the Poisson noise increases with the frequency of the field f , and quickly attains a maximum value at high frequencies. Moreover, the same figure shows that, in agreement with Eq. (106), the Poisson noise at the maximum is simply related to the measurement noise T_{σ} (cf. Fig. 7 for $\rho = 2$).

7. Examples

Similarly to what has been done in Paper I, in this section we consider three typical weight functions, namely a top-hat, a Gaussian, and a parabolic weight. For simplicity, we will consider 1-dimensional cases only; this will have also some advantages when representing the results obtained with figures. Hence, we will use x instead of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as spatial variable.




Fig. 3. The value of $C(1, 1)/\rho$ for top-hat weights as a function of the density ρ . Both weight functions w_A and w_B are top-hats (see Eq. (107)) centered on zero. Using Eq. (108), we can use this graph to obtain T_σ as a function of the density and the point separation $x_A - x_B$.




Fig. 4. The noise term T_σ for two top-hat weights as a function of the point separation $\delta = |x_A - x_B|$ for two densities, $\rho = 2$ and $\rho = 5$. The plot also shows the quantity S_{11}/ρ , which at high densities approximates T_σ (since then $C \simeq 1$). Note that S_{11} for a top-hat function is just given by $S_{11} = (2 - \delta)/4$.

7.1. Top-hat

The simplest weight that we can consider is a top-hat function, defined as

$$w(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |x| < 1/2, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (107)$$

Since w is either 1 or 0, we just need to consider $C(1, 1)$ to evaluate T_σ . Regarding the Poisson noise, from Eq. (52) we deduce that $C(1, 2)$, $C(2, 1)$, and $C(2, 2)$ are also required.

Figure 3 shows $C(1, 1)$ and $C(1, 1)/\rho$ as functions of the density ρ for two identical top-hat weight functions centered on the origin. From this plot we can recognize some of the limiting cases studied above. In particular, the fact that $C(1, 1)/\rho$ goes to unity at low densities is related to Eq. (92); similarly, the limit of $C(1, 1)$ at high densities is consistent with Eq. (68). The same figure shows also the moments expansion of $C(1, 1)$ up to fourth order. As expected, the expansion completely fails at low densities, while is quite accurate for $\rho > 5$.

Curves in Fig. 3 have been calculated using the standard approach described by Eqs. (45), (46) and (63). Actually, in the simple case of top-hat weight functions, we can evaluate $C(1, 1)$ using a more direct statistical argument. We start by observing that in our case, for $x_A = x_B$, we have

$$T_\sigma = \sigma^2 C(1, 1)/\rho. \quad (108)$$

On the other hand, a top-hat weight function is basically acting by taking simple averages for all objects that fall inside its support. This suggests that, for $x_A = x_B$, we can evaluate its measurement noise as

$$T_\sigma = \sigma^2 \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{p(N)}{N}, \quad (109)$$

where $p(N)$ is the probability of having N objects inside the support. This probability is basically a Poisson probability distribution with average ρ . However, since we are adopting the prescription of ‘‘avoiding’’ weight functions without objects in their support, we must explicitly discard the case $N = 0$ and consequently renormalize the probability. In summary, we have

$$p(N) = \frac{e^{-\rho} \rho^N}{N!} \Big/ [1 - e^{-\rho}]. \quad (110)$$

This expression combined with Eq. (109) allows us to evaluate $C(1, 1) = \rho T_\sigma / \sigma^2$:

$$C(1, 1) = \frac{e^{-\rho}}{1 - e^{-\rho}} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{\rho^{N+1}}{N! N}. \quad (111)$$

We can directly verify this result using Eqs. (45), (46) and (63). In fact, for the top-hat function we find

$$Q(s_A, s_B) = [e^{-s_A - s_B} - 1], \quad (112)$$




Fig. 5. Numerical calculations for 1-dimensional Gaussian weight functions $w_A = w_B$ centered on 0 and with unit variance. The various curves shows the function $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ for different densities ρ . Note that, as expected, $C(w_A, w_B)$ approaches unity for large densities.




Fig. 6. Same as Fig. 5, but for two Gaussian weight functions centered on 0 and 1 and with unit variance.




Fig. 7. The noise term T_σ for two Gaussian weights (of unit variance) as function of their separation. Similarly to Fig. 4, the plot also shows the high-density approximations S_{11}/ρ . Note that in this case S_{11} is also a Gaussian (with double variance).




Fig. 8. The Poisson noise T_P for two Gaussian weights (of unit variance) for a periodic function of the form $f(x) = \sin kx$ as a function of the weight separation $\delta = |x_A - x_B|$, for a density $\rho = 2$. Note that, as expected, the Poisson noise increases with k and approaches the limit discussed in Sect. 6.7 for high frequencies. More precisely, since for a sine function we have $\langle \sin^2 x \rangle = 1/2$, Eq. (106) gives $T_P \simeq T_\sigma / (2\sigma^2)$ (this can indeed be verified by a comparison with Fig. 7). Note also that, while T_P is strictly positive for $\delta = 0$, it can become negative (see curve for $k = 0.5$) at larger separations.

$$Y(s_A, s_B) = e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} = e^{-\rho} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-k(s_A + s_B)} \rho^k}{k!}, \quad (113)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C(1, 1) &= \frac{\rho^2}{1 - e^{-\rho}} \int_0^{\infty} ds_A \int_0^{\infty} ds_B Y(s_A, s_B) e^{-s_A - s_B} = \frac{\rho^2 e^{-\rho}}{1 - e^{-\rho}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} ds_A \int_0^{\infty} ds_B \frac{e^{-(k+1)(s_A + s_B)} \rho^k}{k!} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\rho}}{1 - e^{-\rho}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\rho^{k+2}}{k! (k+1)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

Finally, with a change of the dummy variable $k \mapsto n - 1$ we recover Eq. (111).

The other terms needed for the Poisson noise can be evaluated using a calculation similar to the one performed in Eq. (114). Actually, it can be shown that for any positive integers w_A and w_B we have

$$C(w_A, w_B) = \frac{e^{-\rho}}{1 - e^{-\rho}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\rho^{k+2}}{k! (k + w_A)(k + w_B)}. \quad (115)$$




Fig. 9. Numerical calculations for 1-dimensional parabolic weight functions $w_A = w_B$ centered on 0 and with unit variance. The various curves shows the function $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ for different densities ρ .




Fig. 10. The noise term T_σ for two parabolic weights as a function of their separation (see also Figs. 4 and 7).

Figure 4 shows the expected measurement noise T_σ as a function of the point separation $\delta = |x_A - x_B|$. Note that, for densities of order $\rho = 5$ or larger, a good approximation is obtained by just taking $C(w_A, w_B) = 1$ (cf. the moments expansion (68)), so that $T_\sigma \simeq S_{11}/\rho$; we also observe that, for a top-hat weight function, S_{11} is a linear function.

7.2. Gaussian

Frequently, a Gaussian weight function of the form

$$w(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} \quad (116)$$

is used. Although it is not possible to carry out analytical calculations and obtain $C(w_A, w_B)$, numerical integrations do not pose any problem. Figure 5 shows, for different densities, the function $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ for two identical weights $w_A = w_B$ centered in zero; Fig. 6 shows the same quantity when one of the weight function is centered at unity. Note that, in this last figure, the largest covariance is at $x = 0.5$, as expected.

Figure 7 shows the expected measurement noise T_σ as a function of the weight separation. Similarly to the top-hat weight, an approximation valid for high density is $T_\sigma = S_{11}/\rho$. Figure 8 shows, instead, the Poisson noise T_P expected for a field f of the form $f(x) = \sin kx$, for different values of k . Note that the noise, as expected, increases with k , and quickly reaches the “saturation” value discussed in Sect. 6.7. Note also that the noise is, at lowest lowest density, negative for $\delta \simeq 2.5$.

7.3. Parabolic weight

Finally, we study of a parabolic weight function of the form

$$w(x) = \begin{cases} 3x^2/4 & \text{if } |x| < 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (117)$$

This function illustrates well some of the peculiarities of finite support weight functions. Figure 9 shows the results of numerical integrations for $w_A w_B C(w_A, w_B)$ at different densities ρ . A first interesting point to note is the discontinuity observed at $x = 1$, which is in agreement with Eq. (81). Moreover, as expected from Eq. (92), the function plotted clearly approaches a constant at low densities ρ . Finally, the measurement noise T_σ is plotted in Fig. 10.

8. Conclusions

In this article we have studied in detail the covariance of a widely used smoothing technique. The main results obtained are summarized in the following items.

1. The covariance is composed of two main terms, T_σ and T_P , representing measurement errors and Poisson noise, respectively; the latter one depends on the field f on which the smoothing is performed.
2. Expressions to compute T_σ and T_P have been provided. In particular, it has been shown that both terms can be obtained in term of a kernel $C(w_A, w_B)$, which in turn can be evaluated from the weight function $w(\theta)$.
3. We have obtained an expansion of the kernel $C(w_A, w_B)$ valid at high densities ρ .

4. We have shown that T_σ has an upper limit, given by σ^2 , and a lower limit, provided by Eq. (90).
5. We have evaluated the form of the noise contributions in the limiting cases of high and low densities.
6. We have considered three typical cases of weight functions and we have evaluated $C(w_A, w_B)$ for them.

Finally, we note that although the smoothing technique considered in this paper is by far the most widely used in Astronomy, alternative methods are available. A statistical characterization of these methods, using a completely different approach, will be presented in a future paper (Lombardi & Schneider, in preparation).

Acknowledgements. This work was partially supported by a grant from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, and the TMR Network ‘‘Gravitational Lensing: New constraints on Cosmology and the Distribution of Dark Matter.’’

Appendix A: Vanishing weights

In Sect. 3.2 we have obtained the solution of the covariance problem under the hypothesis that the weight function $w(\theta)$ is strictly positive. In this appendix we will generalize the results obtained there to non-negative weight functions (see also Sect. 4).

If w_A is allowed to vanish, then we might have a finite probability that y_A vanishes, i.e. a finite probability that no point θ_n is inside the support of w_A . A finite probability in a probability distribution function appears as a Dirac’s delta distribution. Since this point is quite important for our discussion, let us make a simple example. Suppose that ξ is a real random variable with the following characteristics:

- ξ has probability 1/3 to vanish.
- ξ has probability 2/3 to be in the range $(0, \infty)$; in this range ξ has an exponential distribution.

Then we can write the probability distribution function for ξ as

$$p_\xi(\xi) = \frac{1}{3}\delta(\xi) + \frac{2}{3}H(\xi)\exp(-\xi), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where H is the Heaviside function (see Eq. (40)). In other words, the probability distribution for ξ includes the contribution from a Dirac’s delta distribution centered on $\xi = 0$. If p_ξ is known, the probability that ξ is exactly zero (1/3 in this example) can be obtained using

$$P(\xi = 0) = \int_{0^-}^{0^+} p_\xi(\xi') d\xi' = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^\xi p_\xi(\xi') d\xi'. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Let us now turn to our problem. As mentioned above, for vanishing weights we expect that y_A might vanish, i.e. its probability might include the contribution from a delta distribution centered on $y_A = 0$; similarly, if w_B is allowed to vanish, the probability distribution for y_B might include a delta centered in $y_B = 0$. For a given y_B , the probability $P_A(y_B)$ that y_A vanishes is given by

$$P_A(y_B) \equiv \lim_{y_A \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{0^-}^{y_A} p_y(y'_A, y_B) dy'_A = \lim_{s_A \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_A[p_y(\cdot, y_B)](s_A), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the properties of Laplace transform have been used in the last equality (see Appendix D). A similar equation holds for the probability that y_B vanishes, $P_B(y_A)$. Note that the Laplace transform in Eq. (A.3) is performed only with respect to the first variable. The joint probability P_{AB} that both y_A and y_B vanish is (cf. Eq. (61))

$$P_{AB} \equiv \lim_{\substack{y_A \rightarrow 0^+ \\ y_B \rightarrow 0^+}} \int_{0^-}^{y_A} dy'_A \int_{0^-}^{y_B} dy'_B p_y(y'_A, y'_B) = \lim_{\substack{s_A \rightarrow \infty \\ s_B \rightarrow \infty}} \mathcal{L}[p_y](s_A, s_B) = Y(\infty, \infty). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

We then also define (cf. Eqs. (62))

$$P_A \equiv \int_0^\infty P_A(y_B) dy_B = \mathcal{L}[p_y](\infty, 0^+) = Y(\infty, 0^+), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$P_B \equiv \int_0^\infty P_B(y_A) dy_A = \mathcal{L}[p_y](0^+, \infty) = Y(0^+, \infty). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Using Eq. (45), we find $P_A = \exp(-\rho\pi_A)$, $P_B = \exp(-\rho\pi_B)$, and $P_{AB} = \exp(-\rho\pi_{A \cup B})$, where π_A is the area of the support of w_A , π_B is the area of the support of w_B , and $\pi_{A \cup B}$ is the area of the union of the two supports. This result is of course not surprising and has been already derived in the paragraph before Eq. (61) using a different approach.

For vanishing weights, we decided to use the following prescription: We discard, in the ensemble average for $\text{Cov}(\tilde{f}; \theta_A, \theta_B)$, the configurations $\{\theta_n\}$ for which the function \tilde{f} is not defined either at θ_A or at θ_B . In order to implement this prescription, we can explicitly modify the probability distribution p_y and exclude ‘‘by hand’’ cases where the denominator of Eq. (19) vanishes;

Table B.1. Moments M_{ij} up to the fourth order. The table shows, for each row, the values of M_{ij} with $(i + j)$, the order, fixed. Hence, for example, the row for order 2 shows M_{20} , M_{11} , and M_{02} in sequence.

Order ($i + j$)	$j = 0$	$j = 1$	M_{ij} $j = 2$	$j = 3$	$j = 4$
0	1	–	–	–	–
1	0	0	–	–	–
2	ρS_{20}	ρS_{11}	ρS_{02}	–	–
3	ρS_{30}	ρS_{21}	ρS_{12}	ρS_{03}	–
4	$\rho S_{40} + 3\rho^2 S_{20}$	$\rho S_{30} + 3\rho^2 S_{20} S_{11}$	$\rho S_{22} + \rho^2 S_{02} S_{20} + 2\rho^2 S_{11} S_{11}$	$\rho S_{03} + 3\rho^2 S_{02} S_{11}$	$\rho S_{04} + 3\rho^2 S_{02}$

for the purpose, we consider separately cases where w_A or w_B vanish. We define a new probability distribution for (y_A, y_B) which accounts for vanishing weights:

$$\bar{p}_y(y_A, y_B) \equiv \begin{cases} p_y(y_A, y_B) & \text{if } w_A \neq 0, w_B \neq 0, \\ [p_y(y_A, y_B) - P_A(y_B)\delta(y_A)]/(1 - P_A) & \text{if } w_A = 0, w_B \neq 0, \\ [p_y(y_A, y_B) - P_B(y_A)\delta(y_B)]/(1 - P_B) & \text{if } w_A \neq 0, w_B = 0, \\ [p_y(y_A, y_B) - P_A(y_B)\delta(y_A) - P_B(y_A)\delta(y_B) + P_{AB}\delta(y_A)\delta(y_B)]\nu & \text{if } w_A = 0, w_B = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

We recall that $\nu = 1/(1 - P_A - P_B + P_{AB})$. In constructing this probability, first we have explicitly removed the degenerate situations, then we have renormalized the resulting probability. Note that the normalization factor in the last case, namely $1 - P_A - P_B + P_{AB}$, comes from the so-called ‘‘inclusion-exclusion principle’’ ($1 - P_A - P_B + P_{AB}$ is the probability that *both* f_A and f_B are defined). Using this new probability distribution in the definition (32) for Y we obtain

$$Y(s_A, s_B) = \begin{cases} e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} & \text{if } w_A \neq 0, w_B \neq 0, \\ [e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} - e^{\rho Q(\infty, s_B)}]/(1 - P_A) & \text{if } w_A = 0, w_B \neq 0, \\ [e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} - e^{\rho Q(s_A, \infty)}]/(1 - P_B) & \text{if } w_A \neq 0, w_B = 0, \\ [e^{\rho Q(s_A, s_B)} - e^{\rho Q(s_A, \infty)} - e^{\rho Q(\infty, s_B)} + e^{\rho Q(\infty, \infty)}]\nu & \text{if } w_A = 0, w_B = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Finally, we need to change the normalization factor in Eq. (47) in order to account for cases where y_A or y_B are vanishing. Indeed, the correcting factor $C(w_A, w_B)$ has been obtained by assuming that all objects can populate all the plane with uniform probability distribution (cf. Eq. (25)); now, however, a fraction $(P_A + P_B - P_{AB})$ of configurations have been excluded. Hence we have

$$C(w_A, w_B) = \frac{\rho^2}{1 - P_A - P_B + P_{AB}} \mathcal{L}[Y](w_A, w_B). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

This complete the discussion of vanishing weights.

Appendix B: Moments expansion

In Sect. 5 we have written the moments expansion for $C(w_A, w_B)$. Here we complete the discussion by providing a proof for that result.

At high densities, y_A and y_B are basically Gaussian random variables with average values \bar{y}_A and \bar{y}_B (we anticipate here that these averages are given by the density ρ). Hence, we can expand them in the definition of $C(w_A, w_B)$:

$$\begin{aligned} C(w_A, w_B) &= \rho^2 \int_0^\infty dy_A \int_0^\infty dy_B \frac{p_y(y_A, y_B)}{(w_A + y_A)(w_B + y_B)} \\ &= \rho^2 \int_0^\infty dy_A \int_0^\infty dy_B \frac{p_y(y_A, y_B)}{(w_A + \bar{y}_A)(w_B + \bar{y}_B)} \left[\sum_{i=0}^\infty \left(\frac{\bar{y}_A - y_A}{w_A + \bar{y}_A} \right)^i \right] \left[\sum_{j=0}^\infty \left(\frac{\bar{y}_B - y_B}{w_B + \bar{y}_B} \right)^j \right] \\ &= \rho^2 \sum_{i,j=0}^\infty (-1)^{i+j} \frac{M_{ij}}{(\bar{y}_A + w_A)^{i+1} (\bar{y}_B + w_B)^{j+1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where M_{ij} are the ‘‘centered’’ moments of p_y :

$$M_{ij} \equiv \int_0^\infty dy_A \int_0^\infty dy_B p_y(y_A, y_B) (y_A - \bar{y}_A)^i (y_B - \bar{y}_B)^j. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

The centered moments can be expressed in terms of the “un-centered” ones, defined as

$$\mathcal{M}_{ij} \equiv \int_0^\infty dy_A \int_0^\infty dy_B p_y(y_A, y_B) y_A^i y_B^j = (-1)^{i+j} Y^{(i,j)}(0, 0). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Here $Y^{(i,j)}(0, 0)$ is the i th partial derivative on s_A and j th partial derivative on s_B of $Y(s_A, s_B)$, evaluated at $(0, 0)$. These, in turn, can be expressed as derivatives of Q . For the first terms we have

$$Y^{(0,0)}(0, 0) = Y(0, 0) = 1, \quad Y^{(1,0)}(0, 0) = \rho Q^{(1,0)}(0, 0), \quad Y^{(0,1)}(0, 0) = \rho Q^{(0,1)}(0, 0), \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$Y^{(2,0)}(0, 0) = \rho Q^{(2,0)}(0, 0) + [\rho Q^{(1,0)}(0, 0)]^2, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$Y^{(1,1)}(0, 0) = \rho Q^{(1,1)}(0, 0) + [\rho Q^{(1,0)}(0, 0)][\rho Q^{(0,1)}(0, 0)], \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$Y^{(0,2)}(0, 0) = \rho Q^{(0,2)}(0, 0) + [\rho Q^{(0,1)}(0, 0)]^2. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Finally, the derivatives of Q can be evaluated as

$$Q^{(i,j)}(0, 0) = (-1)^{i+j} S_{ij}, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where S_{ij} , we recall, is given by Eq. (67). Note that $S_{01} = S_{10} = 1$ because of the normalization of w_A and w_B , and thus, as already anticipated, $\bar{y}_A = \bar{y}_B = \rho$. In summary, we find

$$M_{00} = 1, \quad M_{10} = M_{01} = 0, \quad M_{20} = \mathcal{M}_{20} - (\mathcal{M}_{10})^2 = \rho S_{20}, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$M_{11} = \mathcal{M}_{11} - \mathcal{M}_{10}\mathcal{M}_{01} = \rho S_{11}, \quad M_{02} = \mathcal{M}_{20} - (\mathcal{M}_{01})^2 = \rho S_{20}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

We stress that, in general, it is not true that $M_{ij} = \rho S_{ij}$ (more complex expressions are encountered for higher order terms; cf. the last term in Eq. (66)). Finally, we can write the expansion of $C(w_A, w_B)$:

$$C(w_A, w_B) \simeq \frac{\rho^2}{(\rho + w_A)(\rho + w_B)} + \frac{\rho^3 S_{20}}{(\rho + w_A)^3(\rho + w_B)} + \frac{\rho^3 S_{11}}{(\rho + w_A)^2(\rho + w_B)^2} + \frac{\rho^3 S_{02}}{(\rho + w_A)(\rho + w_B)^3}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

This is precisely Eq. (68). Using the same technique and a little more perseverance, we can also obtain higher order terms. In particular, Table B.1 reports the moments M_{ij} defined in Eq. (B.2) up to the fourth order. This table, together with Eq. (B.1), can be used to write an accurate moment expansion of $C(w_a, w_b)$.

Appendix C: Varying weights

In Paper I we have considered a modified version of the estimator (1) which allows for the use of supplementary weights. Suppose that we measure a given field $f(\theta)$ at some positions θ_n of the sky. Suppose also that we use a weight u_n for each object observed, so that we replace Eq. (1) with

$$\tilde{f}(\theta) \equiv \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N \hat{f}_n u_n w(\theta - \theta_n)}{\sum_{n=1}^N u_n w(\theta - \theta_n)}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

For example, if we have at our disposal some error estimate σ_n for each object, we might use the weighting scheme $u_n = 1/\sigma_n^2$ in order to minimize the noise of the estimator (C.1).

A statistical study of the expectation value of this estimator has already been carried out in Paper I. Here we proceed further and study its covariance under the same assumptions as the ones used for the study of Eq. (1) in the main text. However, since one of the main reasons to use weights is some knowledge on the variance of each object, we use a generalized form of Eq. (7):

$$\langle [\hat{f}_n - f(\theta_n)][\hat{f}_m - f(\theta_m)] \rangle = \sigma^2(u_n) \delta_{nm}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Note, in particular, that the variance is assumed to depend on u_n (or, equivalently, the weight is assumed to depend on the variance). Similarly to Paper I, we also assume that, for each object n , the weight u_n is independent of the position θ_n and of the measured signal \hat{f}_n , and that each u_n follows a known probability distribution p_u .

In Paper I we have shown that the average value of $\tilde{f}(\theta)$ can be calculated using the equations

$$R_X(s_X) \equiv \int_\Omega d^2\theta \int_0^\infty du p_u(u) [e^{-s_X u w_X(\theta)} - 1] = \int_0^\infty p_u(u) Q_X(u s_X) du, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

$$Y_X(s_X) \equiv \exp[\rho R_X(s_X)], \quad (\text{C.4})$$

$$B_X(v_X) \equiv \rho \mathcal{L}[Y_X](v_X), \quad (\text{C.5})$$

$$\langle \tilde{f}_X \rangle = \int_\Omega d^2\theta \int_0^\infty du p_u(u) f(\theta) B_X(u w_X(\theta)) u w_X(\theta). \quad (\text{C.6})$$

We now evaluate the covariance of the estimator (C.1) using a technique similar to the one used in Sect. 3. We have

$$\langle \tilde{f}_A \tilde{f}_B \rangle = \frac{1}{A^N} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_0^{\infty} du_1 p_u(u_1) \dots \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_N \int_0^{\infty} du_N p_u(u_N) \frac{\langle [\sum_n \hat{f}_n u_n w_A(\theta_n)] [\sum_m \hat{f}_m u_m w_B(\theta_m)] \rangle}{[\sum_n u_n w_A(\theta_n)] [\sum_m u_m w_B(\theta_m)]}. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

As usual we consider separately the cases $n = m$ and $n \neq m$, thus obtaining the two terms T_1 and T_2 :

$$T_1 = \frac{N}{A^N} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_0^{\infty} du_1 p_u(u_1) \dots \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_N \int_0^{\infty} du_N p_u(u_N) \frac{[f^2(\theta_1) + \sigma^2(u_1)] u_1^2 w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_1)}{[\sum_n u_n w_A(\theta_n)] [\sum_m u_m w_B(\theta_m)]}, \quad (\text{C.8})$$

$$T_2 = \frac{N(N-1)}{A^N} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_0^{\infty} du_1 p_u(u_1) \dots \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_N \int_0^{\infty} du_N p_u(u_N) \frac{f(\theta_1) u_1 w_A(\theta_1) f(\theta_2) u_2 w_B(\theta_2)}{[\sum_n u_n w_A(\theta_n)] [\sum_m u_m w_B(\theta_m)]}. \quad (\text{C.9})$$

Let us introduce new variables $v_{Xn} = u_n w_X(\theta_n)$ (with $X \in \{A, B\}$) for the combination of weights, and let us define similarly to Eq. (26) $y_X \equiv \sum_{n=2}^N v_n$. Then the probability distributions for v_{Xn} and y_X can be evaluated using the set of equations

$$p_v(v_A, v_B) = \frac{1}{A} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta \int_0^{\infty} du p_u(u) \delta(v_A - u w_A(\theta)) \delta(v_B - u w_B(\theta)), \quad (\text{C.10})$$

$$p_y(y_A, y_B) = \int_0^{\infty} dv_{A2} \int_0^{\infty} dv_{B2} p_v(v_{A2}, v_{B2}) \dots \int_0^{\infty} dv_{AN} \int_0^{\infty} dv_{BN} p_v(v_{AN}, v_{BN}) \delta(y_A - v_{A2} - \dots - v_{AN}) \times \delta(y_B - v_{B2} - \dots - v_{BN}). \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Again, it is convenient to consider the Laplace transforms of these two probability distributions:

$$V(s_A, s_B) = \mathcal{L}[p_v](s_A, s_B) = \frac{1}{A} \int_0^{\infty} du p_u(u) \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta e^{-s_A u w_A(\theta) - s_B u w_B(\theta)} = \int_0^{\infty} p(u) W(us_A, us_B) du, \quad (\text{C.12})$$

$$Y(s_A, s_B) = \mathcal{L}[p_y](s_A, s_B) = [V(s_A, s_B)]^{N-1}. \quad (\text{C.13})$$

In the continuous limit we define instead

$$R(s_A, s_B) \equiv \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta \int_0^{\infty} du p_u(u) [e^{-s_A u w_A(\theta) - s_B u w_B(\theta)} - 1] = \int_0^{\infty} p(u) Q(us_A, us_B) du, \quad (\text{C.14})$$

$$Y(s_A, s_B) = \exp[\rho R(s_A, s_B)]. \quad (\text{C.15})$$

Finally, the equivalent of the correcting factor $C(w_A, w_B)$ (cf. Eq. (11)) is, in our case, the quantity

$$B(v_A, v_B) \equiv \rho^2 \int_0^{\infty} dy_A \int_0^{\infty} dy_B \frac{p_y(y_A, y_B)}{(v_A + y_A)(v_B + y_B)} = \rho \mathcal{L}[Y](v_A, v_B). \quad (\text{C.16})$$

The quantity B can be used to evaluate T_1 : In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= \frac{N}{A} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_0^{\infty} du_1 p_u(u_1) \int_0^{\infty} dy_A \int_0^{\infty} dy_B p_y(y_A, y_B) \frac{[f^2(\theta_1) + \sigma^2(u_1)] u_1^2 w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_1)}{[u_1 w_A(\theta_1) + y_A][u_1 w_B(\theta_1) + y_B]} \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_0^{\infty} du_1 p_u(u_1) [f^2(\theta_1) + \sigma^2(u_1)] u_1^2 w_A(\theta_1) w_B(\theta_1) B(u_1 w_A(\theta_1), u_1 w_B(\theta_1)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.17})$$

Similarly, for T_2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &= \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_1 \int_0^{\infty} du_1 p_u(u_1) \int_{\Omega} d^2\theta_2 \int_0^{\infty} du_2 p_u(u_2) f(\theta_1) f(\theta_2) u_1 w_A(\theta_1) u_2 w_B(\theta_2) \\ &\quad \times B(u_1 w_A(\theta_1) + u_2 w_A(\theta_2), u_1 w_B(\theta_1) + u_2 w_B(\theta_2)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.18})$$

The final evaluation of $\text{Cov}(\tilde{f})$ then proceeds similarly to what done in the main text for the estimator (1).

Appendix D: Properties of the Laplace transform

For the convenience of the reader, we summarize in this appendix some useful properties of the Laplace transform. Proofs of the results stated here can be found in any advanced analysis book (e.g. Arfken 1985). Although in this paper we have been dealing mainly with Laplace transforms of two-argument functions, we write the properties below for the case of a function of a single argument for two main reasons: (i) The generalization to functions of several arguments is in most cases trivial; (ii) Several properties can be better understood in the simpler case considered here.

Suppose that a function $f(x)$ of a real argument x is given. Its Laplace transform is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}[f](s) \equiv \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^-} \int_x^{\infty} dx' f(x') e^{-sx'} = \int_{0^-}^{\infty} dx f(x) e^{-sx}. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Note that we use 0^- as lower integration limit in this definition.

The Laplace transform is a *linear operator*; hence, if α and β are two real numbers and $g(x)$ is a function of real argument x , we have $\mathcal{L}[\alpha f + \beta g] = \alpha \mathcal{L}[f] + \beta \mathcal{L}[g]$.

The Laplace transform of the derivative of f can be expressed in terms of the Laplace transform of f . In particular, we have

$$\mathcal{L}[f'](s) = s \mathcal{L}[f](s) - f(0^-). \quad (\text{D.2})$$

This equation can be generalized to higher order derivatives. Calling $f^{(n)}$ the n th derivative of f , we have

$$\mathcal{L}[f^{(n)}](s) = s^n \mathcal{L}[f](s) - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} s^{n-i-1} f^{(i)}(0^-). \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Surprisingly, this equation holds if, for n negative, we consider $f^{(n)}$ to be the $-n$ th integral of f ; note that in this case the summation disappears. Hence, for example, we have

$$\mathcal{L}\left[\int_{0^-}^x f(x') dx'\right](s) = \frac{1}{s} \mathcal{L}[f](s). \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Often, properties of the Laplace transform come in pairs: For every property there is a similar one where the role of f and $\mathcal{L}[f]$ are swapped. Here is the “dual” of property (D.2):

$$\mathcal{L}[xf(x)](s) = -\frac{d\mathcal{L}[f](s)}{ds}, \quad (\text{D.5})$$

or, more generally,

$$\mathcal{L}[x^n f(x)](s) = (-1)^n \frac{d^n \mathcal{L}[f](s)}{ds^n}. \quad (\text{D.6})$$

A similar equation holds for “negative” derivatives, i.e. integrals of the Laplace transform. In this case, however, it is convenient to change the integration limits to (s, ∞) . In summary, we can write

$$\mathcal{L}[f(x)/x](s) = \int_s^{\infty} \mathcal{L}[f](s') ds'. \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Given a positive number a , the Laplace transform of the function f shifted by a is given by

$$\mathcal{L}[f(x-a)H(x)](s) = \mathcal{L}[f](s)e^{-sa}, \quad (\text{D.8})$$

where H is the Heaviside function defined in Eq. (40). A dual of this property can also be written:

$$\mathcal{L}[f(x)e^{bx}](s) = \mathcal{L}[f](s-b). \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Finally, we consider two useful relationships between limiting values of f and $\mathcal{L}[f]$:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s \mathcal{L}[f](s), \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \mathcal{L}[f](s). \quad (\text{D.10})$$

References

- Arfken, G. 1985, *Mathematical methods for physicists* (Orlando, Florida: Academic press)
- Chandrasekhar, S. 1989, *Stochastic, statistical, and hydromagnetic problems in physics and astronomy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c1989)
- Deguchi, S., & Watson, W. D. 1987, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 59, 2814
- Eadie, W., Drijard, D., James, F., Roos, M., & Sadoulet, B. 1971, *Statistical Methods in Experimental Physics* (Amsterdam New-York Oxford: North-Holland Publishing Company)
- Lombardi, M., & Schneider, P. 2001, *A&A*, 373, 359
- Lombardi, M., Schneider, P., & Morales-Merlino, C. 2001, *A&A*, 382, 769