ABSTRACT

We describe the optical design and optimisation of the Low Frequency Instrument (LFI), one of two instruments onboard the Planck satellite, which will survey the cosmic microwave background with unprecedented accuracy. The LFI covers the 30–70 GHz frequency range with an array of cryogenic pseudo-correlation radiometers. Stringent optical requirements on angular resolution, sidelobes, main beam symmetry, polarization purity, and feed orientation have been achieved. The optimisation process was carried out by assuming an ideal telescope according to the Planck design and by using both physical optics and multi-reflector geometrical theory of diffraction. This extensive study led to the flight design of the feed horns, their characteristics, arrangement, and orientation, while taking into account the opto-mechanical constraints imposed by complex interfaces in the Planck focal surface.
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1. Introduction

The Planck Satellite was developed to measure the temperature and polarization of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) over the entire sky with unprecedented sensitivity and angular resolution. The Low Frequency Instrument (LFI), operating in the 30–70 GHz frequency range, is an array of cryogenic pseudo-correlation radiometers (Bersanelli et al. 2010) sharing the focal surface of a 1.5 m off-axis dual reflector telescope with the High Frequency Instrument (HFI) (see Lamarre et al. 2010). This unique optical layout, with one instrument (LFI) surrounding the other (HFI), leads to potentially significant off-axis aberrations in the LFI beams that must be accurately controlled in the telescope and instrument design optimization phases. The requirements on the LFI beams were originally set in terms of angular resolution (33′, 24′, and 14′, respectively at 30 GHz, 44 GHz, and 70 GHz) and straylight contamination (lower than 3 μK). The aim of this paper is to describe the complex process of design and optimization of the LFI optics, leading to the current flight configuration, which in some cases achieves angular resolutions superior to the requirements.

A CMB experiment should ideally have an optical system producing symmetric Gaussian beam responses to avoid distortion effects, and without spillover, to avoid straylight entering the detectors through the sidelobes producing signals that may be indistinguishable from fluctuations in the CMB. In real systems, however, residual non-idealities in the optical system may introduce serious limitations to the scientific return if not well understood and controlled. The systematic effects induced by the optics can be divided into two main areas: (i) the aberrations of
the main beam, which degrade the angular resolution and increase the uncertainty in the measurements at high multipoles (particularly for polarization) as the texture of the cosmic signal is smeared and distorted; (ii) the sidelobes in the feed/telescope radiation pattern, which contribute to the straylight induced noise, i.e., the unwanted power reaching the detectors and not coupled through the main beam. These introduce contamination mainly at large and intermediate angular scales, typically at multipoles less than $\sim 100$.

In this paper, we present the definition, optimization, and characterization of the LFI optical interfaces. The work involved here has been carried out by means of electromagnetic simulations devoted to maximizing the angular resolution and at the same time minimizing systematic effects. The starting point of the optimization activity was the Planck telescope, which is an off-axis Gregorian telescope satisfying the Mizuguchi-Dragone condition. Initially, the LFI focal surface configuration included (in addition to the frequency channels at 30, 44 and, 70 GHz), also a channel at 100 GHz comprising seventeen horns distributed around the HFI front-end. The LFI 100 GHz channel was subsequently removed, but it was part of the initial study and much of the analysis was completed for this channel and applied to the lower frequencies. The position and orientation of each horn was determined by taking into account the mechanical constraints imposed by the LFI interfaces and 4 K reference loads attached to the HFI instrument (see Mandolesi et al. 2010) and assuming a Gaussian model. We emphasize that the simulations discussed in this paper were carried out by assuming a radio frequency model composed of the ideal telescope, the baffle, and the coldest V-groove thermal radiator (see Sandri et al. 2002b). The current most suitable model of the detailed beams for both LFI and HFI, taking into account a realistic model of the telescope, are given in Tauber et al. (2010).

The assumed Planck telescope design and the focal surface layout are described in Sects. 2 and 3, respectively. In Sect. 4, edge-taper degradation of the horns is presented. The edge-taper was degraded to improve the angular resolution while maintaining straylight rejection to within the requirements. Section 5 presents the feedhorn alignment process, complete so that CMB polarization measurements can be made. In Sect. 6, given the edge-taper values and the location and orientation of the feeds determined in the previous sections, each horn design was then optimized in terms of sidelobe level, cross polarization response, and beamwidth. This optimization was first carried out at 100 GHz, i.e., the most critical channel for LFI, and the results were extrapolated to lower frequencies, taking care to check the consistency at the end of the activity. Finally, the fully optimized performance of the LFI beams is reported in Sect. 7.

2. Telescope optical design

The Planck telescope was designed to comply with the following high level opto-mechanical requirements: wide frequency coverage (about two decades), 100 squared degrees of field of view, wide focal region ($400 \times 600$ mm), and a cryogenic operational environment ($40-65$ K). These unique characteristics for an experimental cosmology telescope have never been previously implemented. The Planck telescope represents a challenge for telescope technology and optical design (Villa et al. 2002; Tauber et al. 2010).

The telescope optical layout is based on a dual reflector off-axis Gregorian design. This configuration allows it to have a small overall focal ratio (and thus small feeds), an unobstructed field of view, and low diffraction effects from the secondary reflector and struts. It allows, at the same time, the secondary reflector to be appropriately oversized. To improve the image quality, the design has been optimized by changing the conic constants, the radius of curvature, the distance between the mirrors, and the tilting of both mirrors, using the spillover level and the wave front error as optimization parameters (Dubrul et al. 2000). The primary mirror is elliptical in shape (but nearly parabolic since the conic constant is about $-0.9$) as in aplacnic configurations (Wilson 1996), and the size of the rim is $1.9 \times 1.5$ m. The offset of the primary reflector, i.e., the distance between its center and its major axis, is $1.04$ m, while the secondary reflector offset is $0.3$ m. The secondary mirror is elliptical with a nearly circular rim about $1$ m in diameter. The overall focal ratio, $F_{\alpha}$, equals $1.1$, and the projected aperture is circular with a diameter of $1.5$ m. The telescope field of view is $\pm 5^\circ$ centered on the line of sight (LOS), which is tilted at about $3.7^\circ$ relative to the main reflector axis, and forms an angle of $85^\circ$ with the satellite spin axis, which is typically oriented in the anti-Sun direction during the survey (Dupac 2008). The Planck telescope as a complete satellite subsystem is shown in Fig. 1 and a detailed description is reported in Tauber et al. (2010).

3. LFI optical interfaces

In its flight configuration, LFI is coupled to the telescope by eleven dual-profiled, corrugated, conical horns (Villa et al. 2010): six feed horns at 70 GHz (FH18 – FH23), three feed horns at 44 GHz (FH24 – FH26), and two feed horns at 30 GHz (FH27 and FH28). Figure 2 shows the arrangement of the horns inside the LFI main frame. It should be noted that the feed position in the focal surface is axisymmetric (for instance, FH27 is symmetric to FH28 at 30 GHz), a natural design choice based on the symmetry of the telescope and satellite. As a consequence, only six different feed elements have been considered in the optimization analysis: one feed at 30 GHz, two at 44 GHz, and three at 70 GHz (Villa et al. 2010). The center of the focal surface is occupied by the HFI horns. This optical layout, with one instrument (LFI) around the other (HFI), required that aberration effects in the LFI beams be accurately controlled in the telescope and instrument design optimization phases. Corrugated horns were selected as the most suitable solution in terms of cross polarization levels, sidelobe levels, return and insertion.
LFI feed horns are seen reflected in the primary mirror of the box holding the feedhorns appears to be transparent in this view, to metric detector array (small feed horns on golden circular base) and rectly below the telescope primary mirror. It comprises the HFI bolo-
ttects (Clarricoats 1984; Olver & Xiang 1988). The corrugation of the main lobe shape, the phase centre location, and com-
trols the HFI focal plane optimization process when the focal plane design was not frozen. However, this was sufficient to derive analytical formulae for pointing that have been used in additional focal plane optimizations, ending with the final design. We consider the reference detector plane coordinate system (X_{RDP}, Y_{RDP}, Z_{RDP}) as a starting point to define horn pointing. The horn pointing depends only on the (X_{RDP}, Y_{RDP}) coordinates, while Z_{RDP} defines the phase centre location only. We also define the two rotation angles as $\alpha$ the rotation angle around $Y_{RDP}$, and $\beta$ the rotation around $X_{RDP}$ axis. For the Planck telescope, and in the region where the LFI feeds are located (i.e., outside the centre of the focal plane), the two angles were derived from a linear fit to the optical simulation results:

$$\alpha = a_x \cdot X_{RDP} + b_x,$$

$$\beta = b_y \cdot Y_{RDP} + b_y.$$

The lengths of the horns were chosen to satisfy the following constraints: (i) to guarantee the interface specifications of the 4 K reference load (which are attached to the HFI instrument, and are thus a driver on the LFI focal plane interface design); (ii) to guarantee matching with both the focal surface and the obscuration criterion of the LFI horns. These criteria fixed the clearance as a cone of 45° from the horn aperture rim. It was set after measurements performed by the LFI team (Ocleto et al 2009) and simulations performed by the industrial contractor\textsuperscript{2}. In this way, it was possible to optimize the focal plane with the LFI CAD solid model without performing time consuming electromagnetic computations. Once the horn location and orientation were frozen, the phase centre position and the edge-taper were used as inputs to the corrugation design.

4. Edge-taper evaluation

The angular resolution (expressed here in terms of full width half maximum, FWHM) of the beam in the sky depends on the illumination, $g(x,y)$, of the primary mirror. For an aperture-type antenna (such as a reflecting telescope), the far field is the Fourier transform of the aperture illumination function. If a Gaussian illumination is assumed, the main beam shape is Gaussian too. The flatter the illumination, the narrower the resulting pattern; in contrast, if the illumination is more centrally peaked, then the angular resolution of the pattern is degraded. For a dual reflector telescope, the illumination function $g(x,y)$ is produced by the feed-horn pattern, reflected and diffracted by the subreflector, and distorted by aberrations mainly due to the off-axis position of the feeds. This is the case for the LFI focal plane configuration. The trade-off between the angular resolution (which impacts the instrument’s ability to reconstruct the anisotropy power spectrum of the cosmic microwave background radiation at high multipoles) and the edge-taper (which controls the systematic edge-taper evaluation).

\textsuperscript{2} Thales Alenia Space – France, formerly Alcatel Space.
Table 1. Location and orientation of the LFI feed horns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feed</th>
<th>ν₀ (GHz)</th>
<th>Location (X_{RDP}, Y_{RDP}, Z_{RDP}) (mm, mm, mm)</th>
<th>Orientation (θ_{RDP}, ϕ_{RDP}, θ_{RDP}) (°, °, °)</th>
<th>Taper (dB @ 22°)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FH18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(−76.38, −69.37, 14.54)</td>
<td>(11.93, −46.04, 18.26)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(−92.41, −43.29, 18.66)</td>
<td>(11.63, 28.71, 19.84)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(−101.86, −17.69, 20.86)</td>
<td>(11.38, 11.22, 21.29)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(−101.86, 17.69, 20.86)</td>
<td>(11.38, −11.22, −21.29)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(−92.41, 43.29, 18.66)</td>
<td>(11.63, −28.71, −19.84)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(−76.38, 69.37, 14.54)</td>
<td>(11.93, −46.04, −18.26)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(−138.41, 0.00, 21.29)</td>
<td>(14.85, 0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(55.32, 133.27, −17.90)</td>
<td>(16.44, −113.42, −106.18)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(55.32, −133.27, −17.90)</td>
<td>(16.44, 113.42, 106.18)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(−136.95, 54.94, 18.60)</td>
<td>(15.56, −23.01, −19.22)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(−136.95, −54.94, 18.60)</td>
<td>(15.56, 23.01, 19.22)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. The frames are defined with respect to the RDP and according to GRASP8 angle definition 1999. The mechanical uncertainties, defined at warm temperature, in the location of the feed are 0.4 mm along X_{RDP} and Y_{RDP}, and 0.5 mm along Z_{RDP}.

Fig. 3. Simulated co-polar pattern, in the E-plane, of the FM feed horns at 70 (FH21, FH22, and FH23), 44 (FH24 and FH25), and 30 (FH27) GHz assuming the designed profile.

A preliminary study of the primary mirror edge-taper of the Planck telescope baseline configuration was performed by computing the field distribution on the primary mirror for each feed horn. The simulations was carried out in the transmitting mode (i.e., the horn was treated as a source) using GRASP8. The model of the feed that we used is a X-axis polarized Gaussian horn with an edge-taper of 30 dB at an angle of 22 degrees. The contour plots of the total amplitude field incident on the main reflector were produced for each feed horn considered. Geometrical optics (GO) and the geometrical theory of diffraction (GTD) were used on the sub-reflector to calculate the total amplitude of the field incident on the surface of the primary mirror, in the reference system of the main beam. The resulting contour plots showed that, as expected, the illumination of the primary mirror is roughly elliptical. As a consequence, the field amplitude on the primary mirror rim is not constant. The amplitudes of the field on the main reflector contour were used to set the requirements on the edge-taper values for all the LFI feed-horn illuminations.

The edge-taper correction of each feed horn, to ensure a

---

The GRASP software was developed by TICRA (Copenhagen, DK) for analysing general reflector antennas.
The color scale goes from black (minimum value) to red (maximum value). Diagnostics data are in percent (ΔE(θ, ϕ)/E₀(θ, ϕ)). We then decrease by this difference in the field distribution on the primary mirror (EM(θ, ϕ)) and the flight model case, nominal edge-taper curve (EM(θ, ϕ)). The color scale goes from black (minimum value) to red (maximum value). For the sub-reflector, the color scale goes from 0 to 200% and the white region on the lower part of the reflector is off the of scale since the differences are enormous. For the main reflector, the colour scale goes from 0 to the maximum value, i.e., 37.56%.

Fig. 5. Field distribution on Planck mirrors (the sub-reflector is on the left and the main reflector is on the right) for a 70 GHz feed horn assuming a Gaussian feed approximation (E₀(θ, ϕ), first row) and the flight model feed horn (EM(θ, ϕ), second row).

Fig. 6. Difference in the field distribution on the Planck mirrors between computations with the flight model feed and the Gaussian approximation. Differences data are in percent (ΔE(θ, ϕ)/E₀(θ, ϕ)). The color scale goes from black (minimum value) to red (maximum value). For the sub-reflector, the color scale goes from 0 to 200% and the white region on the lower part of the reflector is off the of scale since the differences are enormous. For the main reflector, the colour scale goes from 0 to the maximum value, i.e., 37.56%.

5. Polarization alignment

The main beams were computed in UV-spherical polar grids, in which u = sin ϑ · cos φ and v = sin ϑ · sin φ and the subscript bf means beam frame to indicate that each main beam was computed in its own coordinate system. These frames are defined starting from considerations, described below, that are related to the main beam polarization. In each point of the UV-grid, the far field was computed in the co- and cross-polar basis according to Ludwig’s third definition (Ludwig 1973). Although the simulated beams are computed as the far-field angular transmission function of a highly polarized radiating element in the focal plane, the far-field pattern is in general no longer linearly polarized, but a spurious component, induced by the optics, is present. The co-polar pattern is interpreted as the response of the linearly polarized detector to radiation from the sky that is linearly polarized in the direction defined as co-polar, and the same is true for the cross-polar pattern, where the cross-polar direction is orthogonal to the co-polar one. Therefore, the main beams can be shown with a contour plot of the co-polar pattern (Ecᵢ), a contour plot of the cross-polar pattern (Ecᵢ), or a contour plot of the total field (E₀). The adopted beam frame reference, in which each main beam was computed, implies that: i) the power peak of the co-polar component lies in the center of the UV-grid; and ii) a minimum in the cross-polar component appears at the same point (i.e., the major axis of the polarization ellipse is along the U-axis). This means that, very close to the beam pointing direction, the main beam can be assumed to be linearly polarized, and the X-axis of the beam frame can be assumed to be the main beam polarization direction.

The LFI radiometers are intrinsically linearly polarized, and by combining the signal received by several detectors it is possible to retrieve the Stokes parameters, U and Q, with particularly high sensitivity in the regions close to the ecliptic poles. LFI polarizability properties were optimized by rotating the feed horns (and the connected OMTs) about their axes to compensate for the offset introduced by the Planck telescope optics and to obtain the desired orientation of the beams’ polarization. The rotation of the spacecraft around its spin axis was considered, and the orientation of the polarization direction of each beam in the sky was taken into account such that the main beam polarization of
two symmetrically located feed horns are at 45 degrees to each other when observing the same direction in the sky. Polarization orientations of the LFI horns are reported in Table 1 ($\psi_{RDP}$ angles), polarization orientations of the corresponding main beams in the sky are reported in Table 2 ($\psi_{MB}$ angle), and the rotation angle of the polarization ellipse computed along the line of sight of each beam (i.e., in the center of the UV-grid) is reported in Table 3 ($\tau$ angle, ranges from $-90^\circ$ to $90^\circ$).

6. Trade-off between angular resolution and straylight

The final trade-off between angular resolution and straylight has been a long and complex process throughout the project development. For each LFI feed horn, several beams have been computed for the radiation patterns corresponding to different geometries (i.e., inner corrugation profile) of the horn itself (Sandri et al. 2004). Then, each beam was convolved with the microwave sky (CMB and foregrounds), taking into account the Planck scanning strategy in the (nominal) fifteen months observational time, and the straylight noise induced by the Galaxy, which has been derived (Burigana et al. 2004). From the comparison between these straylight values, and taking into account the beam characteristics, the optimal horn design was selected for the flight models. In this framework, the inadequacy of a pure Gaussian feed model in realistic far beam predictions has been demonstrated: relevant features in the beam are related to the sidelobes in the feed horn pattern. Not only does the realistic pattern need to be considered, but the details of the corrugation design could also affect the beam characteristics. The edge-taper being equal, different corrugation profiles involve differences of about 3% in the main beam size and about 40% in the straylight signal. It has been demonstrated that not only the spillover level is crucial, but also how the spillover radiation is distributed in the sky, and thus sophisticated pattern simulations are required to accurately quantify the beam aberrations and the straylight contamination.

Finally, while the main beam is highly polarized (greater than 99% linearly polarized, i.e., the cross-polar component is always 25 dB below that of the co-polar component), the computed 4$\pi$ beams have shown that the co- and cross-polar components in the sidelobe region may have the same intensity. Therefore, the cross-polar component will contaminate the co-polar component of the orthogonal polarization. This is particularly important at lower frequencies where the Galactic emission is strongly polarized. In other words, the strongly polarized Galactic emission collected through the sidelobes into the two polarized detectors is added to the slightly polarized CMB field entering the feed horn from the main beam direction. However, because of the rapid spatial variability in both the sky polarized emission and the polarized pattern, the polarized sidelobe contribution will probably average out to a significant degree.

7. LFI main beams

Once the location and orientation of the feed horns, as well as their inner corrugation profile, had been properly defined, we carried out a full characterisation of the optical performance using electromagnetic simulations devoted to computing the LFI beams. The beam solid angle, $\Omega_A$, of an antenna is given by

$$\Omega_A = \int_{4\pi} P_n(\theta, \phi) \, d\Omega = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi P_n(\theta, \phi) \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\phi,$$

where $P_n(\theta, \phi)$ is the normalized power pattern and the field computed by GRASP is normalised to a total power of $4\pi$ watt, i.e.,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi P_n(\theta, \phi) \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\phi = 4\pi.$$

For most antennas, the normalized power pattern has considerably larger values for a certain range of both $\theta$ and $\phi$ than for the remaining part of the sphere. This range is called the main beam and the remainder is called the sidelobes or back lobes. Obviously the quality of an antenna as a directional measuring device depends on how well the power pattern is concentrated in the main beam. The received power originating in region outside the main beam is called straylight, and it is one of the major sources of systematic effects in the Planck observations and for CMB experiments in general. In the next section, the sidelobes of the LFI beams are presented, together with the straylight-induced noise evaluated from these beams. The separation of the power pattern into a main beam and sidelobes can be somewhat arbitrary and is basically governed by convention. Different definitions of these regions could in principle be used: electromagnetic definitions, science-related definitions, and simulation-related definitions. In the framework of the present simulations, the main beam region was defined by taking care that not only the relevant main beam characteristics are computed (angular resolution, ellipticity, directivity, cross polar discrimination factor, and so on), but also that the main beam distortion, at a level of about $-60$ dB (mainly due to the off-axis location of the LFI feed horns), can be evaluated. This involves longer computational times but ensures a superior knowledge of the systematic effects related to the LFI main beams. The main
beam simulations are performed by considering the feed as a source, and by computing the pattern scattered by both reflectors onto the far field with GRASP8 using physical optics (PO) and physical theory of diffraction (PTD) for both reflectors. We assumed an ideal telescope and computed main beam and side-lobe properties for each channel, taking into account the effects of the surrounding structures.

7.1. LFI main beam characterisation

Far field radiation patterns were computed on the co- and cross-polar basis according to Ludwig’s third definition in UV-spherical grids. We computed the main beam angular resolution of each feed model analysed, as well as all major electromagnetic characteristics reported in Tables 2 and 3. $U (\sin \theta \times \cos \phi)$ and $V (\sin \theta \times \sin \phi)$ range from $-0.026$ to $0.026 (\theta \leq 1.5^\circ)$ for the 30 and 44 GHz channels, and from $-0.015$ to $0.015 (\theta \leq 0.9^\circ)$ for the 70 GHz channel. Each grid has been sampled with $301 \times 301$ points, therefore $\Delta U = \Delta V \approx 1.7 \times 10^{-4}$ for the 30 and 44 GHz channels and $10^{-4}$ for the 70 GHz channel. In Table 2, the coordinate systems in which each main beam was computed are reported: $U_{MB}$ and $V_{MB}$ correspond to the centre of the UV-grids shown in this section. In Table 3, relevant main beam characteristics computed at the central frequency are summarized, such as the full width half maximum, the cross polar discrimination factor (XPD), the main beam depolarization parameter ($d$), and the spillover ($S$) are reported.
the main beam. More than the spurious signal itself, fluctuations indistinguishable from signals induced by CMB fluctuations in beam computed assuming the Y-polarized feed. The di
main beam #27 computed assuming the X-polarized feed and the main
are superimposed with dotted lines and the resulting averaged FWHM is 32.58° in both cases. The two beams are perfectly symmetric with respect to the U-axis because of the symmetry of the Planck LFI optics. The lines in the contour plots represent levels of at –3, –10, –20, –30, –40, –50, and –60. The colour scales go from –90 to 0 dB.

Fig. 9. Contour plot in the UV-plane (–0.026 < U, V < 0.026) of the
beams at 70 (resp. 44, 30) GHz, while the far beam
includes the regions at angles greater than 5° for the Sun, Earth, and Galactic plane, respectively). We provide here this information: (∠θ, ∠φ) polar components computed for the feed horns #24 (first row) and #26 (second row). The fit bivariate Gaussian contours are superimposed with dotted lines and the
resulting averaged FWHM is 22.82 and 28.90, respectively. The lines in the
contour plots represent levels of –3, –10, –20, –30, –40, –50, and –60. The colour scales go from –90 to 0 dB.

Fig. 11. Contour plot in the UV-plane (–0.026 < U, V < 0.026) of the
beams at 70 (resp. 44, 30) GHz, while the far beam
includes the regions at angles greater than 5° for the Sun, Earth, and Galactic plane, respectively). We provide here this information: (∠θ, ∠φ) polar components computed for the feed horns #24 (first row) and #26 (second row). The fit bivariate Gaussian contours are superimposed with dotted lines and the
resulting averaged FWHM is 22.82 and 28.90, respectively. The lines in the
contour plots represent levels of –3, –10, –20, –30, –40, –50, and –60. The colour scales go from –90 to 0 dB.

Fig. 10. Contour plot in the UV-plane of the differences between the
main beam #27 computed assuming the X-polarized feed and the main
beam computed assuming the Y-polarized feed. The differences in the co- (left side) and cross- (right side) polar components are normalized to the local amplitude and expressed in dB. Table 3 quantitatively shows the differences between the two polarizations of the same feed.

8. LFI sidelobes

Power that does not originate in sources located in the main beam direction (i.e., the straylight) enters detectors through the sidelobes of the radiation pattern generating a signal that may be indistinguishable from signals induced by CMB fluctuations in the main beam. More than the spurious signal itself, fluctuations in the straylight signal contaminate the measurements mainly on large and intermediate angular scales (i.e., at multipoles ℓ less than ≈100), and must be kept below a level of few µK (the required straylight rejection levels must be at about 10^{-5}, 10^{-7}, and 10^{-9} for the Sun, Earth, and Galactic plane, respectively). The control of this systematic effect was achieved by accurate predictions of the LFI beams. In principle, Physical optics is the most accurate method for predicting beams and may be used in all regions surrounding the reflector antenna system. Nevertheless, as the frequency increases the reflectors need to be more precisely sampled. In addition, a finer integration grid is required because in the sidelobe region, the PO integrand becomes increasingly oscillatory. For a two-reflector antenna system such as Planck, the computation time increases as the fourth power of the frequency, and sidelobe simulations would be impractical for LFI. Although a full PO computation would be required to predict accurately the antenna pattern of the telescope, this is not feasible for the full spacecraft simulations since the PO approach cannot be applied correctly within a reasonable time when multiple diffractions and reflections between scatterers are involved. For this reason, the GRASP8 multi-reflector GTD (MrGTD) was used to compute 4π beam. MrGTD computes the scattered field from the reflectors performing a backward ray tracing, and represents a suitable method for predicting the full-sky radiation pattern of complex mm-wavelength optical systems in which the computational time is frequency-independent.

8.1. LFI sidelobe characterisation

To first approximation, the efficiency of an optical system in rejecting external straylight contamination is quantified by the fractional amount of power entering far from the main beam in the case of an isotropic signal. We provide here this information for all LFI beams in terms of relative (percent) contributions from the intermediate and far beam to the beam 4π integral. The intermediate beam includes here the region at angles between 0.8° (1°, 1.2°, respectively) and 5° from the beam centre for the beams at 70 (resp. 44, 30) GHz, while the far beam includes the regions at angles greater than 5° from the beam centre. The main, intermediate, and far beams are known in tabulated form and with different resolutions. Thus, the accuracy in the computations of their integrals cannot be extremely high. We exploited three different numerical methods and compared the corresponding results: (i) a 2D quadrature in θ and φ, performed
Fig. 12. Contour plot in the UV-plane \((-0.015 < U, V < 0.015)\) of the main beam co- (left side) and cross- (right side) polar components computed for the feed horns \#21 (third row), \#22 (fourth), and \#23 (fifth row). The fit bivariate Gaussian contours are superimposed with dotted lines and the resulting averaged \textit{FWHM} is 12.49, 12.71, and 13.05 arcmin, respectively. The lines in the contour plots represent levels of \(-3, -10, -20, -30, -40, -50, \) and \(-60\). The colour scales go from \(-90\) to \(0 \) dB.

The colour scales go from \(-90\) to \(0 \) dB.

Fig. 13. Co- (top panel) and cross- (bottom panel) polar components of the 4\(\pi\) beam at 30 GHz (feed horn \#27 Y polarized) computed with MrGTD. The maximum level of the main spillover is about \(-4.6 \) dBi at \(\phi \approx 17^\circ\) and \(\theta \approx 85^\circ\) for the co-polar component, and about \(-8.0 \) dBi at \(\phi \approx 18^\circ\) and \(\theta \approx 86^\circ\) for the cross-polar component.

with the routine D01DAF of the Mark 21 version of the NAG numerical library; \((ii)\) a combination of two 1D quadratures, a Gaussian quadrature (adapted in double precision and with 2048 grid points) from Press et al. (1992) for the integral \(\int \theta^\prime\) and the NAG routine D01AJF for the (more difficult) integral in \(\phi\); \((iii)\) a summation over the relevant pixels of the beam responses projected into a map at \(n_{\text{pix}} = 256\) or 1024 in the HEALPix\(^4\) scheme (Gorski et al. 2005) for the far beam or for the intermediate and main beam, respectively. A robust bilinear interpolation is adopted to estimate the beam response between tabulated points. Methods \((ii)\) and \((iii)\) give consistent results for the main beams (agreement level always superior to 0.04\% for methods \((i)\) and \((ii)\) and better than 2.3\% for methods \((i)\) \(-\) or \((ii)\) \(-\) and \((iii)\)). For the intermediate beams, the level of agreement between the results obtained with the three methods depends significantly on the beam considered and ranges from 0.1\% to 15\%, being on average several percent. We report here the results based on method \((ii)\), which samples the 2D function more effectively and allows good control of integration accuracy. Obviously, the true accuracy depends on the beam sampling.

The results are summarized in Table 4, where we also provide predictions for the Galactic straylight contamination. For each (normalized to the maximum power measured in the field, i.e., the main beam power peak) LFI FM beam (Cols. 1 and 2) we report: the 4\(\pi\) beam integral as the sum (the global integral Git. Col. 3) of the contributions from the main, intermediate, and far beam and the relative (percent) contributions to it from the intermediate (IB, Col. 4) and far (FB, Col. 7) beam. The transition between intermediate and far beam was adopted here at 0.8\°, 1\°, and 1.2\° from the beam centre, respectively, at 70 GHz, 44 GHz, and 30 GHz. Columns 5 and 6 (respectively, 8 and 9) report the Galactic straylight contamination (Gsc, in \(\mu K\) RMS and peak-to-peak antenna temperature) evaluated considering the intermediate (respectively, far) pattern region. The RMS and peak-to-peak values reported in the table were estimated by a proper rescaling of the results presented in Burigana et al. (2004) considering the fractional contributions to the 4\(\pi\) integrated antenna pattern from intermediate and far beams and the frequency behaviour of the considered foreground components (diffuse dust, free-free, and synchrotron emission, and HII regions).

In principle, the straylight contamination from the CMB dipole is important only for the even multipoles, where it is expected to dominate over the Galactic one at frequencies greater or equal to 44 GHz (Burigana et al. 2006). Given the fractional contributions from the far sidelobes to the 4\(\pi\) integrated antenna pattern reported in Table 4, we expect that dipole straylight will not significantly affect the recovery of the angular power spectrum at low multipoles and the analysis of large-scale anomalies.

\(^4\) \url{http://healpix.jpl.nasa.gov}
Table 4. Galactic straylight contamination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEAM</th>
<th>POL</th>
<th>GI (10^-5)</th>
<th>IB %</th>
<th>GSC (μK) RMS p–p</th>
<th>FB %</th>
<th>GSC (μK) RMS p–p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 and 23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.652150</td>
<td>0.0634</td>
<td>0.027 0.87</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.14 0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.639975</td>
<td>0.0583</td>
<td>0.025 0.80</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.11 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 and 22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.569425</td>
<td>0.0662</td>
<td>0.028 0.91</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.16 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.553854</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>0.026 0.85</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.14 0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and 21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.513895</td>
<td>0.0761</td>
<td>0.032 1.1</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.18 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.499650</td>
<td>0.0726</td>
<td>0.031 1.0</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.16 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.841957</td>
<td>0.0261</td>
<td>0.051 1.3</td>
<td>0.0789</td>
<td>0.088 0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.887753</td>
<td>0.0271</td>
<td>0.053 1.3</td>
<td>0.1040</td>
<td>0.12 0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and 26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8.468192</td>
<td>0.0472</td>
<td>0.091 2.3</td>
<td>0.0536</td>
<td>0.060 0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.977703</td>
<td>0.0734</td>
<td>0.14 3.5</td>
<td>0.0826</td>
<td>0.092 0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 and 28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10.023255</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
<td>0.30 6.0</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>1.1 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9.969366</td>
<td>0.0520</td>
<td>0.35 7.0</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>1.1 6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 14. Co- (top panel) and cross- (bottom panel) polar components of the 4π beam at 44 GHz (feed horn #24 Y polarized) computed with MrGTD. The maximum level of the main spillover is about –5.4 dBi at φ = 0° and θ ≃ 85° for the co-polar component, and the cross-polar component is down to –15 dBi everywhere.

Fig. 15. Co- (top panel) and cross- (bottom panel) polar components of the 4π beam at 70 GHz (feed horn #23 FM, Y polarized) computed with MrGTD. The maximum level of the main spillover is about –1.8 dBi at φ = 10° and θ ≃ 85° for the co-polar component, and the cross-polar component is, in the main spillover region, at about –4.8 dBi.

(Gruppuso et al. 2007), provided that the relative uncertainty in the modelling of the far sidelobes is ≤20%.

9. Conclusions

From the beginning of the Phase A study to the current flight configuration, we have reported reported the history of the optimization of the LFI optical interface. The definition, optimization, and characterization of the LFI feed horns coupled the Planck telescope have been derived by means of electromagnetic simulations devoted to maximizing the angular resolution and at the same time minimizing systematic effects produced by the sidelobes of the radiation pattern. The position and orientation of each horn was set taking into account the mechanical constraints imposed by the LFI interfaces and the 4 K reference loads. The feeds and corresponding OMTs have been adjusted in the focal surface in such a way that the main beam polarization directions of the two symmetrically located feed horns in the FPU are at an angle of 45 degrees when they observe the same direction in the sky, in order to measure the Q and U Stokes parameters and thus the linear polarization of the CMB. Finally, the LFI optical performance computed with the ideal telescope has been presented. The requirements have been met and in some cases exceeded. Typical LFI main beams have angular resolutions of about 33′, 24′, and 13′, respectively, at 30 GHz, 44 GHz, and 70 GHz, slightly exceeding the requirements for the cosmological 70 GHz channel. The beams have been delivered to the LFI data processing center and they are the current baseline data used in the testing of the data reduction pipeline. Of course, the performance in-flight will be
different owing to the true telescope and focal surface alignment, the surface roughness, and the distortion of the reflectors caused by the cooldown. However, simulations on the Planck radio frequency flight model (Tauber et al. 2010) have shown that the LFI performance is quite similar to the ideal case, so values reported in the tables of this paper (beam characteristics and straylight contamination) are presumably not far from the true values.

Acknowledgements. Planck is a project of the European Space Agency with instruments funded by ESA member states, and with special contributions from Denmark and NASA (USA). The Planck-LFI project is developed by an International Consortium led by Italy and involving Canada, Finland, Germany, Norway, Spain, Switzerland, UK, USA. The Italian contribution to Planck is supported by the Italian Space Agency (ASI). We wish to thank people of the Herschel/Planck Project of ESA, ASI, THALES Alenia Space Industries, and the LFI Consortium that are involved in activities related to optical simulations. Some of the results in this paper have been derived using the HEALPix (Górski, Hivon, and Wandelt 1999). Special thanks to Denis Dubruel (THALES Alenia Space), for his professional collaboration in all these years. We warmly thank David Pearson for constructive comments and suggestions, and for the careful reading of the first version of this work.

Appendix A: Main beam descriptive parameters

Owing to the telescope configuration and the feed horn off-axis location on the focal surface, the main beams are strongly distorted and their shape differs from a Gaussian. In other words, the main beams cannot be mathematically represented by a single parameter (for instance, the full width half maximum) and by a simple formula (Gaussian function, polynomial function) because aberrations prevail at power levels lower than −10 dB. However, it is indispensable to characterize the main beams as precisely as possible, and several descriptive parameters have been evaluated: the angular resolution (FWHM), the ellipticity (ε), the main beam directivity (D), the cross polar discrimination factor (XPD), the depolarization parameter (d), the rotation angle of the polarization ellipse (τ), and the main spillover (S).

A.1. Angular resolution

For CMB anisotropy measurements, an effective angular resolution can be defined as the FWHM of a perfect (symmetric Gaussian) beam, which produces the same signal as the distorted beam when the CMB field is observed (Burligana et al. 1998). Nevertheless, this definition involves astrophysical simulations taking into account the scanning strategy and the CMB expected anisotropy map (or the WMAP results). Owing to the large computation time, this approach is not practical for the optimization activity of the LFI feed horns. Main beam aberrations degrade its angular resolution. Instead of the effective FWHM, the angular resolution can be evaluated by taking the average FWHM of the distorted beam. The average FWHM has been computed in three different ways, using the minimum and maximum values:

- arithmetic average: by taking the average value between the maximum and minimum of the FWHM of the distorted beam:
  \[
  \text{FWHM}_A = \frac{\text{FWHM}_{\min} + \text{FWHM}_{\max}}{2}
  \]
- quadratic average: by taking the quadratic mean between the maximum and minimum of the FWHM of the distorted beam:
  \[
  \text{FWHM}_Q = \sqrt{\frac{\text{FWHM}_{\min}^2 + \text{FWHM}_{\max}^2}{2}}
  \]
- equal area average\(^5\): the distorted beam exhibits the same beam area of a symmetric beam with a FWHM defined as:
  \[
  \text{FWHM}_E = \sqrt{\text{FWHM}_{\min} \cdot \text{FWHM}_{\max}}
  \]

The differences between the three average values are about 2.8% at 30 GHz, 2.5% at 44 GHz, and less than 1.3% at 70 GHz. It is noticed that the arithmetical average value is in-between the other two values, and small differences exist between the FWHM\(_A\) and the arithmetic mean of FWHM\(_Q\) and FWHM\(_E\). The average can be written as a function of the ellipticity (ε, computed as the ratio of the maximum to minimum values of the beam width at −3 dB) in the following way:

\[
\frac{\text{FWHM}_Q + \text{FWHM}_E}{2} = \text{FWHM}_A
\]

or alternatively:

\[
\frac{\text{FWHM}_Q + \text{FWHM}_E}{2} = \text{FWHM}_A
\]

The term between the inner brackets is small (∼10\(^{-4}\)–10\(^{-5}\)), and it is zero in the case of perfect symmetric beam (ε = 1). Although it is important to include in the data analysis the detailed information of the beam shape, these small differences are not a concern for the angular resolution requirements, and the adopted angular resolution is the FWHM computed arithmetically (FWHM\(_A\)).

A.2. Directivity and gain

Directivity is the ability of an antenna to focus energy in a particular direction when transmitting, or when receiving to receive energy preferentially from a particular direction. In a realistic, but lossless antenna (i.e., of efficiency η ~ 1), the directivity D(θ, φ) is essentially equal to the gain G(θ, φ):

\[
G(\theta, \phi) = \eta \cdot D(\theta, \phi) = \frac{4\pi P(\theta, \phi)}{\int \int P(\theta, \phi) d\Omega}.
\]

Thus, gain or directivity is also a normalized power pattern similar to \( P_n \) in Eq. (3) with the difference that the normalizing factor is \( \int P(\theta, \phi) d\Omega / 4\pi \). Substituting Eq. (3) into Eq. (A.3), it is easy to see that the maximum directive gain \( G_{\max} \), improperly called directivity \( D \), can be expressed as

\[
D = G_{\max} = \frac{4\pi}{\Omega_A}
\]

where \( G_{\max} \) is the maximum value of the far field amplitude radiation pattern computed by GRASP8

\[
D = 10 \cdot \log \left( \max \left| \bar{E}_{\text{far}} \right| \right),
\]

and \( \bar{E}_{\text{far}} = |E_{\phi}|^2 + |E_{\theta}|^2 \), and \( D \) is defined in dBi, which is decibels referenced to an isotropic radiator.

\(^5\) The meaning of equal area is derived from Maino et al. (2002). For Gaussian elliptical beams, FWHM\(_E = \text{FWHM}_E\).
A.3. Cross polar discrimination factor

The cross polar discrimination factor (XPD, usually expressed in dB) was computed as the ratio of the directivity to the co- and cross-polar components

\[
XPD = 10 \cdot \log \frac{|E_{cp}|^2}{|E_{sp}|^2}.
\]

(A.6)

A.4. Depolarization parameter

The depolarization parameter (d) was obtained by computing the Stokes parameters in each point of the regular UV-grid:

\[
S_\phi(u, v) = E_{cp}(u, v) + E_{sp}(u, v)
\]

(A.7)

\[
S_\varphi(u, v) = E_{cp}(u, v) - E_{sp}(u, v)
\]

(A.8)

\[
S(u, v) = 2 \cdot E_{cp}(u, v) \cdot E_{sp}(u, v) \cdot \cos[\delta\phi(u, v)]
\]

(A.9)

\[
S_\nu(u, v) = 2 \cdot E_{cp}(u, v) \cdot E_{sp}(u, v) \cdot \sin[\delta\phi(u, v)]
\]

(A.10)

in which \(E_{cp}\) and \(E_{sp}\) are the amplitude field of the co-polar and cross-polar components, respectively, and \(\delta\phi\) is the phase difference between the co-polar and cross-polar fields. Then, over the whole UV-plane, each parameter was summed:

\[
S_N = \sum_{(u,v)} S_N(u, v) \cdot \Delta u \Delta v
\]

where \(N = I, Q, U, V\) (A.11)

and, finally

\[
d(\%) = \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{(S_Q^2 + S_U^2 + S_V^2)}}{S_I} \right) \cdot 100.
\]

(A.12)

A.5. Rotation angle

The rotation angle of the polarization ellipse (\(\tau\), ranges from \(-90^\circ\) to \(90^\circ\)) is computed as

\[
\tau(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{arctan} \frac{S_\phi(u, v)}{S_{\varphi}(u, v)}.
\]

(A.13)

In Fig. A.1, the rotation angles of the 70 GHz main beam #21 and the 44 GHz main beam #24 (both X-polarized) are shown and it should be noted that the main beam is mainly linear polarized close to the main beam pointing direction, as discussed in Sect. 5.

A.6. Spillover

By means of simple ray-tracing, the main beam spillover (which points towards the Galactic plane) can be evaluated quickly for each feed model, taking into account the radiation pattern of the feed and the geometry of the optical system. This is a first approximation to the true spillover since it takes into account only the rays reflected by the subreflector that do not hit the main reflector.

A more precise but time-consuming computation of the spillover was performed using physical optics and the results are very similar. With PO, the spillover was computed as \(1 - W\), where \(W\) is the relative power hitting the main reflector. The power contained in the incident field on the main reflector is computed by integrating Poynting’s vector \(\mathbf{P}\) over the surface:

\[
\mathbf{P} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Re}(\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H}^*),
\]

where \(\text{Re}\) denotes the real part and "\(^*\) the complex conjugate. The power \(\Delta W\) hitting a surface element with area \(\Delta s\) becomes

\[
\Delta W = -\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{n} \Delta s,
\]

where \(\mathbf{P}\) is the Poynting vector of the incident field and \(\mathbf{n}\) is the unit surface normal pointing towards the illuminated side of the surface. The total power \(W\) on the surface becomes

\[
W = \int \int S(\mathbf{\tau}) \cdot \mathbf{n}^\prime(\mathbf{\tau}) \Delta s',
\]

(A.16)

which is a surface integral with the integration variable \(\mathbf{\tau}\).
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