

## Direction Dependent Corrections in Polarimetric Radio Imaging III: A-to-Z Solver - Modeling the full Jones antenna aperture illumination pattern

SRIKRISHNA SEKHAR,<sup>1,2,3</sup> PRESHANTH JAGANNATHAN,<sup>2</sup> BRIAN KIRK,<sup>2</sup> SANJAY BHATNAGAR,<sup>2</sup> AND RUSS TAYLOR<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Inter-University Institute for Data Intensive Astronomy, and Department of Astronomy, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa*

<sup>2</sup>*National Radio Astronomy Observatory, 1003 Lopezville Road, Socorro, NM 87801, USA*

<sup>3</sup>*Inter-University Institute for Data Intensive Astronomy, and Department of Astronomy, University of the Western Cape, Bellville, South Africa*

### ABSTRACT

In this third paper of a series describing direction dependent corrections for polarimetric radio imaging, we present the the A-to-Z solver methodology to model the full Jones antenna aperture illumination pattern (AIP) using Zernike polynomials. In order to achieve accurate, thermal noise limited imaging with modern radio interferometers, it is necessary to correct for the instrumental effects of the antenna primary beam (PB) as a function of time, frequency, and polarization. The algorithm employs the orthonormal, circular Zernike polynomial basis to model the full Jones AIP response, which are obtained by a Fourier transform of corresponding antenna holography measurements. These full Jones models are then used to reconstruct the full Mueller AIP response of an antenna, in principle accounting for all the off-axis frequency dependent leakage effects of the primary beam. The A-to-Z solver is general enough to accommodate any interferometer for which holographic measurements exist, and we have successfully modelled the AIP of VLA, MeerKAT and ALMA as a demonstration of its versatility. We show that our models capture the PB morphology to high accuracy within the first 2 sidelobes, and show the viability of full Mueller gridding and deconvolution for any telescope given high quality holographic measurements.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Modern radio interferometers are capable of high sensitivity, high dynamic range imaging. Imaging in particular is limited by the presence of direction dependent effects (DDEs). In general DDEs are a function of direction, frequency, time and polarization and are typically corrected for during the imaging process unlike direction independent effects (DIEs). Following Hamaker et al. (1996), the measurement equation in radio interferometry is of the form

$$\mathbf{V}_{ij}^{Obs} = \mathbf{G}_{ij} \int \mathbf{M}_{ij}(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{I}_{ij}(\mathbf{s}) e^{i\mathbf{b}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{s}} d\mathbf{s} \quad (1)$$

for a single baseline  $i-j$  for a given frequency at a given time,  $\mathbf{G}_{ij}$  are the DIEs,  $\mathbf{M}_{ij}$  are the DDEs,  $\mathbf{I}_{ij}$  is the sky brightness distribution,  $\mathbf{s}$  defines the direction vector on the sky, and  $\mathbf{b}_{ij}$  are the  $uv$  coordinates of the baseline  $i-j$ . All the terms within the integral in the above equation have to be corrected for during the imaging process, as they are all functions of the direction vector  $\mathbf{s}$ .

$\mathbf{M}_{ij}$  is a  $4 \times 4$  matrix describing the direction dependent (DD) mixing of the full-polarization image 4-vector

$(I_{pp}, I_{pq}, I_{qp}, I_{qq})$ . Each element of  $\mathbf{M}_{ij}$  is a description of the DD response of an interferometer. The diagonal elements represent the power response (*i.e.*, forward gain) of the interferometer. Elements in the first row (or column) encode the first order DD polarization leakages due to antenna optics. Other off-diagonal elements encode higher order combinations of power and polarization leakage terms. These are typically order of magnitude smaller (but not always). Accurate models for the elements of  $\mathbf{M}_{ij}$ , particularly the leakage terms, is a prerequisite for full-Mueller imaging that corrects for the effects of the antenna DD response in full polarization. This work describes a method to develop a model for  $\mathbf{M}_{ij}$  based on holographic measurements of the antenna response.

The Mueller matrix  $\mathbf{M}_{ij}$  can be written as

$$\mathbf{M}_{ij}(\mathbf{s}, \nu, t) = \mathbf{J}_i(\mathbf{s}, \nu, t) \otimes \mathbf{J}_j^*(\mathbf{s}, \nu, t) \quad (2)$$

where  $\otimes$  is the Kronecker product, and  $\mathbf{J}_i$  and  $\mathbf{J}_j$  are the antenna voltage patterns or the direction dependent Jones matrices for antennas  $i$  and  $j$  respectively as a function of frequency  $\nu$  and time  $t$ . The antenna Jones matrix encodes the polarization response of an antenna

to incident radiation and is represented by a  $2 \times 2$  matrix given by

$$\mathbf{E} = \begin{pmatrix} E_p & -E_{p \leftarrow q} \\ E_{q \leftarrow p} & E_q \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

for two orthogonal feed polarizations  $p$  and  $q$ .

In order to accurately reconstruct the sky brightness distribution it is necessary to remove the imprint of  $\mathbf{M}_{ij}$  for each baseline for all direction, frequency and time.

Formally, the PB of an antenna is given by the Fourier transform of the aperture illumination pattern (AIP) and can be represented as

$$\mathbf{A}_i(u, v, \nu, t) = \mathcal{F}J_i(\mathbf{s}, \nu, t) \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_i$  is the complex AIP of antenna  $i$ , at  $uv$  coordinates  $u, v$ .  $J_i$  is the measured complex image plane Jones matrix, (*i.e.*, antenna voltage pattern) and  $\mathcal{F}$  is the Fourier transform operator.  $\mathbf{A}_i$  is mathematically a finite, bounded function and correspondingly  $J_i$  is unbounded. The AIP in general is a function of time, frequency, and polarization. The time dependence for an altitude-azimuth mounted antenna manifests as a rotation of the source within the field of view. We can consider measurements made by a radio interferometer as the sampling of a continuous visibility coherence function by the AIPs at the locations of the baselines in the  $uv$ -plane. The measurement equation (Eq. 1) can be recast using Eq. 4 (following Bhatnagar et al. 2013) as

$$\mathbf{V}_{ij}^{obs}(\mathbf{s}, \nu, \theta_{PA}) = \mathbf{A}_{ij}(\mathbf{s}, \nu, \theta_{PA}) \otimes \mathbf{V}_{ij}^{True} \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = \mathcal{F}\mathbf{M}_{ij}$  is the AIP (given by the Fourier transform of Eq. 1),  $\otimes$  is the outer convolution operator (as described in Bhatnagar et al. 2013),  $\theta_{PA}$  is the parallactic angle and  $\mathbf{V}_{ij}^{True} = \mathcal{F}\mathbf{I}_{ij}(\mathbf{s})$  is the continuous true sky coherence function that is sampled by the baseline AIP  $\mathbf{A}_{ij}$  resulting in the observed visibility data given by  $\mathbf{V}_{ij}^{obs}$ .

There are various algorithms that are used to mitigate the effect of DDEs such as peeling and facet-based algorithms (e.g., Cotton et al. 2004; Noordam 2004; Intema 2014; Van Weeren et al. 2016) and projection algorithms (e.g. Cornwell et al. 2008; Bhatnagar et al. 2008; Bhatnagar et al. 2013; Tasse et al. 2013; Van der Tol et al. 2018) both of which require a model of either the PB or the AIP (refer to Rau et al. (2009) for a more details).

In this paper, we restrict ourselves to a discussion on PB correction via projection algorithms, specifically A-projection. However we note that the A-to-Z solver modeling approach is itself agnostic to the choice of imaging algorithm. Although we create the models in the aperture (*i.e.*, data) domain, a Fourier transform is

sufficient to provide equivalent models for image domain algorithms.

The A-projection algorithms applies an *a priori* model inverse of the antenna AIP  $\mathbf{A}_{ij}^{M\ddagger}/|\mathbf{A}_{ij}|^2$  at the time of convolutional gridding such that

$$\mathcal{F}^\dagger \left[ \frac{\mathbf{A}_{ij}^{M\ddagger}}{|\mathbf{A}|^2} \right] * \mathbf{V}_{ij}^{obs} = \mathcal{F}^\dagger [\mathbf{V}_{ij}^{True}] = \mathbf{I}_{ij} \quad (6)$$

The resulting image is free of the time, frequency and polarization DDEs of the baseline  $i - j$ . The DDEs are “projected out” by using a gridding convolution function that is equal to the inverse of the model AIP, thus recovering the true sky brightness distribution. The quality of the model and its inverse then determines how well we can correct for the DDE of the baseline AIP. There have been many different approaches to fitting, modeling, and simulating the antenna PB response at different observatories (e.g., Du et al. 2016; Jagannathan et al. 2018; Sokolowski et al. 2017; Asad et al. 2021). The primary challenge of pure modeling approaches such as electromagnetic simulations or ray tracing lie with determining the off-diagonal (leakage) Jones response of the antenna. Capturing these leakage terms is necessary to be able to perform accurate widefield polarimetric observations. In all cases, and particularly for dish antennas, measuring the antenna Jones beams via holographic measurements yields the “ground truth” of the antenna Jones response.

We approach the problem in the data domain where we model the bounded and finite AIP (Bates 1971; Scott & Ryle 1977). We also restrict our discussions to radio interferometers composed of dishes for the rest of the paper, specifically focusing on the Karl. G. Jansky Very Large Array (VLA) (Perley et al. 2011), Atacama Large Millimeter Array (ALMA) (Wooten 2003) and MeerKAT (Jonas & Team 2018). We present here a new method, A-to-Z solver, to derive a Zernike polynomial based model of the AIP from measurements of antenna holography and demonstrate its accuracy and efficacy in modeling the full Jones response of the antenna. This allows us in turn to generate full Mueller AIP and antenna PB models. This paves the way for a full Mueller treatment of A-projection, which will result in accurate widefield, wideband off-axis polarimetry. This is currently under development and will be described in an upcoming paper (Jagannathan et al., *in prep*). This paper and the next is a part of our effort to implement full Mueller polarization corrections in the A-Projection algorithm in CASA (McMullin et al. 2007).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows : Section 2 provides the details of how we go from Jones measurements in the image domain to Zernike polynomial models of the aperture. Section 3 discuss the results of

the modeling, the accuracy and reproducibility etc., and Section 4 provides a summary of the methods and their merits and limitations.

## 2. FROM APERTURES TO ZERNIKE

### 2.1. Interferometric Holography

Antenna holography is the process of measuring the far-field voltage pattern of an antenna (Bates 1971; Napier & Bates 1971), either by pointing at a reference (terrestrial) source, or a well characterized celestial calibrator source. In order to measure the Jones matrices, a two-dimensional raster scan is done around a known, unresolved, and preferably unpolarized, calibrator source. Half the array tracks the calibrator source (the “tracking antennas”) while the other half performs the raster scan (the “scanning antennas”). The two halves are then swapped around, in order to get a measurement of all the antennas in the array.

We can recast Equation 1 in the following form (in vector notation) under the assumption that all the tracking antennas are pointing at the same location on the sky as

$$\mathbf{V}_{st} = \mathbf{G}_{st} \mathcal{F} \left[ (\mathbf{J}_s \otimes \mathbf{J}_t^\dagger) \mathbf{S} \mathbf{I}^{sky} \right] \quad (7)$$

where the subscripts  $s$  and  $t$  refer to the scanning and tracking antennas respectively.  $\mathbf{G}_{st}$  are the direction independent gains and  $\mathbf{S}$  is a transformation matrix that converts the sky brightness distribution from Stokes basis into the feed basis of measurement. The Jones matrices  $\mathbf{J}_s$  and  $\mathbf{J}_t$  represent the antenna far field voltage patterns in feed basis of the scanning and the tracking antennas. After calibration of the tracking antennas is performed (using the point source calibrator), the above equation reduces to

$$\mathbf{V}_{st}^{cal} = \mathcal{F} [(\mathbf{J}_s \otimes \mathbf{1})] \quad (8)$$

where the  $\mathbf{J}_t$  is reduced to the identity matrix  $\mathbf{1}$ , and we can therefore measure the complex Jones response (as a function of direction) of the scanning antennas from the calibrated visibilities. The product  $\mathbf{S} \mathbf{I}^{sky}$  is the calibrator source flux as measured in the feed basis. Since the calibrator flux is nominally well known, this becomes a constant (known) factor that can be normalized out.

Further, correlation products from all the pairs of scanning-scanning antennas can be constructed, given by:

$$\mathbf{V}_{ss} = \mathbf{G}_{ss} \mathcal{F} \left[ (\mathbf{J}_{si} \otimes \mathbf{J}_{sj}^\dagger) \mathbf{S} \mathbf{I}^{sky} \right] \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{J}_{si}$  and  $\mathbf{J}_{sj}$  are Jones beams corresponding to the baseline  $i-j$ .  $\mathbf{V}_{ss}$  then measures the total power

Jones beam. These total power measurements measure the first row of the Mueller matrix. It is not possible to reconstruct the antenna Jones matrix from these Mueller measurements. However, the first row of the Mueller matrix can be reconstructed from the Jones beams (Eq. 8), and provide an internal consistency check for our measurements. We describe below the details of the holography for three different instruments (VLA, MeerKAT, and ALMA).


*VLA*—We use the holography data described in Perley (2016). In this paper, we discuss only the S-Band observations, although the method is applicable to any observable frequency band at the VLA. At S Band the observations used 3C147 as the standard unpolarized calibrator. The scanning antennas covered a regular grid of 57x57 points around the calibrator, with an angular separation of 2.62’ between each pointing. This was sufficient to sample out to 5 sidelobes at the highest end of the band. Two spectral windows (centred at 2308 MHz and 2948 MHz) were badly affected by persistent RFI, and we could not get reasonable beam measurements from them. We instead utilize ray traced antenna AIPs which were modelled identically to the rest of the band to derive the Zernike polynomial coefficients.

*MeerKAT*—We used MeerKAT L band holography data that covered the entire MeerKAT L band (from  $\sim 880$  to 1680 MHz) at a resolution of  $\sim 0.85$  MHz. The data sampled out to 5 sidelobes at the highest frequency. The holographic pointing was performed in a spiral pattern around the calibrator source 3C273, utilizing the on-the-fly (OTF) capabilities of MeerKAT. The beams were then resampled on to a regular  $128 \times 128$  with a separation of 4.68 arcmin per grid pointing. For more details please refer to Asad et al. (2021).


*ALMA*—We use ALMA holography data described in Bhatnagar et al. (2020), obtained in 2018. We focus here only on the Band 3 data, which measured out to  $\sim 5$  sidelobes of the PB. The holography sampled a 49x49 grid with a spacing of  $0.2 \times \text{HPBW}$  (half power beam width) around the calibrator source J1924-2914. The full Jones beams for both the 12m antennas, DA and DV, were recorded. The DA and DV antennas are two of the three types of 12m antennas that constitute ALMA. The primary difference between the antennas is the position of the antenna feed legs, which are rotated by  $45^\circ$ .

### 2.2. Pointing Offset Correction

Prior to modeling the measured aperture, any residual pointing errors in the holography need to be removed first, as small pointing errors cause a phase gra-



**Figure 1.** Plot of the power per Zernike term for the real and imaginary parts of the AIP for EVLA (top) and MeerKAT (bottom). The y-axis scale is in arbitrary units, since the FFT to convert the Jones beams to apertures scales all the pixels by a factor of  $\sqrt{N_{pix}}$ . This has no impact on the accuracy of the modeling or reconstruction since the relative power between the different Zernike terms is what determines the morphology of the reconstructed aperture, and is a conserved quantity under this transformation.



**Figure 2.** Normalized fitted value of  $Z_2^{-2}$  (Oblique Astigmatism) from VLA and MeerKAT apertures. The sinusoidal patterns present in these coefficients correspond to the standing waves in the antenna. **Left:** The coefficient power across a section of the VLA S band, the coefficients capture the standing wave of  $\sim 17$  MHz. **Right:** The coefficient power across a section of the MeerKAT L band. The standing wave of frequency  $\sim 37$  MHz is captured. These standing waves correspond to the secondary reflection between the antenna surface and the feed.

dient across the aperture (Bhatnagar & Cornwell 2017). If these phases remain during the modeling step, they will be captured by the Zernike model leading to offsets in the generated model PB. While all the telescopes discussed here have some form of *a priori* models for pointing offsets (and in some cases perform a dedicated pointing calibration scan), residual pointing errors tend to accumulate through the course of an observation.

In order to measure and correct for the pointing errors, a 2D Gaussian is fitted to the main lobe of the holographic beams. We use a non-linear Levenberg-Marquardt least squares fitter (Moré 1978) as implemented in the `astropy` Python package (Robitaille et al. 2013).

The beam for each feed polarization was fitted independently, and the vector sum of the pointing vectors between the two feeds is taken to be the pointing offset. This procedure is repeated as a function of antenna and frequency. We use the vector sum to preserve the beam squint between the two orthogonal polarizations. The measured pointing offsets were used to regrid the beam such that the peak of the Stokes I beam lies at the centre of the image. All four Jones beams are regridded identically. For the VLA and ALMA, where we had access to the holography visibility data, we were able to remove the pointing offsets per baseline prior to averaging all the baselines of an antenna. This results in higher SNR upon averaging, eliminating smearing and decorrelation due to baseline-based pointing errors.

Finally, the holography data were averaged across all antennas and all channels within a spectral window prior to applying the Fourier transform. This averaging results in an improvement of  $\sqrt{N_{ant} \times N_{chan}}$  in the SNR which is especially useful in the cross hands which usually have  $\sim 10 - 100\times$  smaller SNR than the parallel hands. Empirically we have determined that the average antenna model is sufficient for our modeling purposes. It is however worth noting that the choice to average across antennas and frequency will impose a dynamic range limitations on the final image, contingent on the level of antenna-to-antenna variations and variation across a single spectral window for a particular instrument.

### 2.3. Obtaining the AIP

The spatial frequency resolution in the aperture domain is inversely proportional to the total angular extent sampled by holography. It is given by :

$$\Delta u \propto \frac{1}{l_{sky}} \quad (10)$$

where  $l_{sky}$  is the total angular extent of the holography (in radians) and  $\Delta u$  is the size of the resolution element in the aperture (in lambda).

It is necessary that a large number of sidelobes be covered by holography in order to obtain accurate aperture plane measurements. However in practice only a finite number of sidelobes can be measured, due to various practical considerations. In such a case, the corresponding aperture domain measurements are affected by ringing and these ringing artefacts extend far beyond the physical aperture. We therefore need to determine the “true” edge of the aperture in order to model the AIP rather than the ringing artefacts.

The real part of the AIP for an unblocked aperture is guaranteed to be positive within the physical aperture itself. In the case of a blocked aperture  $\Re(A)$  can have null or negative values within the regions that are shadowed. However in both cases, the last pixel inside the aperture (in an unblocked region) will be positive and the first pixel outside the aperture will be negative. This is commonly called the “aperture roll-off”. In absolute value, the drop between these two pixels can be a factor of between 10 to 100. At low frequencies, the magnitude of the drop is smaller since there is more diffraction and spill-over at the edge of the aperture. The above condition has proven to be very robust in determining the cutoff radius of the aperture for a variety of different antenna types and frequencies. We identify the size of the aperture by locating the radius of the first negative component in the real part of the aperture, in a direction moving out from the centre of the aperture. This condition is general, and allows us to naturally determine the cutoff radius as a function of frequency.

The apertures derived from antenna holography have a gradual rolloff at the edge of the aperture, due to the limited number of sidelobes that can be sampled by holography. The diameter of the main lobe of the PB depends very strongly on the size of the aperture, and therefore in order to get the correct beam sizes it is necessary to determine the aperture size as accurately as possible. Directly applying a Fourier transform to the measured holography typically results in 5-6 pixels across the aperture, and the roll-off is contained in a single pixel. This can bake in an error of up to 15% in the derived PB size.

In order to obtain accurate ( $< 1\%$  error) PB sizes we used an oversampling factor of 100 prior to the Fourier transform of the holography followed by image plane minimization (see Sec. 3.4) to account for the changing aperture efficiency across the band. We performed this interpolation in CASA using the `imregrid`<sup>1</sup> task

<sup>1</sup> [https://casa.nrao.edu/casadocs/casa-6.1.0/global-task-list/task\\_imregrid/about](https://casa.nrao.edu/casadocs/casa-6.1.0/global-task-list/task_imregrid/about)



which performs cubic spline interpolation, while preserving pixel flux scaling. We note here that interpolation of any kind does not increase the amount of information in the underlying image. Therefore interpolating by a large factor, while allowing us to determine the edge of the roll-off more accurately, does not increase the steepness of the roll-off or give us any more resolution across other features in the aperture.

#### 2.4. Aperture Fitting

Zernike polynomials are complex, ortho-normal polynomials defined on a unit circle (Zernike 1934; Born & Wolf 2013). Zernike polynomials also form the natural basis to model optical apertures, making them an ideal fit for modeling the antenna AIP.

We refer to Lakshminarayanan & Fleck (2011) for the definition of the Zernike polynomials, however we use Noll sequential indices (Noll 1976) to map the two Zernike indices  $(n, m)$  to a single index  $k$ . Under this mapping, the first 10 orders  $(n : 0 \rightarrow 10)$  of Zernike polynomials map to the first 66 terms  $(k : 0 \rightarrow 66)$  of the flattened index.

We fit the aperture measurements with the first 10 orders (*i.e.*, 66 terms) of Zernike polynomials after first taking out the known systematic errors from the holography image (such as antenna pointing offsets).

The AIP model is given by

$$\mathbf{A}^M(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{k=0}^{10} [\mathbf{A}_k^{\Re} + \iota \mathbf{A}_k^{\Im}] \cdot Z(k, \mathbf{s}) \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathbf{s}$  spans the aperture of a fixed diameter and  $\mathbf{A}_k$  are the coefficients for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  Zernike term  $Z(k, \mathbf{s})$ . The superscripts  $\Re$  and  $\Im$  indicate separate coefficients for the real and imaginary parts of the AIP. The objective functions used for deriving the coefficients  $\mathbf{A}^{\Re}$  and  $\mathbf{A}^{\Im}$  are

$$\chi_{\Re}^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{s}} |\Re[\mathbf{A}^H(\mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{A}^M(\mathbf{s})]|^2 \quad (12a)$$

$$\chi_{\Im}^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{s}} |\Im[\mathbf{A}^H(\mathbf{s}) - \mathbf{A}^M(\mathbf{s})]|^2 \quad (12b)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}^H$  is the measured AIP from holography observations. The models are fitted in the aperture domain independently for the real and imaginary parts and for each of the four Jones terms. Modeling all the terms of the complex antenna Jones matrix allows us to reconstruct the entire  $4 \times 4$  Mueller matrix. The reverse operation of going from Mueller matrix to Jones matrices is not possible due to missing phase information in the measured Mueller matrix. This is the primary


reason for the measurement of antenna Jones matrices (voltage beams).

We use a non-linear least-squares fitter as implemented in the SciPy package (Virtanen et al. 2020) to minimize the objective functions defined in Eq. 12. The fitter uses a non-linear trust region solver algorithm (Branch et al. 1999) with a stopping threshold criterion. We define the stopping threshold to be equal to the thermal noise per pointing in order to prevent over-fitting. We will demonstrate in the following sections that the correlated nature of our residuals, albeit small, is a sign of un-modelled zernike terms. We eschew using higher orders in favor of accurately modeling the main lobe of the antenna PB and the first sidelobe.


The plots in Fig. 1 show the fitted power per Zernike term (real and imaginary) for VLA and MeerKAT. The y-scale on the plots is in arbitrary units. The distribution of power across the Zernike terms reflects the different characteristics of the two apertures. The VLA has a blocked aperture and feed legs which cast a shadow on the dish. Modeling the relatively sharp edges of the shadow on the aperture requires higher order Zernike terms. Accordingly, the high spatial frequency Zernike terms (above index 50) see an increase in power for the case of VLA as seen in Fig 1. In contrast, MeerKAT has an unblocked aperture and correspondingly has lower amplitudes for the higher order terms.

As mentioned previously, the Zernike polynomials capture various physically meaningful optical properties of the aperture capture the piston, tip and tilt respectively). Fig. 2 plots the  $Z_2^{-2}$  term, or the ‘‘oblique astigmatism’’ across a section of the band for VLA and MeerKAT. This term clearly captures the resonant frequency dependent variation between the feed and the antenna surface for both the telescopes. We measure the VLA standing wave of frequency  $\sim 17$  MHz, corresponding to a sub-reflector at a height of  $\sim 8.5\text{m}$  consistent with known values for VLA (e.g., Jagannathan et al. 2018). For MeerKAT we measure a standing wave of frequency  $\sim 37$  MHz corresponding to a sub-reflector height of  $\sim 4\text{m}$  which is also consistent with the MeerKAT specification (Esterhuysen et al. 2011).

Fig. 3 shows a plot of the measured aperture, the Zernike model, and the residual for (a) VLA, (b) MeerKAT, (c) ALMA DV and (d) ALMA DA respectively. The plots show the magnitude (*i.e.*,  $\sqrt{\Re(\mathbf{A}^M)^2 + \Im(\mathbf{A}^M)^2}$  following Eq. 12) of the aperture for a single polarization and frequency for each telescope type. As noted earlier the fitting is performed independently for the real and imaginary components. The broad morphology of the aperture is captured by the model, leaving behind residuals at the percent level



**Figure 3.** The measured, model, and residual apertures for each of the 4 antenna types discussed in this paper. In all cases, only the amplitude term for a single polarization is shown, for brevity. The residuals look similar across polarization in all cases. (a) VLA S Band (3 GHz) R polarization (b) MeerKAT L Band (1.2 GHz) X polarization (c) ALMA Band 3 (108 GHz) DV type X polarization, (d) ALMA Band 3 (108 GHz) DA type X polarization. The apertures have been normalized to the peak illumination value. In every case the residuals show systematic higher order structure, that correspond to power in the higher sidelobes. With the current level of modeling we are able to capture all the power in the main lobe and the first sidelobe.



**Figure 4.** Cut across the normalized residual PB for each of the four antenna types discussed here. The plot shows where the un-modelled structure in the aperture appears in the image plane. The MeerKAT beam is at 1.6 GHz, VLA S Band at 4 GHz, and the ALMA beams at 108 GHz. In the case of VLA and MeerKAT we selected the highest SPW in order to show the largest number of sidelobes. The shaded region spans the region from the first null through the fourth null, *i.e.*, the first three sidelobes for the EVLA.

or less in all cases. The residuals correspond to the unmodelled higher spatial frequency signal and look similar across frequency and polarization for all the telescopes.

Fig. 4 shows a slice across the residuals of the different antenna types discussed in this paper. The shaded region spans the region from the first null to the fourth null, *i.e.*, the first three sidelobes for the EVLA. These plots are the Fourier transform of the aperture residuals *i.e.*,  $\mathcal{F}[\mathbf{A}^{Holo} - \mathbf{A}^M]$ , since the modeling is performed in the aperture domain. The beam models capture the response to floating point precision ( $10^{-6}$ ) out to the second sidelobe for all the modelled telescopes. The residual error rapidly increases as we move further out, which is expected. From Fig. 4 the residuals correspond to unmodelled power in the outer sidelobes. The higher order sidelobes correspond to the high spatial frequency features in the aperture domain, which correspondingly require higher order Zernike polynomials to model. Empirically, we see that increasing the number of terms used to model the aperture results in a reduction in the systematics of the aperture plane residuals.

### 3. RESULTS & BEAM PROPERTIES

#### 3.1. Beam Spectral Index

With modern interferometers, wideband continuum imaging has become the norm enabling theoretically higher sensitivities. In order to achieve these sensitivity limits it is vital to account for the effects of the wideband antenna primary beam. Fig 5 shows the spectral index  $\alpha_{pb}$  and the spectral curvature  $\beta_{pb}$  introduced by the antenna PB onto a wideband continuum image at 3GHz at the VLA on the left panel and at 1.2GHz of MeerKAT on the right. The spectral index and curvature are defined as

$$\mathbf{I}_\nu = \mathbf{I}_{\nu_0} \left( \frac{\nu}{\nu_0} \right)^{\alpha + \beta \log\left(\frac{\nu}{\nu_0}\right)} \quad (13)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are the spectral index and spectral curvature respectively,  $\mathbf{I}$  is the source flux density at frequency  $\nu$  and  $\nu_0$  is the reference frequency.

The uncorrected PB spectral index at half power of the VLA PB is  $\alpha_{pb} = -5$ . The various means of mitigating the PB spectral index have been analyzed in detail in [Rau et al. \(2016\)](#). It is worth noting that for large continuum frequency bands of observations the higher order spectral terms of the PB such as curvature also leave a significant spectral signature on the PB across wide fields of view.

#### 3.2. Beam Squint & Squash

Fig. 6 shows the contour density plots of the measured residual pointing errors for EVLA, MeerKAT, ALMA

DA & DV antennas. The errors plotted here were determined independently per antenna, SPW and channel, except for ALMA, for which the band averaged values for a single SPW were used. In all cases each colour corresponds to one of the two orthogonal feeds (blue = R & X; red = L & Y respectively). The VLA shows a clear separation between the pointing centres of the R & L feeds, corresponding to the well known beam squint as demonstrated in [Jagannathan et al. \(2018\)](#). Both MeerKAT and ALMA show significant overlap between the pointing centre of the feeds, as is expected from basic antenna optics for linear and circular feeds.

Figure 7 plots the frequency dependence of the mean squint and the beam squash. The mean pointing offset for each correlation is defined as

$$d_{\text{offset}}(\nu) = \frac{1}{N_{\text{ant}}} \sum_i \frac{\Delta\alpha_i(\nu) + \Delta\delta_i(\nu)}{2} \quad (14)$$

where  $\Delta\alpha_i(\nu)$  and  $\Delta\delta_i(\nu)$  are the right ascension and declination offsets respectively as a function of frequency. The beam squash is defined as


$$\Phi = \frac{\overline{l_{\text{major}}}}{\overline{l_{\text{minor}}}} \quad (15)$$

where  $\overline{l_{\text{major}}}$  and  $\overline{l_{\text{minor}}}$  are the major and minor axes of the ellipse fitted to the beam of the antenna averaged response in feed basis, measured along the position angle of the ellipse. The plot only shows the frequency dependence for VLA and MeerKAT since they have a large fractional bandwidth.

The VLA shows a clear separation between the pointing centres of the R and L feeds (Fig. 7(1a)). The separation is  $\sim 3\%$  of the HPBW as a function of frequency, which is consistent with previous measurements of the beam squint. MeerKAT however shows a more complex beam squint behaviour across the band. Both X & Y feeds are biased toward positive offsets at lower frequencies, and approach a minimum at  $\sim 1400$  MHz. The beam squint also shows a quasi-oscillatory behaviour. The periodicity of the oscillation does not correspond to the standing wave frequency, and the cause of the quasi-periodicity of the pointing is not immediately obvious. In terms of beam squash, VLA shows consistent behaviour across the band. There is a small amount of beam ellipticity ( $\Phi = 1.01 - 1.03$ ) increasing slightly toward the higher frequencies. MeerKAT beam squash behaviour is analogous to the beam squint, the two feeds showing ellipticity along orthogonal directions, with a minimum at  $\sim 1400$  MHz.

#### 3.3. Direction Dependent Polarization Leakage





**Figure 5.** Plot of the spectral index and spectral curvature of the EVLA S Band (left) and MeerKAT L Band (right) beams. The plots show only the main lobes of the primary beam with the spectral index steepening as we move further away from the pointing center.

During the process of antenna holography, we obtain two independent measurements of the antenna beams. The first are the Jones beams, as we discussed in previous sections. The second are the total power beams (*cf.* Eq. 7 and Eq. 9). Constructing the Stokes beams from the total power beams is a much more straightforward process, and is identical to constructing the Stokes products from the correlated visibilities themselves. By comparing the full Stokes beams derived from Zernike models to the total power beams, we are able to verify both the efficacy of the Jones modeling against an independent measurement as well as the sign conventions of the Jones to Mueller unitary conversion matrix  $S$  (Hamaker et al. 1996). The conversion from Jones to Mueller via the unitary matrix  $S$  is given by

$$M_{\text{stokes}} = S^\dagger [J_i \otimes J_j]_{\text{feed}} S \quad (16)$$

where  $S$  is a  $4 \times 4$  transformation matrix, and  $J_i$  and  $J_j$  are the  $2 \times 2$  Jones matrices for antennas  $i$  and  $j$  respectively.

Fig. 8 shows the measured, model, and residual VLA S Band and ALMA Band 3 Stokes products. The top row shows the measured Stokes products from the total power beams. The second row shows the equivalent Zernike models of the beams, and the bottom row shows the difference between the two. The residuals in Stokes I are at the level of *i.e.*, a  $\sim 1\%$  fractional error on the beam model. The morphology for the Stokes-Q and -U beams are generally in agreement. We note that the power beams are different from the Jones beams in two ways - (*i*) the baseline pairs used to construct the two sets of beams are different (and non-overlapping), and (*ii*) the effect of pointing errors will affect the two beams slightly differently. The comparison with the power beams or the Mueller matrix does not reflect the efficacy of the fit itself, but rather demonstrates internal consistency of the Jones matrices and the transfor-

mation matrix required to go from feed to Stokes basis, namely the  $S$  matrix.

As an additional consistency check, we compare the Stokes I PB generated from AW project to the Stokes I PB from holography. AW project calculates the PB via a Fourier transform of the gridded, weighted baseline AIP derived during imaging which is reflective of the true PB of the measurement.


Fig. 9 shows the fractional residuals between the Stokes I beam produced by the `awproject` gridded in CASA and the Stokes I beam derived from the holography for VLA at 2.8 GHz and MeerKAT at 1.25 GHz. This figure is representative of other SPWs across the band for both telescopes. The fractional error is large toward the nulls, which is expected. The AW projection code cannot as yet perform full Mueller corrections and hence we restrict ourselves to comparing the Stokes I beams. From these plots it is clear that our modeling has captured the PB response well, both in the main lobe and the first (few) sidelobe(s). The details of how these coefficients are included in CASA are outlined in Appendix B. The implementation of a full-Mueller, wide-band AW projection algorithm is currently being tested, the results of which will be described in a forthcoming paper (Jagannathan et al., *in prep*).

### 3.4. Modeling the aperture across frequency

In order to obtain PB sizes accurate to  $< 1\%$  we need to account for changes in aperture efficiency across the band. Aperture efficiency changes the effective diameter of the dish, and we introduce a scaling factor  $\eta_A$  to account for this as follows:

$$D'_A(\nu) = \eta_A(\nu) D_A \quad (17)$$

where  $D_A$  is the nominal antenna diameter (25m in the case of VLA) and  $D'_A$  is the effective antenna diam-



**Figure 6.** Contour density plots of the measured pointing offsets for VLA, MeerKAT, ALMA DA and DV. In all cases, the two different colors correspond to the different correlation products. VLA is the only antenna type with circular feeds, and it shows a clear separation between the pointing centres of the R & L feeds. This separation is the well-known beam squint. The squint as a function of frequency is plotted in Fig. 7. MeerKAT and ALMA both have linear feeds and do not show a consistent separation between the two feeds.


eter. Fig. 10 plots the behaviour of  $\eta_A$  as a function of frequency for VLA S-Band observations.

We derive this scaling factor in the following manner : (i)  $\eta_A$  is introduced in the code as a specifiable (free) parameter (ii) For a given value of  $\eta_A$  a primary beam image is generated (at a given frequency) using the `awproject` griddler in CASA, and the residuals are computed against the PB generated via the `standard` griddler. The value of  $\eta_A$  that minimizes these residuals is stored. We found that a “brute-force” minimization method was sufficient, for generating a PB to the accuracy we required. To that end at every  $\eta_A$  starting from 0.7 through 1.3 in steps of 0.01 the minimization was carried out. Further reducing the step size to 0.001 yielded no improvement in the values of  $\eta_A$ .

### 3.5. Efficacy

To show the performance of the Zernike modelled apertures in imaging we carried out a simulation. We generated a sky model of 6 point sources, each of flux density 1 Jy which were then attenuated by the average measured holographic antenna PB, using a central frequency of 2948 MHz and 64MHz bandwidth. The simulated measurement set is generated following Jagannathan et al. (2017).

The sources were placed at PB gain locations of 1.0, 0.8, 0.5, 0.2, 0.1, and 0.05. The first five sources were placed in the main-lobe and the last source at the peak of the first side-lobe. The resulting measurement set was then imaged using the `awproject` and `standard`




**Figure 7.** Plots of the mean pointing offset (left) and the beam squash (right) per correlation product as a function of frequency for EVLA and MeerKAT. These data show the frequency dependence of the same offsets plotted in Fig. 6. **(1)** VLA shows a clear separation between the R & L feeds, which corresponds to  $\sim 3\%$  of the beam width as a function of frequency. This is consistent with previous measurements of beam squint for VLA. On the other hand, although the VLA PB shows some degree of ellipticity ( $\Phi > 1$ ), the R and L beams are very similar across the band, and do not show a large difference in their beam squash. **(2)** MeerKAT has a more complex beam squint behaviour vs. frequency. Both the X and Y feeds tend toward a zero mean offset at higher frequencies, with a minimum at  $\sim 1400$  MHz. The X and Y beams show a significantly different beam squash, indicating that the beams are preferentially elongated along orthogonal axes. Similarly to the squint, the beam squash is a minimum at  $\sim 1400$  MHz.

gridding algorithms in CASA and the resulting images were primary beam corrected to recover the true flux densities *i.e.*,  $\mathbf{I}_M/\mathbf{PB}_M$  where  $\mathbf{I}_M$  is the recovered sky model and  $\mathbf{PB}_M$  the antenna primary beam produced by the imaging algorithm during imaging.


Fig. 11 shows the recovered flux densities of the sources as a function of the PB gain level. The dashed line in grey represents the true flux density of the predicted sources. If the recovery is exact all points would lie along that line. The blue line represents the new Zernike aperture models used in AW-Projection while the orange line represents ray-traced aperture illumination models currently in use. The green line plots the polynomial model of the antenna main-lobe utilized by the default gridding algorithm (*i.e.*, the `standard` grider) within the CASA `tclean` framework. The figure

demonstrates that the Zernike polynomial model more accurately represents the antenna holography and consequently does a better job of retrieving the flux density of the source across the main-lobe and out to the first side-lobe where the error in the retrieved flux density is 10%. The ray-traced AIP performance within the main-lobe is consistently lower by 2% across the main-lobe but underestimates the flux density by nearly 23% at the first side-lobe. The improvements in modeling the sidelobe, as well as the ability to generate full-Mueller PB models is the primary advantage of the method outlined in this paper. The level of flux density recovery makes the A-to-Z solver a more versatile and effective method than both ray tracing and using axis symmetric 2D polynomial as demonstrated here.

#### 4. CONCLUSION




**Figure 8.** The full Mueller residuals for VLA (left) and ALMA (right). In each figure, from top to bottom are the measured Stokes beams (total power), the model Stokes beams and the residual. There is good agreement between the morphology of the measured and model Stokes beams. For ALMA, the Stokes V measurement has very low SNR since it is the difference between the cross-hand feeds. We note that this is a problem only in the total power measurements, the Jones beams have better SNR.



**Figure 9.** Fractional residual between the Stokes I PB produced by the AW projection framework and the Stokes I PB generated from measured holography for VLA at 2.9 GHz (left) and MeerKAT at 1.25 GHz (right). In both cases the fractional error is  $\leq 2\%$  within the main lobe, rising to  $\leq 10\%$  in the first sidelobe. The fractional error near the nulls will naturally tend to be very large.

We have demonstrated the A-to-Z solver methodology which we use to model the full Jones response of an antenna using Zernike polynomials. We have further demonstrated that this approach results in wide-field, wideband, full Mueller PB models that are accurate to the first sidelobe. By using the measured AIP, we rely on direct measurements of the optical properties to inform the modeling, which is necessary in capturing the polarization leakage behaviour. This makes it easy to generalize our method to any arbitrary interferometer with holographic measurements, without needing to rely on setting up complex simulations that typically require a large time and compute investment. We have demonstrated the generality of our approach by modeling the




**Figure 10.** Plot of  $\eta_A$  scaling factor as a function of frequency for VLA S Band. The dashed line is the polynomial fit to the data. We find that  $\eta_A$  reduces as a function of frequency, analogous to increasing aperture efficiency, and flattens out at the highest frequencies. The sudden spike at  $\sim 2.25$  GHz and dip at  $\sim 3.25$  GHz correspond to SPWs corrupted by RFI, yielding unreliable antenna holography measurements.

VLA, ALMA and MeerKAT telescopes which have a variety of different feed polarization, dish, and frequency configurations. The only limitation to extending this method to other telescopes and facilities is the availability of high quality interferometric observations.

We also demonstrate the efficacy of the Zernike polynomials in modeling optical properties of the dish and beam, such as the standing wave due to the second reflection between the antenna feed and secondary reflector. These effects show up in different Zernike terms, that typically correspond to actual optical aberrations such as the tip, tilt, defocus and astigmatism. The





**Figure 11.** Plot of the recovered flux between the Zernike model, the ray traced model and the polynomial model of the EVLA PB.

broadband beam squint and beam squash behaviour are also well modeled, and our measurements are consistent with existing previous estimates. The primary beam models described in this paper are generally accurate to one to two sidelobes, which is relevant for widefield imaging and deep mosaicing experiments.

We have implemented the A-to-Z modeling functionality in a Python package (Sekhar & Jagannathan 2021a)<sup>2</sup> that (at the time of writing) has been verified to work on VLA L- and S-Band, MeerKAT L-Band and ALMA Band 3 data. These models can then be used to generate full Stokes beam models (*i.e.*, the first row of the Mueller matrix), the functionality for which has been implemented in a separate Python package (Sekhar & Jagannathan 2021b)<sup>3</sup> in order to perform image plane leakage corrections. These coefficients have also been included in (at the time of writing) a development branch of CASA that uses the Zernike models within the A-Projection framework. As mentioned earlier, this branch currently only corrects for Mueller-diagonal terms and the full Mueller corrections are underway. We will present the details of both the aperture and image plane widefield polarization leakage corrections in a forthcoming paper in this series (Jagannathan et al., *in prep*).

## APPENDIX

### A. APPENDIX A : FM MODELS

Figure 12 plots the Full Mueller models for all the telescopes discussed in this paper. These models were obtained by constructing the Mueller elements from the Jones models.

### B. IMPLEMENTATION OF ZERNIKE COEFFICIENTS IN TCLEAN

The coefficients derived in the manner described in this Sec. 2.4 are included in the `awproject` gridded in CASA by listing them in a CSV file. This format allows for the specification of Zernike coefficients as a function of frequency, polarization and antenna type (when necessary). Each band of each telescope will be specified in a different CSV file that can be passed in to the code. Listing 1 shows an extract of such a CSV file. This is an extendable format that can be modified to accept heterogeneous arrays (partially or fully) by adding a further index to track the antenna type.

**Listing 1.** Extract from the CSV file specifying the coefficients for VLA S Band beams. The columns are Stokes, frequency (in MHz), the Zernike index, the real and imaginary coefficients, and the aperture efficiency factor. The Stokes is listed in CASA readable format, using the numbers 5-8 to denote circular feeds and 9-12 for linear.


```
#stokes,freq,ind,real,imag,eta
5,2052,0,308.13023030,-0.06968780,1.11
6,2052,0,0.14375480,-0.07500360,1.11
7,2052,0,0.11308890,0.24478490,1.11
8,2052,0,301.83666030,-0.00622780,1.11
```

Since Zernike polynomials are analytically well defined, the aperture models can be exactly evaluated at the specified UV locations during gridding, rather than using a cached pre-computed value from an over-sampled grid.

<sup>2</sup> <https://gitlab.nrao.edu/pjaganna/zcpb>

<sup>3</sup> <https://github.com/Kitchi/plumber>





**Figure 12.** The direction dependent Mueller terms generated from the Zernike models for (a) VLA S Band (2.5 GHz) (b) MeerKAT L Band (1.2 GHz) (c) ALMA DV antenna Band 3 (108 GHz) (d) ALMA DA antenna Band 3 (108 GHz).

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The National Radio Astronomy Observatory is a facility of the National Science Foundation operated under cooperative agreement by Associated Universities, Inc. The MeerKAT telescope is operated by the South African Radio Astronomy Observatory, which is a facility of the National Research Foundation, an agency of the Department of Science and Innovation. IDIA is a partnership of the University of Cape Town, the University of Pretoria and the

University of the Western Cape. We acknowledge the use of the ilifu cloud computing facility - [www.ilifu.ac.za](http://www.ilifu.ac.za), a partnership between the University of Cape Town, the University of the Western Cape, the University of Stellenbosch, Sol Plaatje University, the Cape Peninsula University of Technology and the South African Radio Astronomy Observatory. The ilifu facility is supported by contributions from IDIA, the Computational Biology division at UCT and the Data Intensive Research Initiative of South Africa (DIRISA).

This paper makes use of the following ALMA data: *uid\_\_\_A002\_Xd2d9a0\_X8dd3*, *uid\_\_\_A002\_Xd2d9a0\_X92ae*, *uid\_\_\_A002\_Xd2d9a0\_X991e*, *uid\_\_\_A002\_Xd2d9a0\_X8f4c*, *uid\_\_\_A002\_Xd2d9a0\_X9427*, *uid\_\_\_A002\_Xd2d9a0\_X9b2e*. ALMA is a partnership of ESO (representing its member states), NSF (USA) and NINS (Japan), together with NRC (Canada), MOST and ASIAA (Taiwan), and KASI (Republic of Korea), in cooperation with the Republic of Chile. The Joint ALMA Observatory is operated by ESO, AUI/NRAO and NAOJ.

SS acknowledges financial support from the Inter-University Institute for Data Intensive Astronomy (IDIA) and the National Radio Astronomy Observatory (NRAO). IDIA is a partnership of the University of Cape Town, the University of Pretoria and the University of the Western Cape. PJ would like to thank Bruce Veidt and Tom Landecker for interesting discussions on the modelling of aperture illumination functions.

*Facilities:* VLA, ALMA, MeerKAT, ilifu

## REFERENCES

- Asad, K. M. B., Girard, J. N., de Villiers, M., et al. 2021, MNRAS, 502, 2970, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab104](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab104)
- Bates, R. 1971, International Journal of Engineering Science, 9, 1107
- Bhatnagar, S., & Cornwell, T. 2017, The Astronomical Journal, 154, 197
- Bhatnagar, S., Cornwell, T., Golap, K., & Uson, J. M. 2008, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 487, 419
- Bhatnagar, S., Rau, U., & Golap, K. 2013, ApJ, 770, 91, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/770/2/91](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/770/2/91)
- Bhatnagar, S., Jagannathan, P., Sekhar, S., et al. 2020, ALMA Study Project Report: Full Mueller Mosaic Imaging with ALMA
- Born, M., & Wolf, E. 2013, Principles of optics: electromagnetic theory of propagation, interference and diffraction of light (Elsevier)
- Branch, M. A., Coleman, T. F., & Li, Y. 1999, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 21, 1
- Cornwell, T. J., Golap, K., & Bhatnagar, S. 2008, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing, 2, 647
- Cotton, W. D., Condon, J. J., Perley, R. A., et al. 2004, in Ground-based Telescopes, Vol. 5489, International Society for Optics and Photonics, 180–189
- Du, X., Landecker, T. L., Robishaw, T., et al. 2016, PASP, 128, 115006, doi: [10.1088/1538-3873/128/969/115006](https://doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/128/969/115006)
- Esterhuysen, W., Kusel, T., Theron, I., et al. 2011, Concept Description: MeerKAT Receptor for Consideration by SKA, Tech. rep.
- Hamaker, J., Bregman, J., & Sault, R. 1996, Astronomy and Astrophysics Supplement Series, 117, 137
- Intema, H. T. 2014, Astrophysics Source Code Library, ascl
- Jagannathan, P., Bhatnagar, S., Brisken, W., & Taylor, A. R. 2018, The Astronomical Journal, 155, 3, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aa989f](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aa989f)
- Jagannathan, P., Bhatnagar, S., Rau, U., & Taylor, A. R. 2017, The Astronomical Journal, 154, 56, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aa77f8](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aa77f8)
- Jonas, J., & Team, M. 2018, Proceedings of MeerKAT Science: On the Pathway to the SKA, 25
- Lakshminarayanan, V., & Fleck, A. 2011, Journal of Modern Optics, 58, 545
- McMullin, J. P., Waters, B., Schiebel, D., Young, W., & Golap, K. 2007, in Astronomical data analysis software and systems XVI, Vol. 376, 127
- Moré, J. J. 1978, in Numerical analysis (Springer), 105–116
- Napier, P., & Bates, R. 1971, International Journal of Engineering Science, 9, 1193
- Noll, R. J. 1976, JOsA, 66, 207
- Noordam, J. E. 2004, in Ground-based telescopes, Vol. 5489, International Society for Optics and Photonics, 817–825
- Perley, R. 2016, EVLA Memo 195 Jansky Very Large Array Primary Beam Characteristics
- Perley, R., Chandler, C., Butler, B., & Wrobel, J. 2011, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 739, L1
- Rau, U., Bhatnagar, S., & Owen, F. N. 2016, AJ, 152, 124, doi: [10.3847/0004-6256/152/5/124](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-6256/152/5/124)
- Rau, U., Bhatnagar, S., Voronkov, M. A., & Cornwell, T. J. 2009, Proceedings of the IEEE, 97, 1472
- Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., Greenfield, P., et al. 2013, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 558, A33
- Scott, P. F., & Ryle, M. 1977, MNRAS, 178, 539, doi: [10.1093/mnras/178.4.539](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/178.4.539)

- Sekhar, S., & Jagannathan, P. 2021a, ZCPB, doi: [10.5281/zenodo.5484156](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5484156)
- . 2021b, Plumber, doi: [10.5281/zenodo.5484098](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5484098)
- Sokolowski, M., Colegate, T., Sutinjo, A., et al. 2017, Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia, 34
- Tasse, C., Van Der Tol, S., Van Zwieten, J., van Diepen, G., & Bhatnagar, S. 2013, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 553, A105
- Van der Tol, S., Veenboer, B., & Offringa, A. R. 2018, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 616, A27
- Van Weeren, R., Williams, W., Hardcastle, M., et al. 2016, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 223, 2
- Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., et al. 2020, Nature methods, 17, 261
- Wootten, A. 2003, in Large ground-based Telescopes, Vol. 4837, International Society for Optics and Photonics, 110–118
- Zernike, F. 1934, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 94, 377, doi: [10.1093/mnras/94.5.377](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/94.5.377)