Method for a safe statistical veto using IFO channels

Stefan Hild (AEI Hannover)

LSC/Virgo meeting, March 2007, Det-Char-session

LIGO-G070174-00-Z

Standard statistical veto

- Events in H originate from GW and Noise (recorded in X)





- Events in H that occur at the same time as events in X are vetoed.

$$| t_0^H[i] - t_0^X[j] | \quad < t_{\mathrm{win}}$$

- The standard statistical veto only works for veto channels containing no traces of GW signal (seismometers, microphones, magnetic field sensors, ...).

Limitations of the standard statistical veto

- As soon as X contains GW signals the application of a standard statistical veto would veto potentially real GW signals.
- Unfortunately many promising veto channels may contain traces of GW-signal, for example interferometer signals (light powers, control signals, ...)



Two populations of coincident events:

- ***Events originating from noise*** ***(we want to veto)***
- ***GW-like events*** ***(we DON'T want to veto)***

Separate two populations by the amplitude ratio of the coincident events

If event *X*(j) originates from the event *H*(i) their amplitude ratio has to correspond to:

$$\frac{a^X[j]}{a^H[i]} = |\alpha_{\mathrm{rat}}[i]|$$

To get a safe veto method we have to compare the amplitude ratio of the two coincident events with the amplitude ratio a GW-signal would have:

If $\frac{a^X[j]}{a^H[i]} = |\alpha_{\mathrm{rat}}[i]|$ **_H(i)_ is not vetoed**

If $\frac{a^X[j]}{a^H[i]} \neq |\alpha_{\mathrm{rat}}[i]|$ **_H(i)_ gets vetoed !**



Real world scenario

In reality we have to allow for some inaccuracies:

- Error in the amplitude estimation of the two events $\Delta a^H[i]$ $\Delta a^X[j]$
- Error in back-coupling transfer function (measurement, non stationarity) $|\alpha_{\mathrm{rat}}[i]|$

Allow for overall error Δa_{tot}

VETO CONDITION

Two coincident events *H(i)* and *X(j)* are vetoed in the case that the amplitude ratio matches one of these requirements:

$$\frac{a^X[j]}{a^H[i]} < \frac{|\alpha_{\mathrm{rat}}[i]|}{(1+\Delta a_{\mathrm{tot}})},$$

$$\frac{a^X[j]}{a^H[i]} > |\alpha_{\mathrm{rat}}[i]|\,(1+\Delta a_{\mathrm{tot}})$$

Dust falling through main output beam

high dust concentration (broken AC)



Time coincidence window = 10ms

low dust concentration



Time coincidence window = 10ms

When dust is falling through the main output beam, coincidence glitches are induced to H and P_{DC}.

P_{DC} contains traces of GW-signal

What is P_{DC} ?

It is the DC light from the main dark port photo detector.

It contains traces of GW-signal.

Hardware injections of sinusoidal signals show coherence of 1.



Application of the method (Example: ‚Dust-Veto‘)

Application to two data sets of GEO S5 data:

- Data Set 1: Full September 2006 (low dust concentration)
- Data Set 2: 8 hours from May 2006 (high dust concentration)

Final set of three veto conditions:

$$\left|t_0^X[j] - t_0^H[i]\right| < 8\,\mathrm{ms}$$ **Time coincidence**

$$\left|f_0^X[j] - f_0^H[i]\right| < 1\mathrm{kHz}$$ **Frequency coincidence**

$$\frac{a^X[j]}{a^H[i]} > 3\,\alpha_{\mathrm{rat}}[i]$$ **Amplitude cut**
(amplitude consistency check)

Dust-Veto:
High dust concentration period (Data set 2)



Full veto pipeline (for GEO S5 data)



Dust-Veto:
Low dust concentration period (Data set 1)



Application to S5 data from GEO600 gives encouraging results.

Summary of the veto performance

Data Set	1	2
Total number of events in H	96454	2281
Total number of events in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{DC}}$	26600	615
Event rate in $H[\mathrm{h}^{-1}]$	134	285
Event rate in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{DC}}[\mathrm{h}^{-1}]$	37	77
Number of events vetoed	5517	491
Efficiency [%]	5.72	21.5
Background [%]	0.02	0.02
Significance	286	1075
Use-percentage [%]	20.7	79.8

S. Hild et al: „A statistical veto employing an amplitude consistency check " , submitted to Class. Quantum Grav.



This new method is easily applicable for all other GW detectors.

Short reciepe for statistical veto with amplitude consistency check

Is there a promissing IFO channel ***X*** showing coincidence events with GW channel ?

no → **No veto**

yes → Check if ***X*** contains traces of GW signal (using differential armlength actuators)

no → **Safe to apply Standard staistical veto**

yes → Measure $|\alpha_{\mathrm{rat}}[i]|$ many times (different timescales).

Non stationary → **No veto**

stationary → Evaluate Δa_{tot} .

→ Define amplitude cut.

E N D

Determine overall error

Need to determine Δa_{tot} **!!**

1. Back-coupling TF was measured to vary less than +/-50% over months.
2. Maximum error in amplitude estimation of mHACR using 3 sigma gives 60% for events of SNR = 4
   (sine-Gaussian injections into Gaussian noise)



3. For the real data we will allow for 200% error in amplitude estimation.