

DRAFT VERSION APRIL 25, 2019
Typeset using L^AT_EX **modern** style in AASTeX62

Accuracy Requirements for Empirically-Measured Selection Functions

WILL M. FARR^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook NY 11794, United States*

²*Center for Computational Astronomy, Flatiron Institute, New York NY 10010, United States*

When conducting a population analysis on a catalog of objects the effect of the selection function must be incorporated to avoid so-called ‘‘Malmquist bias’’ (Malmquist 1922; Loredo 2004; Mandel et al. 2018). Suppose we have a catalog consisting of data d_i , $i = 1, \dots, N_{\text{obs}}$, that constrain the parameters θ_i of a set of N_{obs} objects. We wish infer the population distribution function

$$\frac{dN}{d\theta}(\lambda), \quad (1)$$

which can depend on some population-level parameters λ . The joint posterior for the object-level parameters θ_i and population-level parameters is (Loredo 2004; Mandel et al. 2018)

$$\pi \propto \prod_{i=1}^{N_{\text{obs}}} \left[p(d_i | \theta_i) \frac{dN}{d\theta_i}(\lambda) \right] \exp[-\Lambda(\lambda)] p(\lambda). \quad (2)$$

$p(d | \theta)$ is the likelihood function that describes the measurement process for the catalog, $p(\lambda)$ is a prior, and Λ is the expected number of detections:

$$\Lambda(\lambda) \equiv \int_{\{d|f(d)>0\}} dd d\theta \frac{dN}{d\theta}(\lambda) p(d | \theta). \quad (3)$$

f represents the selection function; an observation will be included in the catalog if and only if it generates data such that $f(d) > 0$. We factor an overall normalization out of the population distribution so that

$$\frac{dN}{d\theta}(\lambda) = R\xi(\theta | \tilde{\lambda}), \quad (4)$$

with the amplitude of ξ fixed in some way; $\tilde{\lambda}$ is the set of parameters that remain once the amplitude of the population distribution is fixed. In this re-parameterization, $\Lambda = Rx$, where x is given by

$$x(\tilde{\lambda}) \equiv \int_{\{d|f(d)>0\}} dd d\theta \xi(\theta | \tilde{\lambda}) p(d | \theta). \quad (5)$$

will.farr@stonybrook.edu

wfarr-vsolar@flatironinstitute.org

If ξ integrates to one over all θ , then x is the *fraction* of sources from a population described by $\tilde{\lambda}$ that are detectable.

In simple cases the integral in Eq. (5) can be evaluated analytically. But for most realistic applications it is not possible to analytically evaluate f (see e.g. Burke et al. 2015; Christiansen et al. 2015; Abbott et al. 2016a,b; Burke & Catanzarite 2017). Instead, the detection efficiency must be estimated by drawing synthetic objects from a fiducial distribution, $p_{\text{draw}}(\theta)$, drawing corresponding data from the likelihood function $p(d|\theta)$, and “injecting” these data into the pipeline used to produce the catalog, recording which observations are detected (Tiwari 2018). This procedure introduces uncertainty in the estimation of the selection integral; we must have enough draws that this uncertainty does not alter the shape of the posterior π very much.

Given a set of detected objects with parameters θ_j , $j = 1, \dots, N_{\text{det}}$ generated from a total number of draws N_{draw} the integral in Eq. (5) can be estimated via

$$x \simeq \frac{1}{N_{\text{draw}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{det}}} \frac{\xi(\theta_j | \tilde{\lambda})}{p_{\text{draw}}(\theta_j)}. \quad (6)$$

Under repeated samplings x will follow an approximately normal distribution

$$x \sim N(\mu, \sigma), \quad (7)$$

with

$$\mu \simeq \frac{1}{N_{\text{draw}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{det}}} \frac{\xi(\theta_j | \tilde{\lambda})}{p_{\text{draw}}(\theta_j)}, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\sigma^2 \equiv \frac{\mu^2}{N_{\text{eff}}} \simeq \frac{1}{N_{\text{draw}}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{det}}} \left[\frac{\xi(\theta_i | \tilde{\lambda})}{p_{\text{draw}}(\theta_i)} \right]^2 - \frac{\mu^2}{N_{\text{draw}}}. \quad (9)$$

We have introduced the parameter N_{eff} that gives the *effective* number of independent draws that contribute to the estimate of x .

Given a particular sampling of the selection function, we should marginalize over the uncertainty in x . Eq. (2) becomes

$$\pi \propto \prod_{i=1}^{N_{\text{obs}}} \left[p(d_i | \theta_i) \xi(\theta_i | \tilde{\lambda}) \right] \int dx R^{N_{\text{obs}}} \exp[-Rx] N(x | \mu, \sigma). \quad (10)$$

Integrating over $-\infty < x < \infty$, we obtain

$$\pi \propto \prod_{i=1}^{N_{\text{obs}}} \left[p(d_i | \theta_i) \xi(\theta_i | \tilde{\lambda}) \right] R^{N_{\text{obs}}} \exp \left[\frac{R\mu(R\mu - 2N_{\text{eff}})}{2N_{\text{eff}}} \right]. \quad (11)$$

The divergence of this expression as $R \rightarrow \infty$ reflects that the normal approximation permits non-zero probability of $x < 0$. Eq. (11) has stationary points in R at

$$R = R_{\pm} = \frac{N_{\text{eff}} \pm \sqrt{N_{\text{eff}}(N_{\text{eff}} - 4N_{\text{obs}})}}{2\mu}. \quad (12)$$

Provided $N_{\text{eff}} > 4N_{\text{obs}}$ these stationary points will occur for real, positive R . In this case, the stationary point at R_- is a local maximum; at R_+ we have a minimum associated with the “unphysical” transition to the divergent behavior as $R \rightarrow \infty$. We have

$$R_- = \frac{N_{\text{obs}}}{\mu} \left(1 + \frac{N_{\text{obs}}}{N_{\text{eff}}} + 2 \left(\frac{N_{\text{obs}}}{N_{\text{eff}}} \right)^2 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{N_{\text{obs}}}{N_{\text{eff}}} \right)^3 \right). \quad (13)$$

$R = N_{\text{obs}}/\mu$ is the point estimate for the detection efficiency in Eq. (6). Near $R = R_-$ a normal approximation holds for the posterior as a function of R with $\mu_R = R_-$ and

$$\sigma_R = \frac{\sqrt{N_{\text{obs}}}}{\mu} \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{N_{\text{obs}}}{N_{\text{eff}}} + \frac{31}{8} \left(\frac{N_{\text{obs}}}{N_{\text{eff}}} \right)^2 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{N_{\text{obs}}}{N_{\text{eff}}} \right)^3 \right). \quad (14)$$

Marginalizing the normal approximation over R imposing a flat-in-log R prior gives

$$\log \pi \propto \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{obs}}} \log p(d_i | \theta_i) \xi(\theta_i | \tilde{\lambda}) - N_{\text{obs}} \log \mu + \frac{3N_{\text{obs}} + N_{\text{obs}}^2}{2N_{\text{eff}}} + \mathcal{O}(N_{\text{eff}})^{-2}. \quad (15)$$

The term involving μ would appear in an analysis that ignores the rate R and works entirely with population distributions (Mandel et al. 2018; Fishbach et al. 2018); the term involving N_{eff} is a correction to account for the uncertainty in our estimate of the selection integral.

The uncertainty in parameters is driven by the *differences* in the log-posterior. The R -dependent terms contribute to such differences through

$$\Delta \log \pi = \dots - N_{\text{obs}} \left(\frac{\partial \log \mu}{\partial \tilde{\lambda}} - \frac{N_{\text{obs}}}{2N_{\text{eff}}} \frac{\partial \log N_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \tilde{\lambda}} \right) \Delta \tilde{\lambda}. \quad (16)$$

Both derivatives are independent of N_{eff} , so the relative contribution of the second term to the parameter estimates is $\mathcal{O}(N_{\text{obs}}/N_{\text{eff}})$.

If N_{eff} becomes close to $4N_{\text{obs}}$ for any relevant set of population parameters then the posterior no longer peaks in R and more injections must be obtained for an accurate analysis.

A worked example, along with the L^AT_EX source for this document, can be found at <https://github.com/farr/SelectionAccuracy>.

REFERENCES

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2016a, ApJ, 833, L1, doi: 10.3847/2041-8205/833/1/L1</p> <p>—. 2016b, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 227, 14, doi: 10.3847/0067-0049/227/2/14</p> | <p>Burke, C. J., & Catanzarite, J. 2017, Planet Detection Metrics: Per-Target Detection Contours for Data Release 25, Technical Report KSCI-19111-002, NASA Ames Research Center</p> |
|---|--|

- Burke, C. J., Christiansen, J. L., Mullally, F., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 809, 8,
doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/809/1/8](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/809/1/8)
- Christiansen, J. L., Clarke, B. D., Burke, C. J., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 810, 95,
doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/810/2/95](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/810/2/95)
- Fishbach, M., Holz, D. E., & Farr, W. M. 2018, *ApJ*, 863, L41,
doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/aad800](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/aad800)
- Loredo, T. J. 2004, in *American Institute of Physics Conference Series*, ed. R. Fischer, R. Preuss, & U. V. Toussaint, Vol. 735, 195–206
- Malmquist, K. G. 1922, *Meddelanden fran Lunds Astronomiska Observatorium Serie I*, 100, 1
- Mandel, I., Farr, W. M., & Gair, J. R. 2018, *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1809.02063.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.02063>
- Tiwari, V. 2018, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 35, 145009,
doi: [10.1088/1361-6382/aac89d](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6382/aac89d)