

From fghigo@nrao.edu Mon Oct 28 14:37:01 2002
 Date: Tue, 22 Oct 2002 13:16:27 -0400
 From: Frank Ghigo <fghigo@nrao.edu>
 To: rfisher <rfisher@nrao.edu>
 Cc: rmaddale@sadira.gb.nrao.edu, bgarwood@sadira.gb.nrao.edu, rprestag@nrao.edu,
 jford@sadira.gb.nrao.edu, ashelton@sadira.gb.nrao.edu,
 mclark@sadira.gb.nrao.edu, nradziwi@nrao.edu, fghigo@sadira.gb.nrao.edu,
 dhogg@nrao.edu, fschwab@nrao.edu
 Subject: strange rms

There seems to be some discrepancy between the RMS measured in spectra from the GBT spectrometer versus the theoretical values. The problem has been noted in the 3-level modes **for** 50MHz **and** 12.5MHz bandwidths. Dave Hogg has pointed **this** out **for** astronomical checkout data in modes 4N2-6A-12 3 **and** 4N2-6A-50-3. These are the only narrow-band 3-level modes examined so far.

The rms decreases with integration time as expected, but measured values are significantly lower than theoretical. On the other hand, **for** 9-level modes, the observed rms agrees well with the theoretical.

I will summarize the details below, **and** the main questions are:

How is 3-level data treated differently from 9-level in the Spectrometer software, **and** in the filler?

Are we using the right theoretical formula?

-- frank

We are using the formula (as given in the GBT quick guide):

$$\text{RMS} = K1 * \text{Tsyst} / \sqrt{K2 * \text{Teff} * \text{Npol} * \text{BW}/\text{Nchan}}$$

K1 is the backend sampling factor, **for** which we are using:

K1 = 1.032 **for** 9-level

K1 = 1.235 **for** 3-level

and K2 is the autocorrelator channel weighting function, **for** which we use 2.0 because the spectra were Hanning smoothed.

Here is some data from the checkout of 4N2-6A-12-3:

Effective Int. Time	Theoretical RMS in mK	Observed RMS, in mK
150	153.	123.
300	108.	87.6
750	68.6	54.7
1500	48.5	39.1

More details in web page:

http://www.local.gb.nrao.edu/gbt/gbtstatus/checkouts/4N2-6A-12-3_lband/Report.html
 (note that in the report, Dave is using K1=1.36)