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ABSTRACT
Following Sawangwit & Shanks (2010a), we stack WMAP 7-year temperature data around extragalactic point sources to probe deviations in the source profiles from the Jupiter-modeled WMAP beams. Like them, for WMAP catalog sources we find that the stacked source profiles are broader than the WMAP model beam. Subtracting a galactic foreground model changes the stacked profiles, particularly at Q-band, but even after subtraction, the profiles are significantly wider than the WMAP models in the Q-, V-, and W-bands. However, we find that the profiles of NVSS-selected sources are consistent with the WMAP beam models, in conflict with the finding of Sawangwit & Shanks (2010a), and we attribute their result to galactic foreground. Our NVSS profiles provide strong evidence that the broad profiles around WMAP sources are caused by selection bias at the faint end of the WMAP catalog, where faint sources aligned with a positive CMB fluctuation may be boosted above the WMAP catalog threshold. With parametric beam models, we explore other explanations for the broad profiles, including source spectral energy distribution and positional uncertainty, but discard them as unlikely.

DATA
Our analysis uses the WMAP 7-year point source catalog and temperature maps. Our final analysis uses the foreground-reduced maps provided by the WMAP team. We also use the NRAO VLA Sky Survey point source catalog, taking bright sources with flux density greater than 2 Jy at 1.4 GHz.

WMAP & NVSS STACKING
Why stack?
Observing the sky convolves it with telescope's beam pattern, hence bright point-like objects are smoothed to resemble the beam. Therefore, subtracting extragalactic point sources is a means to recover the beam pattern. A challenge
Sawangwit & Shanks (2010a) stacked WMAP 5-year data around WMAP source catalog positions, finding stacked profiles much broader than the WMAP beam modeled from Jupiter measurements. Noting the sensitivity of WMAP’s power spectrum measurement to the beam reconstruction, they present this as a challenge to the CDM model.
Procedures
We stack sources by defining angular annuli about their catalog position, then average pixels enclosed by the annuli. For WMAP-selected sources we use bright profiles similar to Sawangwit & Shanks (2010a), and like them, we note that faint sources have broader profiles than bright ones. In conflict with their result, for NVSS-selected sources, we find that the profiles resemble the WMAP beam models, unless we neglect to remove the foreground model.

PROFILE FITTING
We minimize \( \chi^2 \) comparing model profiles to the stacked data using two contributions to the covariance of profile bins: detector noise and background CMB fluctuations (assumed that sources are uncorrelated with CMB). We compute the noise covariance analytically and the CMB covariance with ACID simulations. Figures 6-8 show the covariance matrices. The detector noise covariance is diagonal, but the CMB fluctuations are strongly correlated between profile bins. To explore the broad profiles, we designed increasingly complicated profile models based on the Jupiter-modeled WMAP beam. The profiles for NVSS-selected sources are well-fit by the simplest model. No model adequately explains the profiles for WMAP-selected sources.

Amplitude/offset model:
The simplest model has a temperature amplitude factor and constant temperature offset. This should fit the data well if Jupiter-modeled beams are reliable. The best-fit model and residuals are shown in Figures 9-12 for WMAP and NVSS-selected sources. This model is a bad fit for the WMAP sources (for V, \( \chi^2 = 49.6, 18 \text{ d.o.f.}, \text{Po} \chi^2 = 1.8 \times 10^{-7} \)) but a good fit for NVSS sources (for V, \( \chi^2 = 19.0, 18 \text{ d.o.f.}, \text{Po} \chi^2 = 0.39 \)). There are similar results for all DAs in Q, V, and W bands.
Angular scaling:
This model adds a parameter that scales \( \chi^2 \), which can check the bandpass effective frequency for sources, which potentially can broaden the profile. For WMAP sources, the \( \chi^2 \) of this fitting in each band was also poor, and the best-fit effective frequency was unrealistically low given the measured SEDs of WMAP sources.
Positional uncertainty:
In this model, instead of an angular scaling, we convolve the beam with a Gaussian, which probes uncertainties on WMAP catalog positions. For WMAP sources, again the \( \chi^2 \) of this fitting was poor, which returned a best-fit positional uncertainty that was far too big.
Flux-dependent positional uncertainty:
If the width of the Gaussian is allowed to vary as a power law with source flux density, as if faint sources had greater positional uncertainty than bright ones, we can obtain good fits for WMAP source profiles. However, the required power law index is inconsistent between the bands, making this explanation unlikely.

SELECTION BIAS
If WMAP catalog sources are preferentially selected to lie on positive CMB fluctuations, those fluctuations, which have significant power on scales larger than the beam, can broaden the stacked source profiles. This is reasonable, because for sources near the catalog threshold, sources that have their measured flux boosted by CMB fluctuations will tend to be included in the catalog, while those that have their measured flux suppressed will tend to be excluded. Since this effect is most significant near the catalog threshold, it explains why faint WMAP sources show broader profiles than bright ones.

As a first step to examine this effect, we assess the average impact on the source profile for those K-band selected sources that receive a positive boost. Our prescription follows:
* Simulate a CMB-only map with K-band noise.
* Filter it with a filter optimized to find point sources.
* At random positions, determine whether the filtered map exceeds zero at that point (positive indicates a flux boost).
* For boosted sources, stack the unfiltered CMB-only simulation around that position.
Figure 14 shows this estimate for an average over 1000 maps with 100 prospective sources per map. Although similar in size and shape to the fluctuation estimated from the data, this does not account for flux-suppressed sources that remain in the catalog, which requires a more detailed estimate.

CONCLUSIONS
We stack WMAP temperature data around WMAP and NVSS catalog sources. For WMAP sources, we find broad profiles similar to Sawangwit & Shanks (2010a), but for NVSS-selected sources, the profiles are consistent with the WMAP beams. Removal of galactic foregrounds is required. Several parametric models fail to account for the WMAP profiles. The most likely explanation is that the broad profiles are caused by residual CMB fluctuations. These underlying fluctuations are preferentially positive because of a bias in the WMAP catalog selection. We plan a complete 5-band mock-WMAP source catalog simulation to examine the selection effect in more detail.
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