## Paul Baker Design Schroeder, Table 6.17 Used

## Design Procedure



Figure 1 Paul Baker telescope layout

Assuming that I already have a known CCD size that I'm targeting, start with the desired focal length for the system $f_{\text {eff }}$ and the F-number for the system $F_{\text {sys }}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
D=\frac{f_{e f f}}{F_{s y s}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The key parameter that is used to parameterize much of the design is the simple ratio between $f_{2}$ and $f_{1}$ given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
k=\frac{f_{2}}{f_{1}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the diameter of the secondary $D_{2}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{2}=k D \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the results that follow, $f_{1}$ will be swept from about $0.05 f_{\text {eff }}$ up to $0.95 f_{\text {eff. }}$. It is convenient to compute $f_{2}$ from (2) simply as

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{2}=k f_{1} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The distance between the back of the primary mirror and the back of the third mirror extends the length of the overall scope. This distance will be referred to as the quantity B here and a little algebra shows that it is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=\frac{2 k}{1-k} f_{1}-f_{1}+f_{2} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $k$ is the key ratio between the primary's focal length $f_{1}$ and that of the secondary $f_{2}$ given by

In this formula, $\mathrm{f}_{2}$ is taken to be positive even though it is a convex mirror. It is also helpful to see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
k=1-\frac{f_{1}}{f_{\text {eff }}} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

It strictly true that $0<k<1$. Given $f_{\text {eff }}$, it is a simple matter to sweep $f_{1}$ from a small positive value to just less than $f_{\text {eff }}$ and compute $k$ from (6), then $f_{2}$ from (7), and finally $B$ from a variant of (5) given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=\frac{2 f_{1} f_{2}}{f_{1}-f_{2}}-f_{1}+f_{2} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The focal length for the third mirror is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{3}=\frac{1}{1-k} f_{2} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The power loss ratio due to obstruction by the secondary is simply given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\text {Loss }}=k^{2} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The F-numbers for all three mirrors are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& F_{1}=\frac{f_{1}}{D} \\
& F_{2}=\frac{f_{2}}{D_{2}}  \tag{11}\\
& F_{3}=\frac{1}{1-k} \frac{f_{2}}{D_{3}}=\frac{f_{3}}{D_{3}}
\end{align*}
$$

in which $D_{3}=D_{2}$. Neither $D_{2}$ nor $D_{3}$ includes the effects of the angular field of view and in general, these diameters must be increased. These diameters are further increased by the fact that the primary and secondary mirrors are conic sections (parabolic and elliptical).

The two mirror spacings shown in Figure 1 are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{12}=f_{1}-f_{2} \\
& S_{23}=S_{12} \frac{f_{3}}{f_{2}}\left(\frac{2 k}{1-k}\right) \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

Parameterized results are shown graphically now for two 1200 mm systems with (i) $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sys }}=2$ and (ii) $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sys }}=4$ using U15228 for the computations.

Other needed design quantities are:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{f_{3}}{f_{2}}=\frac{1}{1-k} \\
& M S R=\frac{f_{3}}{f_{2}}\left(\frac{2 k}{1-k}\right)  \tag{13}\\
& K_{1}=-1 \\
& K_{2}=-1+\left(\frac{R_{2}}{R_{3}}\right)^{3}
\end{align*}
$$



Figure 2 Relationship between $f_{2}$ and $f_{1}$ is independent of the system's F-number


Figure 3 The percentage of optical power lost is dependent only parameter $k$


Figure 4 Primary and secondary mirror conical parameters are independent of system F-number, only dependent upon parameter $k$.


Figure 5 Back-distance $B$ for $F_{\text {sys }}=2$


Figure 6 Mirror F -numbers versus k for $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sys }}=2$


Figure 7 Distance from final focus to the back of the primary mirror. A negative value means that the focus is inside the main body of the telescope (between primary and secondary). $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sys }}=2$ here.


Figure 8 For $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sys }}=4$ system


Figure 9 For $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sys }}=4$ system


Figure 10 For $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sys }}=4$ system

## Paul Baker 1 Telescope: $F_{\text {sys }}=2.5, f_{\text {eff }}=1058 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{D}=16.67$ "

This design was developed and put into OSLO before the convenient graphical results for key telescope dimensions had been put together. Consequently, the back distance and other parameters are less than ideal.

Originally, I put the optical details within OSLO but I could not get anything reasonable for performance. I quickly discovered that the fundamental problem was that serious baffling was required in order to prevent direct light from coming around the secondary mirror and the third mirror and corrupting the system performance. The designs shown here do not show these details, but they are crucial for good telescope performance.


Figure 11 OSLO main table entries


Figure 12 Paul Baker 1 design layout showing excessive back-distance B


Figure 13 Spot diagram performance for Paul Baker 1 is nearly diffraction limited at proper focus. At this diameter, however, atmospherics will determine the resultant resolution rather than diffraction theory, so this performance would be quite acceptable.


Figure 14 Ray trace analysis for Paul Baker 1 design


Figure 15 Point spread function for Paul Baker 1 design


Figure 16 Modulation transfer function for Paul Baker 1 design


Figure 17 MTF diffraction for Paul Baker 1 design

## Paul Baker 2 Design: $f_{\text {eff }}=14,583 \mathrm{~mm}, F_{\text {sys }}=4.166, D=137.8$ "

I originally had trouble duplicating very fast design given in Table 6.18 of Schroeder. At the time, I thought that the problem might be the very small F -number, but now I know that most of the problem was lack of any suitable baffling and the consequent pollution of the third-mirror by direct rays coming straight through the system.

Table 1 Paul Baker 2 Design Parameters

| Parameter | Value | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | 3500 mm | Diameter of primary mirror |
| $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ | 3 | F-number of primary mirror |
| $\mathrm{f}_{1}$ | 10500 mm | Focal length of primary mirror. Concave surface |
| $\mathrm{R}_{1}$ | 21000 mm | Radius of curvature for primary mirror |
| k | 0.28 | $\mathrm{f}_{2} / \mathrm{f}_{1}$ ratio |
| $\mathrm{f}_{2}$ | 2940 mm | Focal length for secondary mirror. Convex surface |
| $\mathrm{R}_{2}$ | 5880 mm | Radius of curvature for secondary mirror |
| $\mathrm{R}_{3} / \mathrm{R}_{2}$ | $1 /(1-k)=1.388888$ | For flat-field |
| $\mathrm{R}_{3}$ | 8166.67 mm | Radius of curvature for third mirror, concave surface. |
| MSR | 1.08025 | Mirror separation ratio: M1 to M2 distance divided by M2 to M3 distance |
| $\mathrm{S}_{12}$ | 3969 mm | Distance from primary to secondary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{23}$ | 8166.7 mm | Distance from secondary to third mirror |
| $\mathrm{K}_{1}$ | -1 | Conical parameter for primary (parabolic) |
| $\mathrm{K}_{2}$ | -0.62675 | Conical parameter for secondary (elliptical) $=$ $-1+\left(\frac{R_{2}}{R_{3}}\right)^{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sys }}$ | 4.16 | F-number for the system |



Figure 18 OSLO design parameters corresponding to Table 1

## Paul Baker Table $6.17 \mathrm{f} / 4.16$ <br> FOCAL LENGTH $=-1.458 \mathrm{e}+04 \mathrm{NA}=0.1131$

## UNITS: MM DES: OSLO

$\stackrel{1.01 e+03}{ }$


Figure 19 OSLO file paul baker 2.len for Paul Baker telescope $f / 4.16$.


Figure 20 Wavefront analysis for Figure 19


Figure 21 Ray trace analysis for Figure 19
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Figure 22 Spot analysis for Figure 19


Figure 23 Point spread functions for Figure 19


Figure 24 Modulation transfer functions for Figure 19


Figure 25 Polychromatic MTF for Figure 19

## Paul Baker 3 Design (After Lessons Learned): $f_{\text {eff }}=1200 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{D}=\mathbf{3 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ (12"), $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sys }}=4$

Truly remarkable performance. Access to image is very difficult, and baffling is very demanding and would need more work, but image clarity is really something.

Table 2 Paul Baker 3 Design Parameters

| Parameter | Value | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | 300 mm | Diameter of primary mirror |
| $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ | 2.72 | F-number of primary mirror |
| $\mathrm{f}_{1}$ | 816 mm | Focal length of primary mirror. Concave surface |
| $\mathrm{R}_{1}$ | 1632 mm | Radius of curvature for primary mirror |
| k | 0.32 | $\mathrm{f}_{2} / \mathrm{f}_{1}$ ratio |
| $\mathrm{f}_{2}$ | 261.12 mm | Focal length for secondary mirror. Convex surface |
| $\mathrm{R}_{2}$ | 522.24 mm | Radius of curvature for secondary mirror |
| $\mathrm{R}_{3} / \mathrm{R}_{2}$ | $1 /(1-k)=1.4706$ | For flat-field |
| $\mathrm{R}_{3}$ | 768 mm | Radius of curvature for third mirror, concave surface. |
| $\mathrm{f}_{3}$ | 384 | Focal length of third mirror |
| MSR | 1.38408 | Mirror separation ratio: M1 to M2 distance divided by M2 to M3 distance |
| $\mathrm{S}_{12}$ | 554.88 mm | Distance from primary to secondary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{23}$ | 768 mm | Distance from secondary to third mirror |
| $\mathrm{K}_{1}$ | -1 | Conical parameter for primary (parabolic) |
| $\mathrm{K}_{2}$ | -0.6856 | Conical parameter for secondary (elliptical) $=$ $-1+\left(\frac{R_{2}}{R_{3}}\right)^{3}$ |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {sys }}$ | 4 | F-number for the system |



Figure 26 Paul Baker 3 design

| Paul Baker 1200mm F/4 | UNITS: MM |
| :---: | :--- |
| FOCAL LENGTH $=-1200 \quad \mathrm{NA}=0.1208$ | DES: OSLO |

$$
\stackrel{95.9}{ }
$$



Figure 27 Paul Baker 3 design


Figure 28 Paul Baker 3 design

FULL FIELD=0.4deg
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Valley
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## Figure 29 Paul Baker 3 design
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Figure 30 Paul Baker 3 design


Figure 31 Paul Baker 3 design


Figure 32 Paul Baker 3 design


Figure 33 Paul Baker 3 design

## Paul Baker 4 Design: 1200 mm F/4 with Key Optics Internal

Again, truly outstanding performance!


Figure 34 Paul Baker 4 design


Figure 35 Paul Baker 4 design


Figure 36 Paul Baker 4 design


Figure 37 Paul Baker 4 design


Figure 38 Paul Baker 4 design. Clearly diffraction-limited performance.


Figure 39 Paul Baker 4 design


Figure 40 Paul Baker 4 design


Figure 41 Paul Baker 4 design

## Aplanatic Gregorian 13-Inch F/10



Figure 42 Aplanatic Gregorian 1 design


| Aplanatic Gregorian 13 Inch $\mathrm{f} / 10$ | UNITS: MM |
| :---: | :--- |
| FOCAL LENGTH $=-3286$ | $\mathrm{NA}=0.0426$ |



Figure 43 Aplanatic Gregorian 1 design
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Figure 44 Aplanatic Gregorian 1 design


Figure 45 Aplanatic Gregorian 1 design

## Aplanatic Gregorian 13-Inch F/5



Figure 46 Aplanatic Gregorian 2 design


Figure 47 Aplanatic Gregorian 2 design


Figure 48 Aplanatic Gregorian 2 design


Figure 49 Aplanatic Gregorian 2 design


Figure 50 Aplanatic Gregorian 2 design

## Ritchey-Chretien F/3 F/5 from OSLO Sample Files



Figure 51 RC design


Figure 52 RC design

| Field 0.7 deg $T^{0.02 \mathrm{~mm}}$ | ASTIGMATISM $\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{T}+(\mathrm{mm})$ | LONGITUDINAL SPHERICAL ABER. (mm) | CHROMATIC FOCAL SHIFT (mm) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 63.5 <br> UNITS: mm |  |
| FIELD: 1deg <br> IMAGE NA: 0.0622 EFL: 1.61e+03mm <br> WAVELGTH: +:0.588 $\triangle: 0.486 \quad 0: 0.656 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { RC cas } \\ \text { RAY } \end{gathered}$ | grain f/3 f/8 ACE ANALYSIS | $\begin{gathered} \text { OSLO } \\ 30 \text { Oct 09 } \\ 03: 44 \text { PM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Figure 53 RC design


Figure 54 RC design

| FULL FIELD 1 deg | (\%) | $\bigcirc$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0.7 \mathrm{FIELD} \\ & 0.7 \mathrm{deg} \end{aligned}$ | 앙 | (1) 素啫 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lc} \text { ON-AXIS } & - \\ \text { Odeg } & \circ \end{array}$ | © | $\bigcirc \bigcirc$ | 0 |
| -0.2 | -0. 1 | $0 \quad 0.1$ | 0.2 |
|  |  | FOCUS SHIFT |  |
| SPOT SIZE \& FOCUS SHIFT: UNITS $=\mathrm{m}$ WAVELENGTHS ( $\mu \mathrm{m}$ ) <br> W1: 0.588 W2: 0.486 W3: 0.656 |  | RC cassegrain f/3 f/8 SPOT DIAGRAM ANALYSIS | $\begin{gathered} \text { OSLO } \\ 30 \text { Oct 09 } \\ 03: 45 \text { PM } \end{gathered}$ |

Figure 55 RC design


Figure 56 RC design


Figure 57 RC design


Figure 58 RC design

## Flat-Field Schmidt Cassegrain



Figure 59 Flat-field Schmidt Cassegrain


Figure 60 Flat-field Schmidt of Figure 59


Figure 61 Flat-field Schmidt of Figure 59


Figure 62 Flat-field Schmidt of Figure 59


Figure 63 Flat-field Schmidt of Figure 59


Figure 64 Flat-field Schmidt of Figure 59


Figure 65 Flat-field Schmidt of Figure 59


Figure 66 Flat-field Schmidt of Figure 59

## Houghton Cassegrain 1



Figure 67 Houghton-Cassegrain 1 design


Figure 68 Houghton-Cassegrain 1 design


Figure 69 Houghton-Cassegrain 1 design


Figure 70 Houghton-Cassegrain 1 design


Figure 71 Houghton-Cassegrain 1 design


Figure 72 Houghton-Cassegrain 1 design


Figure 73 Houghton-Cassegrain 1 design


Figure 74 Houghton-Cassegrain 1 design

## Houghton Cassegrain 2



Figure 75 Houghton Cassegrain 2 design, but with modifications compared to text. Different glass used in the two corrector lenses.


Figure 76 Houghton Cassegrain 2 design


Figure 77 Houghton Cassegrain 2 design


Figure 78 Houghton Cassegrain 2 design


Figure 79 Houghton Cassegrain 2 design


Figure $\mathbf{8 0}$ Houghton Cassegrain 2 design


Figure 81 Houghton Cassegrain 2 design


Figure 82 Houghton Cassegrain 2 design

## Lurie Houghton 2 Design



Figure 83 Lurie Houghton 2 design


Figure 84 Lurie Houghton 2 design


Figure 85 Lurie Houghton 2 design


Figure 86 Lurie Houghton 2 design


Figure 87 Lurie Houghton 2 design


Figure 88 Lurie Houghton 2 design


Figure 89 Lurie Houghton 2 design


Figure 90 Lurie Houghton 2 design

## Summary

## 0 = Poor 10 = Excellent

| Design | Construction Difficulty | Focal Plane Access | Speed (F-\#) | Size | Vignetting | Color | Spot | Near Term Interest | Longer Term Interest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paul Baker 1 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Paul Baker 2 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 2 |
| Paul Baker 3 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 2 |
| Paul Baker 4 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Aplanatic Gregorian 1 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 2 |
| Aplanatic Gregorian 2 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| RC Corrected | 9 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 9 |
| Flat Field Schmidt | 9 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| Houghton Cass 1 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 7 |
| Houghton Cass 2 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| Lurie Houghton 1 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

At F/4, the Lurie-Houghton is a very attractive candidate for a first telescope. Not only is the F-number acceptably small for astrophotography, but the optical surfaces are all spherical and image quality is outstanding. Staying at 12 " or less for the primary makes the corrector lenses manageable. Higherorder aberrations begin setting in for F-numbers around 3.5 and lower; they can be compensated for by allowing different lens radii to be used along with different kinds of glass for the two lenses. However, these additional complexities do not seem worth the effort to go from F/4 to say F/3.

Longer term, I see doing a larger focal length scope and larger aperture. The larger aperture knocks out using a corrector plate in my opinion. This leaves me pretty much going toward the Ritchey-Chretien plus field flattener direction.

