Reconstruction of sub-threshold events of cosmic-ray radio detectors using an autoencoder

P. Bezyazeekov

International Cosmic Ray Conference, Berlin 2021

July 6, 2021

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Deep learning: motivation



Average of 400 events, expected noise reduction with factor $\sqrt{400}=20$

- \Rightarrow Noise is not white/contain features
- \Rightarrow Train autoencoder to learn these features

Chosen architecture (autoencoder)

- Unsupervised neural network with compressed representation
- Use Keras and Tensorflow with GPU support
- Based of 1D convolution layers
- ReLu (max(0, x)) activation function
- Max pooling (and upsampling) after convolutional layers
- Binary crossentopy loss function and RMSprop optimizer
- Train networks via uDocker on SCC ForHLR II cluster



Learning strategy and training pipeline

Datasets:

▶ 25k upsampled (×16) traces with real background + low-amplitude simulations (< $100 \,\mu\text{V/m}$) with randomly located pulse

Training and evaluation:

- ▶ Depth (D) and number of filters per layer as free parameters
- Primary evaluate by loss metrics
- Blind test with full-pipeline Offline reconstruction

i-th encoding layer is described by the following (i=1,...,D):

$$S_i = S_{\min} \times 2^{D-i}, \ n_i = 2^{i+N-1},$$
 (1)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

where $S_i \mbox{ is a size of the } i\mbox{-th filter, } n_i \mbox{ is a number of filters per layer}$

D and N are free parameters; $S_{\rm min}=16$ is minimal size of layer Size of input/output array: 4096 (1280 ns) – 25% of original trace

Threshold and metrics

- Threshold amplitude \Leftrightarrow 5% tolerance to false positives
- \blacktriangleright Efficiency: $N_{\rm rec.}/N_{\rm tot.},$ fraction of events passed the threshold
- ▶ Purity: N_{hit}/N_{rec.}, fraction of events with reconstructed position of the peak: |t_{rec.} - t_{true}| < 5 ns</p>



Best architecture contains $N_{dof} = 10240$

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ ヨ ト ▲ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ の Q ()

Example: correct identification



True signal and noise are identified correctly, noise is removed

Example: no identification



True signal is heavily distorted by noise, and removed as background

(日)、

э

Example: double identification



Signal-like RFI is identified as signal

• • • • • • • • • • • • •

ъ

Preliminary conclusion

- Monte-Carlo tests show performance comparable to standard method and matched filtering
- "Stack more layers" works, but requires larger training sets
- ► Amplitude reconstruction degenerates when SNR < 1 trace is normalized to [0; 1] ⇒ peak is hidden in noise

How to convince ourselves that the reconstruction is valid when the signal is not visible?



Data-driven benchmark

- ▶ Tunka-133/Tunka-Rex events with $E \in [10^{16} 10^{17}]$ eV
- Almost zero events in this energy band by standard method
- ▶ Decreasing autoencoder threshold $0.395/0.500 \rightarrow 0.200/0.500$
- \blacktriangleright Cross-check cuts: direction reconstruction $\Delta\Omega < 5^\circ$, clustering events





Example reconstruction



Adaptive LDF (after cuts)

Few antennas are synthesized into single one in order to increase SNR The slope of averaged LDF is used for energy reconstruction



イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Energy reconstruction (after cuts)

Reconstruction based on single antenna method, $E=\kappa A_d e^{-\eta(d-d_0)}$ Normalization factor from standard reconstruction; $\mu=0\%,$ $\sigma=26\%$



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲豆▶ ▲豆▶ 三豆 - のへで

Conclusion

- The performance of Tunka-Rex autoencoder has been tested on real data
- Numbers of both true and false positives are increased when loosing cuts
- We can reconstruct arrival direction but struggling with energy reconstruction

Radio autoencoder can be used as self-trigger technique

- Need more sophisticated cuts to lower the threshold
- Need better training