

Motivation

The machine learning techniques, especially the convolutional neural network (CNN), have been successfully applied to image-related scenarios. In the field of high energy physics (HEP), the detectors can be used as imaging devices, for example, the Calorimeter (CAL) of ISS-CREAM. We would like to explore alternative methods based on machine learning for ISS-CREAM data analysis.

Objective

- 1. Reconstruct the total CR primary energy.
- 2. Check and calibrate the sampled energy of the calorimeter.
- 3. Identify CR events from among noise events.



Other posters in this conference about this analysis:

- 1. ISS-CREAM instrument: Poster 696 by Scott Nutter: Analysis Results from the Cosmic Ray Energetics And Mass Instrument for the International Space Station (ISS-CREAM)
- 2. Tracking overview: Poster 1051 by Kenichi Sakai: ISS-CREAM detector performance and tracking algorithms.
- 3. CAL & BSD energy calibration: Poster 866 by Yu Chen: On-Orbit Energy Calibration of the Calorimeter on the ISS-CREAM Instrument Using the Boronated Scintillator Detector

Machine learning applications on event reconstruction and identification for ISS-CREAM

Monong Yu^{a,*}, Tyler Anderson^a, Yu Chen^a, Stéphane Coutu^a, Tyler LaBree^b, Jason T. Link^{c,d}, John W. Mitchell^d, S. A. Isaac Mognet^a, Scott L. Nutter^b, Kenichi Sakai^{c,d}, Jacob Smith^{c,d}

Tools & Materials

- Packages: Tensorflow 2.0, Python 3.7, Sklearn, Scipy, Keras and other supporting packages
- Computer: Intel Core i7-6400 @3.4GhZ × 8 with a Ubuntu 16.04 operating system.
- The networks are trained separately for

Objective 1: A regression model that uses a mixed component of H, He, C, O, Fe with equal fraction. The model is trained on 40,179 showers. All events in this task are generated by Monte Carlo. Tracking angle is also used as an input.

Objective 2: A regression model that uses a mixed component from B to Fe with balanced fractions matched to existing CR composition data. The model is trained on 22,037 events. All events in this task are generated by Monte Carlo. Tracking angle is not used

Result 1

By analyzing10,000 additional testing samples not participated in the training process, the energy reconstruction based on a machine learning method

- Can in principle achieve a resolution of as good as 25%. Better than 50% using traditional method for an on-orbit program.
- The 2D distribution shows a smooth reconstructed energy path.
- In the 100 TeV region, there is a small bias, as illustrated in the 2D distribution plot. This is because our training set has fewer high-energy samples.

Result 2

By analyzing 6630 additional testing samples, we achieved

- An energy resolution as good as 8%.
- The 2D distribution shows a smooth path which is better than the one in result 1, since predicting the sampled energy in CAL is more direct. It avoids the additional degree of freedom, i. e., the tracking angle.





From left to right: Distribution of predicted energy as a function of target energy; Residual distribution of the logarithm of the predicted energy; Relative energy resolution as a function of true deposited energy.

a. Penn State University, Department of Physics, University Park, PA 16802, USA

b. Northern Kentucky University, Dept of Physics, Geology, and Engineering Technology, Highland Heights, KY 41099 USA c. NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Astroparticle Physics Laboratory, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA

d. Center for Research and Exploration in Space Science and Technology, (CRESST) UMBC, Baltimore MD, 21250

Result 3

By analyzing 353 CR events and 20,000 noise events as testing samples, we achieved a model that has

- A true positive rate of 93.2% and a true negative rate of 99.4%.
- This could help us preserve most of the "CR like" events and reject a significant fraction of the noise events that triggered the instrument acquisition electronics.
- It gives an unbiased result that does not relate to any detector calibration.

	Actual True (CR)	Actual False (Noise)
Predicted Positive (CR)	True Positive = 93.2%	False Positive = 0.6%
Predicted Negative (Noise)	False Negative =6.8%	True Negative = 99.4%

The confusion matrix of this classification model. Since we train the X-Z view and Y-Z view separately, we define that a CR event is one where both views have likelihoods of 50% or higher of being "CR like," otherwise the event is classified as noise.

Conclusions

- The results show that these approaches have the same or even better performance compared to traditional methods.
- Less computing power is needed compared to the traditional method that requires detailed Monte Carlo simulations.
- Machine-learning based methods make the analysis of complex showers straightforward.
- Independent of any detector calibration.
- It leads to ever increasing applications in high energy physics and particle astrophysics.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in the U.S. by NASA grants NNX17AB43G, NNX17AB42G, and their predecessor grants, as well as by directed RTOP funds to NASA GSFC. The authors also thank M. Geske, Penn State, for contributions to the BSD, and K. Wallace at Northern Kentucky University for contributions to Monte Carlo simulations. We also recognize the contributions of past CREAM and ISS-CREAM collaborators.

