CNN For High Energy - Validation -

2020.03.24

Seungmok Lee

Training Data Selection

- Training data was selected using criteria below.
 - Signal tag
 - Runnum 1765, 1601 (Calibration run)
 - Have coincidence
 - Nmt500 > 0.12
 - Background tag
 - Runnum 1858, 1859 (Physics run)
 - No coincidence
 - Nmt500 < 0.12



Data Statistics

		Training data		Validation data		Test data	
		Background	Signal	Background	Signal	Background	Signal
Crystal 1	3~6 keV	146,089	414	18,264	47	18,273	38
	6~10 keV	62,381	452	7,805	48	7,806	47
Crystal 3	3~6 keV	142,487	1,367	17,815	164	17,792	187
	6~10 keV	50,477	1,909	6,322	226	6,326	222
Crystal 7	3~6 keV	146,834	1,892	18,365	224	18,371	218
	6~10 keV	63,592	2,761	7,959	333	7,980	312

CNN Structure

- 1dimensional CNN motivated by AlexNet was successful!
- Batch norm., ReLU activation applied.

Input shape	Layer	Output shape
(4080, 2)	Conv1D(filters=96, kernel_size=39, strides=3)	(1348, 96)
(1348, 96)	MaxPool1D(pool_size=4)	(337, 96)
(337, 96)	Conv1D(filters=256, kernel_size=23)	(315, 256)
(315, 256)	MaxPool1D(pool_size=3)	(105, 256)
(105, 256)	Conv1D(filters=384, kernel_size=9)	(97, 384)
(97, 384)	Conv1D(filters=384, kernel_size=9)	(89, 384)
(89, 384)	Conv1D(filters=256, kernel_size=9)	(81, 256)
(81, 256)	MaxPool1D(pool_size=3, strides=2)	(40, 256)
(40, 256)	Flatten()	10240
10240	Dense(512)	512
512	Dense(2)	2

Compatibility

Traine	ed Using	Tested on		Signal	Background	E1 Score [9/]	
Crystal	Energy [keV]	Crystal	Energy [keV]	Eff. [%]	Eff. [%]	FT Score [%]	
3	6~10	3	3~6	100	95.48	97.69	
3	3~6	3	6~10	100	99.21	99.60	
7	6~10	3	6~10	100	99.18	99.59	
7	6~10	3	3~6	100	94.22	97.03	
7	3~6	3	6~10	100	100	100	
7	3~6	1	6~10	100	99.69	99.84	
7	3~6	1	3~6	100	99.64	99.82	
3	6~10	1	6~10	100	99.69	99.84	
1	3~6	7	6~10	99.68	100	99.84	



Testing Data Selection

- Testing data was selected without nmt cut.
 - Runnum 1765, 1601 (Calibration run)
 - Have coincidence
 - Runnum 1858, 1859 (Physics run)
 - No coincidence
 - Not tagged. Crystal3 was used.

- Trained model could successfully split data without nmt cut.
 - Model was trained using crystal 7, energy 3~6 keV data.



- 3~6 keV data showed very clear nmt distribution.
- It seems not nmt-biased.



• 2~3 keV data showed clear nmt distribution, too.



- Nmt distribution was not that clear in low energy.
 - Nmt is known to be unavailable in this low energy, so these are not intuitive.



- Signal wave has typically longer waveform.
- Accumulating the waveform helps to visualize overall property.
- Figures after this slide were generated by model trained using crystal 7 energy 3-6 keV data.



Crystal 3, energy 6-10 keV events were classified successfully.



Crystal 3, energy 3-6 keV events were classified successfully, too.



Crystal 3, energy 2-3 keV events were classified successfully, too.



Crystal 3, energy 1-2 keV events classification result seems not bad, but 'something' arises at the front side.



Crystal 3, energy 0.5-1 keV events classification seems not that good. However, signalclassified event number is too small.



Accumulated Waveform

Crystal 3, energy 0-0.5 keV events classification seems also not that good. However, signalclassified event number is too small.



Validation – Ipar:nmt500 Plot

Energy 3~6 keV data is split clearly.





Nmt500 vs Lpar (signal)

Validation – Ipar:nmt500 Plot

Energy 1~2 keV data is split not clearly, and low lpar part appears.





Nmt500 vs Lpar (signal)

Validation – Ipar:nmt500 Plot

Energy 0~0.5 keV data is not split. But signal data is too rare.





Nmt500 vs Lpar (signal)

Validation – energy:lpar Plot

Some low lpar samples were classified as signal. These samples should be studied more.



Lpar vs Energy (signal)



Validation

- I need some more validation ways.
- Maybe training dataset in lower energy range is useful.