

## Enhancing the Compton Spectrometer & Imager's event reconstruction capabilities with machine learning

Robin Anthony-Petersen<sup>1</sup>, John Tomsick<sup>1</sup>, Andreas Zoglauer<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>Space Sciences Laboratory, University of California Berkeley

Compton telescopes utilize a gamma-ray Compton scattering one or more times in their detector volume to reconstruct the photon's path and determine its initial scatter angle. For compact Compton telescopes this task is complicated by the fact that the time between successive interactions is shorter than the readout time of the detector. As a result, the correct path of the gamma-ray must be extracted from the raw data by determining the most likely scattering sequence. Here we consider the Compton Spectrometer and Imager (COSI) and the implications of using machine learning for COSI's event reconstruction. We have tested four different approaches to Compton event reconstruction for COSI: the classical Compton sequence reconstruction, a naive Bayesian, a random forest, and a neural network. These approaches were implemented in the Medium-Energy Gamma-ray Astronomy library (MEGAlib) software toolkit, which is also where we simulated the data, trained the approaches, and evaluated the results. Our findings show that these new methods outperform the classical event reconstruction approach and result in the lowest rates for wrongly reconstructed event paths.



Preliminary results	



Figure 1. (a) Consider an incoming gamma-ray which Compton scatters twice within a detector volume and then gets absorbed. We can readout the position and energy information of each interaction, however the order of the interactions is not explicit in the raw data and must be extracted in the analysis pipeline. (b) Once the sequence of interactions is determined, the initial Compton scatter angle is determined and the gamma-rays origin is confined to an annulus (Compton cone) in the sky. Using overlapping Compton cones, the point of origin can be determined. (c) The key performance parameter of a Compton telescope is the Angular Resolution Measure (ARM). The ARM is defined by the shortest distance (in degrees) between the known photon's origin and the Compton cone.

## Event reconstruction algorithms

Classical Compton sequence reconstruction



Figure 2. When a photon Compton scatters N times (N > 1), the second  $\varphi$ k scattered angle can be determined both kinematically and geometrically. The classical approach pickes the sequence that minimizes this difference. While computationally fast, the classical approach



**RMS** improvement Method Classical 0% 17.0% Bayesian 24.9% Random Forest 27.4% Neural Network

Figure 6. ARM plot demonstrating the performance of the four algorithms: classical, Bayesian, random forest, and neural network. Correctly reconstructed events appear in the central peak of the ARM distribution around 0°, and wrongly reconstructed events appear off-peak. For this plot, the algorithms were implement, trained, and evaluated in MEGAlib. 100,000,000 events were simulated using a Na-22 source in cosima and trained using the responsecreator. The trainings were then evaluated with ground-based Na-22 calibration data from the 2016 COSI balloon. The ARM plot shows clear improvement in performance for the machine learning approaches, with the neural network offering the most

In-progress work

has on COSI's science capabilities Does it improve COSI's sensitivity?

511 keV COSI SMEX geometry cosima simulations





## Naive Bayesian

Shortcomings

Benefits • (In theory) can account for all physical effects

Computationally demanding

• Data space is too large to compute

 $P(A|B) = \frac{P(B|A)P(A)}{P(B|A)P(A)}$ likelihood posterior brior

Figure 3. The Bayesian approach utilizes Baye's theorem to determine the probability of an original input given some obtained result. This approach works well for Compton event reconstruction because we can create an extensive set of simulation files for the Bayesian algorithm from which it can generate a probability graph to analyze all possible interaction sequences and determine the most likely reconstructed path. Unfortunately, the data space required to consider all relevant physical effects is too large to compute, causing important information to be left out of the calculations.

Random forest decision tree Benefits • Can account for all physical effects Shortcomings X<sub>0</sub>≤ -21  $X_1 \le 26 \ X_0 \le 6$ X, ≤ 1 • To be quantified during bench marking process

Figure 4. A random forest is a type of decision tree algorithm. Inputs are represented by nodes in the tree, output values are given by leaves, and the paths connecting a node to a leaf are represented by weighted branches. These weights are determined using simulation data.

## Neural network

Benefits Can account for all physical effects • Good at handling non-linearities • Better performance than the other approaches



Figure 5. The neural network we used has a standard topology of a multi-layer perceptron with a single hidden layer and 8 different blocks of input nodes. The input layers accept input data, the output layers define possible outcomes, and the hidden layer transforms the data to match the outcome desired by the output layers by assigning weights between the different nodes of each layer (neurons). The neural network is trained using simulations. As the network processes more and more data, the weights between the neurons are adjusted to minimize the difference between the network's results and the true results of the simulation.