Machine learning for PSF characterisation and interpolation



Thibault Kuntzer Frédéric Courbin

CEA

17 October 2016

PDF available at http://obswww.unige.ch/~kuntzer/talks/cea_psf_kuntzer.pdf

▶ Binaries issue, PSF systematics & mitigation

Building a colour-magnitude diagram with one filter

PSF interpolation revisited

MULTIPLE STARS

Effects on Euclid PSF and mitigation



$$\hat{C} pprox (1 + \mathcal{M})C + \mathcal{A}, \qquad \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A} \sim \langle |\delta \mathbf{e}_{\mathsf{PSF}}|^2
angle, \langle \delta \mathcal{R}_{\mathsf{PSF}}^2
angle$$

▶ Science requirement for the PSF shape:



From Paulin-Henriksson+2008

Performance needed for measurement

size
$$\sim 5\%$$

ellipticity $\sim 1\%$

 $\hat{C} pprox (1 + \mathcal{M})C + \mathcal{A}, \qquad \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A} \sim \langle |\delta \mathbf{e}_{\mathsf{PSF}}|^2
angle, \langle \delta R^2_{\mathsf{PSF}}
angle$

► Science requirement for the PSF shape:



From Paulin-Henriksson+2008

Performance needed for measurement

size
$$\sim 5\%$$

ellipticity $\sim 1\%$

 $\hat{C} pprox (1 + \mathcal{M})C + \mathcal{A}, \qquad \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A} \sim \langle |\delta e_{\mathsf{PSF}}|^2
angle, \langle \delta R_{\mathsf{PSF}}^2
angle$

▶ Science requirement for the PSF shape:



From Paulin-Henriksson+2008

Performance needed for measurement

size $\sim 5\%$ ellipticity $\sim 1\%$



- Unresolved objects affect the convolution kernel
- Multiple stars are ubiquitous (\gtrsim 35%)



Unresolved objects affect the convolution kernel

• Multiple stars are ubiquitous (\gtrsim 35%)



Unresolved objects affect the convolution kernel

• Multiple stars are ubiquitous (\gtrsim 35%)



▶ Stars i(AB) ≤ 18: Non compliant
 ▶ Stars i(AB) ≤ 20: Significant part of budget



Stars i(AB) ≤ 18: Non compliant
 Stars i(AB) ≤ 20: Significant part of budge



- Stars $i(AB) \lesssim 18$: Non compliant
- Stars $i(AB) \lesssim 20$: Significant part of budget

Alterations of the PSF due to a single companion



Alterations of the PSF due to a single companion



size	$\sim 5\%$
ellipticity	\sim 1%









Identifying multiple stars?



Identifying multiple stars?





Exploiting correlated noise

Measured



Exploiting correlated noise



Exploiting correlated noise



- Interpolate PSF parameter at position (Out-of-bag prediction)
- Measured PSF parameter interpolated
- Infer binary presence from systematic bias



- Interpolate PSF parameter at position (Out-of-bag prediction)
- Measured PSF parameter interpolated
- ▶ Infer binary presence from systematic bias



- Interpolate PSF parameter at position (Out-of-bag prediction)
- Measured PSF parameter interpolated
- ▶ Infer binary presence from systematic bias



- Interpolate PSF parameter at position (Out-of-bag prediction)
- Measured PSF parameter interpolated
- ▶ Infer binary presence from systematic bias



- Interpolate PSF parameter at position (Out-of-bag prediction)
- Measured PSF parameter interpolated
- ▶ Infer binary presence from systematic bias



- Interpolate PSF parameter at position (Out-of-bag prediction)
- Measured PSF parameter interpolated
- ▶ Infer binary presence from systematic bias

AUC metrics



ACF/Naive

Summary: finding binaries

- Most of Euclid's binaries have small angular separations
- Effects on PSF measurement is $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$
- Identify harmful binaries (check Kuntzer+16a) using only VIS 4 exposures
- ▶ Looking for systematic biases in measured PSF parameters
- √ "Naive:" auto-correlation analysis, works, but high FPR (data-driven)
- ✓ "Machine learning:" promising, with low FPR (depends on model)
- ► Work in progress:
 - More simulations for healthier metrics evaluations
 - Bayesian approach
 - Inclusion of realistic issues ? (Stars not present in all exposures, dithering, ...)

- Most of Euclid's binaries have small angular separations
- Effects on PSF measurement is $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$
- ► Identify harmful binaries (check Kuntzer+16a) using only VIS 4 exposures
- ► Looking for systematic biases in measured PSF parameters
- ✓ "Naive:" auto-correlation analysis, works, but high FPR (data-driven)
- ✓ "Machine learning:" promising, with low FPR (depends on model)
- ► Work in progress:
 - More simulations for healthier metrics evaluations
 - Bayesian approach
 - Inclusion of realistic issues ? (Stars not present in all exposures, dithering, ...)

- Most of Euclid's binaries have small angular separations
- Effects on PSF measurement is $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$
- Identify harmful binaries (check Kuntzer+16a) using only VIS 4 exposures
- Looking for systematic biases in measured PSF parameters
- ✓ "Naive:" auto-correlation analysis, works, but high FPR (data-driven)
- ✓ "Machine learning:" promising, with low FPR (depends on model)
- ▶ Work in progress:
 - More simulations for healthier metrics evaluations
 - Bayesian approach
 - Inclusion of realistic issues ? (Stars not present in all exposures, dithering, ...)

Summary: finding binaries

- Most of Euclid's binaries have small angular separations
- Effects on PSF measurement is $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$
- ▶ Identify harmful binaries (check Kuntzer+16a) using only VIS 4 exposures
- ▶ Looking for systematic biases in measured PSF parameters
- √ "Naive:" auto-correlation analysis, works, but high FPR (data-driven)
- ✓ "Machine learning:" promising, with low FPR (depends on model)
- Work in progress:
 - More simulations for healthier metrics evaluations
 - Bayesian approach
 - Inclusion of realistic issues ? (Stars not present in all exposures, dithering, ...)

- Most of Euclid's binaries have small angular separations
- Effects on PSF measurement is $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$
- ► Identify harmful binaries (check Kuntzer+16a) using only VIS 4 exposures
- ► Looking for systematic biases in measured PSF parameters
- ✓ "Naive:" auto-correlation analysis, works, but high FPR (data-driven)
- ✓ "Machine learning:" promising, with low FPR (depends on model)
- ► Work in progress:
 - More simulations for healthier metrics evaluations
 - Bayesian approach
 - Inclusion of realistic issues ? (Stars not present in all exposures, dithering, ...)

NGC 6397 Colour-Magnitude diagram

using HST F814W single-band images and machine learning



- \blacktriangleright Stellar mass correlate with effective surface temperature \implies spectra \sim ${\it T_{\rm eff}}$
- ► Different slope ⇒ different PSF (chromaticity!)

Angular resolution: $\theta \sim \frac{\lambda}{D}$



- \blacktriangleright Stellar mass correlate with effective surface temperature \implies spectra \sim ${\it T_{\rm eff}}$
- \blacktriangleright Different slope \implies different PSF (chromaticity!)

```
Angular resolution: 	heta \sim rac{\lambda}{D}
```

Stars in a wide band



Stellar mass correlate with effective surface temperature \implies spectra $\sim T_{\rm eff}$

 \blacktriangleright Different slope \implies different PSF (chromaticity!)

Angular resolution:
$$heta \sim rac{\lambda}{D}$$

Classifying stars



Classifying stars



Predicting / Testing phase





 $\blacktriangleright\,$ Globular cluster, age 12.0 $\pm\,$ 0.8 Gyr, 2nd closest to $\odot\,$

▶ Richer+08: *HST* ACS for 126 orbits, F814W, F606W

Goal: Reproduce colour from {F814W image + magnitude} or {image}



 \blacktriangleright Globular cluster, age 12.0 \pm 0.8 Gyr, 2nd closest to \odot

▶ Richer+08: HST ACS for 126 orbits, F814W, F606W

Goal: Reproduce colour from {F814W image + magnitude} or {image}



 \blacktriangleright Globular cluster, age 12.0 \pm 0.8 Gyr, 2nd closest to \odot

Richer+08: HST ACS for 126 orbits, F814W, F606W

▶ Goal: Reproduce colour from {F814W image + magnitude} or {image}



- \blacktriangleright Globular cluster, age 12.0 \pm 0.8 Gyr, 2nd closest to \odot
- ▶ Richer+08: HST ACS for 126 orbits, F814W, F606W
- ▶ Goal: Reproduce colour from {F814W image + magnitude} or {image}



- $\blacktriangleright\,$ Globular cluster, age 12.0 $\pm\,$ 0.8 Gyr, 2nd closest to $\odot\,$
- ▶ Richer+08: *HST* ACS for 126 orbits, F814W, F606W
- ▶ Goal: Reproduce colour from {F814W image + magnitude} or {image}



- Generate two regressions
- Identify non-MS for removal



- Generate two regressions
- Identify non-MS for removal



- Generate two regressions
- Identify non-MS for removal



- Generate two regressions
- Identify non-MS for removal

▶ Creating a CMD for NGC 697 using HST F814W data

- \checkmark Removing WD by hand creates great fit to the actual CMD
- ✓ Inputs: {imagette of star} and {imagette of star + magnitude}
- ▶ Work in progress:
 - Removal of WD using shape of PSF \longrightarrow concept proven in Kuntzer+16b
 - Generate two regressions (?)
 - Using more data (only \sim 500/2300 stars currently used)
 - Training on simulated data

Software on https://github.com/kuntzer/sclas

▶ Creating a CMD for NGC 697 using *HST* F814W data

- $\checkmark\,$ Removing WD by hand creates great fit to the actual CMD
- ✓ Inputs: {imagette of star} and {imagette of star + magnitude}
- ▶ Work in progress:
 - Removal of WD using shape of PSF \longrightarrow concept proven in Kuntzer+16b
 - Generate two regressions (?)
 - Using more data (only \sim 500/2300 stars currently used)
 - Training on simulated data

Software on https://github.com/kuntzer/sclas

- ▶ Creating a CMD for NGC 697 using *HST* F814W data
- \checkmark Removing WD by hand creates great fit to the actual CMD
- ✓ Inputs: {imagette of star} and {imagette of star + magnitude}
- Work in progress:
 - Removal of WD using shape of PSF \longrightarrow concept proven in Kuntzer+16b
 - Generate two regressions (?)
 - Using more data (only $\sim 500/2300$ stars currently used)
 - Training on simulated data
- Software on https://github.com/kuntzer/sclas

- Creating a CMD for NGC 697 using HST F814W data
- $\checkmark\,$ Removing WD by hand creates great fit to the actual CMD
- ✓ Inputs: {imagette of star} and {imagette of star + magnitude}
- ▶ Work in progress:
 - Removal of WD using shape of PSF \longrightarrow concept proven in Kuntzer+16b
 - Generate two regressions (?)
 - Using more data (only $\sim 500/2300$ stars currently used)
 - Training on simulated data
- Software on https://github.com/kuntzer/sclas

PSF INTERPOLATION

using Auto-Encoders and manifold learning



$$\hat{C} pprox (1 + \mathcal{M})C + \mathcal{A}, \qquad \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A} \sim \langle |\delta \mathbf{e}_{\mathsf{PSF}}|^2
angle, \langle \delta R_{\mathsf{PSF}}^2
angle$$

▶ Science requirement for the PSF shape:



From Paulin-Henriksson+2008

Performance needed for measurement

size
$$\sim 5\%$$

ellipticity $\sim 1\%$

Auto-Encoders

- 1. Encode the PSF into a few coefficients
- 2. Interpolate the coefficients

- 1. Encode the PSF into a few coefficients
- 2. Interpolate the coefficients



Auto-Encoder performance







SUMMARY



PDF available at http://obswww.unige.ch/~kuntzer/talks/cea_psf_kuntzer.pdf

- Unresolved binaries can be found
 - Unresolved multiples alter the PSF
 - Most of Euclid's binaries have small angular separations
 - Effects on PSF determination is $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$
 - "Binary finder" based on systematic biases
 - Auto-correlation, random forests and Bayesian approach (?)
- NGC 6397 Colour-Magnitude diagramme
 - Great fit to the Main Sequence
 - Inputs: {imagette of star} and {imagette of star + magnitude}
 - Can we remove non-MS stars and training on simulations?
- Auto-encoders for PSF interpolation
 - Relatively new and promising ML technique
 - Denoising almost for free
 - Seems to work well on handwritten numbers, harder on stellar images
 - Software on https://github.com/kuntzer/pylae

PDF available at http://obswww.unige.ch/~kuntzer/talks/cea_psf_kuntzer.pdf

Unresolved binaries can be found

- Unresolved multiples alter the PSF
- Most of Euclid's binaries have small angular separations
- Effects on PSF determination is $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$
- "Binary finder" based on systematic biases
- Auto-correlation, random forests and Bayesian approach (?)

NGC 6397 Colour-Magnitude diagramme

- Great fit to the Main Sequence
- Inputs: {imagette of star} and {imagette of star + magnitude}
- Can we remove non-MS stars and training on simulations?

Auto-encoders for PSF interpolation

- Relatively new and promising ML technique
- Denoising almost for free
- Seems to work well on handwritten numbers, harder on stellar images
- Software on https://github.com/kuntzer/pylae

PDF available at http://obswww.unige.ch/~kuntzer/talks/cea_psf_kuntzer.pdf

Unresolved binaries can be found

- Unresolved multiples alter the PSF
- Most of Euclid's binaries have small angular separations
- Effects on PSF determination is \$\mathcal{O}\$(10⁻⁴)
- "Binary finder" based on systematic biases
- Auto-correlation, random forests and Bayesian approach (?)
- NGC 6397 Colour-Magnitude diagramme
 - Great fit to the Main Sequence
 - Inputs: {imagette of star} and {imagette of star + magnitude}
 - Can we remove non-MS stars and training on simulations?

Auto-encoders for PSF interpolation

- Relatively new and promising ML technique
- Denoising almost for free
- Seems to work well on handwritten numbers, harder on stellar images
- Software on https://github.com/kuntzer/pylae

PDF available at http://obswww.unige.ch/~kuntzer/talks/cea_psf_kuntzer.pdf

- Unresolved binaries can be found
 - Unresolved multiples alter the PSF
 - Most of Euclid's binaries have small angular separations
 - Effects on PSF determination is $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$
 - "Binary finder" based on systematic biases
 - Auto-correlation, random forests and Bayesian approach (?)
- NGC 6397 Colour-Magnitude diagramme
 - Great fit to the Main Sequence
 - Inputs: {imagette of star} and {imagette of star + magnitude}
 - Can we remove non-MS stars and training on simulations?
- Auto-encoders for PSF interpolation
 - Relatively new and promising ML technique
 - Denoising almost for free
 - Seems to work well on handwritten numbers, harder on stellar images
 - Software on https://github.com/kuntzer/pylae

