

Universal uncertainty estimation for nuclear detector signals with neural networks and ensemble learning

Pengcheng Ai^{a,b}, Zhi Deng^{a,b,*}, Yi Wang^{a,b}, Chendi Shen^{a,b}

^aDepartment of Engineering Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

^bKey Laboratory of Particle and Radiation Imaging (Tsinghua University), Ministry of Education, Beijing 100084, China

Abstract

Characterizing uncertainty is a common issue in nuclear measurement and has important implications for reliable physical discovery. Traditional methods are either insufficient to cope with the heterogeneous nature of uncertainty or inadequate to perform well with unknown mathematical models. In this paper, we propose using multi-layer convolutional neural networks for empirical uncertainty estimation and feature extraction of nuclear pulse signals. This method is based on deep learning, a recent development of machine learning techniques, which learns the desired mapping function from training data and generalizes to unseen test data. Furthermore, ensemble learning is utilized to estimate the uncertainty originated from trainable parameters of the network and improve the robustness of the whole model. To evaluate the performance of the proposed method, simulation studies, in comparison with curve fitting, investigate extensive conditions and show its universal applicability. Finally, a case study with the NICA-MPD electromagnetic calorimeter is performed with test beam at DESY, Germany. The uncertainty estimation method successfully detected out-of-distribution samples and also achieved good accuracy in time and energy measurements.

Keywords: Nuclear detector signals, Uncertainty estimation, Deep learning, Ensemble learning

1. Introduction

In nuclear physics instruments, front-end electronics produce electrical signals when a target particle enters the sensitive volume of the detector. Due to the charge collection in a certain period of time and dedicated shaping circuits, these signals are usually unipolar or bipolar pulses with finite duration and amplitude [1]. Many factors, such as particle type, incident energy, incident angle and location, etc., influence the shape and intensity of the nuclear pulse signal and make it a complicated statistical process to acquire relevant information from the pulse. The common practice is to calibrate the detector and subsequent electronics with a few kinds of test beam and fit measurements to a fixed distribution. Equivalently, the uncertainty of measurements is assumed to be *homogeneous*, at least in certain conditions. However, in real experimental circumstances, uncertainty varies as a result of both the fluctuation of noise residing in the measurements (*aleatoric* uncertainty or *data* uncertainty) and the statistical model to understand the observations (*epistemic* uncertainty or *model* uncertainty). These indicate the actual uncertainty is *heterogeneous* and changes between different sets of measurements.

Modelling heterogeneous uncertainty is a recursive topic in statistical machine learning. In recent years, with the research of deep learning [2] going deep, researchers begin to realize that deep neural networks are able to model uncertainty in a wide range of tasks from classification to regression [3, 4, 5]. In these works, the main task (either producing a discrete label or a continuous value) and the associated uncertainty are combined into a unified formulation and learned jointly. The estimated uncertainty works as a weight

*Corresponding author

Email address: dengz@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn (Zhi Deng)

coefficient to give differentiated attentions to data and effectively temper the loss caused by problematic examples. In this way, the learned degree of uncertainty correlates with the variation of data and even improves the accuracy of the main task.

Recently, analog-to-digital converters with hundreds of sampling rates come onto the stage of nuclear detectors because of their flexibility and property of information preservation [6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. It also provides a great opportunity to apply novel machine learning algorithms to traditional problems in nuclear instrumentation. In [11], a neural network based on autoencoders was used for timing and characterization of pulse signals from a photon spectrometer. It achieved significantly better results than curve fitting. The pulse-processing neural network was validated by the field programmable gate array [12] and the application specific integrated circuit (ASIC) [13]. Furthermore in [14], the authors demonstrated that neural networks could attain timing resolution near Cramér Rao lower bound in radiation detector systems. In the light of these previous contributions, it is thus worthwhile to explore the extent of neural networks to quantify heterogeneous uncertainty and establish reliable measurements in nuclear detectors.

In this paper, we aim to develop an uncertainty estimation method commonly applicable to nuclear detector signals in a wide range of scenarios. The simulation study in Section 4 serves the purpose of validating its universality. Furthermore, to evaluate its performance in real-world detectors, we use the signals from the electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL) designed for the Multi Purpose Detector (MPD) at the NICA collider [15, 16] as a case study (Section 5). The contributions of the paper are listed as follows:

- We design an algorithm and associated network architectures specially tailored for nuclear detector signals to extract physical features and estimate the corresponding uncertainty. The algorithm achieves desired accuracy in both feature regression and uncertainty estimation.
- We systematically demonstrate the feasibility and superiority of the proposed method through simulation study of a typical mathematical model, in comparison with curve fitting.
- Test beam is performed with ECAL for NICA-MPD to evaluate the actual performance of the method in real-world detectors and also the ability of out-of-distribution detection.

2. A brief introduction to ECAL at NICA-MPD

ECAL is a sampling calorimeter with shashlik structure made by alternate lead absorbers and plastic scintillators. The detailed technical specification can be found in [17]. The main goals of the calorimeter are particle identification jointly with other parts of MPD, measurement of the photon flux, and effective detection of photon from primary or secondary decays for reconstruction. The commissioning of the detector with NICA collider is originally scheduled for December 2021 and delayed by COVID-19. In the first stage of collider run, ECAL is equipped with silicon photomultipliers and waveform sampling-based front-end electronics. 7% energy resolution (300 MeV electron beam) and 750 ps time resolution (cosmic muons) were achieved using a 12-bit 62.5 MSPS analog-to-digital converter (ADC). Upgrades of readout electronics are currently under research and development. ASICs integrated with high-speed ADCs (up to several hundreds of MHz) and digital feature extraction circuits are proposed to be used in the next stage of collider run to improve energy and time resolution. Machine learning techniques, especially neural networks accelerated by digital logic, are studied for their potential to replace traditional fixed algorithms. In particular, the research in this paper is a recent attempt to deploy neural networks in the front-end electronics of ECAL for NICA-MPD experiment.

3. Methodology

3.1. Preliminaries of neural networks and deep learning

Artificial neural networks had been invented since 1950s, and regained great attention soon after AlexNet succeeded in image classification [18]. AlexNet was a classical convolutional neural network (CNN) aimed at two-dimensional grid data, typically in computer vision. Many well-crafted architectures [19, 20] were




Figure 1: (a) An illustration of one-dimensional (1D) convolution layer, the building block of 1D convolutional neural network. The optional activation after bias addition is not plotted in this functional graph. (b) The workflow of a single neural network model, and the method to combine several individual neural network models into an ensemble in the test stage. The inner structure in the square, which can be any network architecture in practice, is only for demonstration.

proposed after the success of AlexNet. Actually, CNNs can not only be two-dimensional, but also three-dimensional [21] or one-dimensional [22], depending on the structure of the data.

Fig. 1(a) illustrates the working principle of one-dimensional (1D) convolution layer, which is used throughout the paper. For each slice of the kernel matrix ($K \times IC$), it is convolved with the input feature map at a specific location to generate one line of output (OL). The convolution is in essence the multiply-and-accumulate operation fundamental to any implementation of CNN. The convolved result is then added by the per-channel bias, and finally an optional activation function (usually the rectified linear unit, or ReLU [23]) applies to the sum. This process is executed recurrently to produce the OC output channels.

It should be noted that the fully-connected matrix multiplication, usually after 1D convolution, can also be represented by Fig. 1(a) when stride S equals the kernel size K . The only difference is that each slice of the kernel is used only *once*, instead of reusing across the input length (IL).

3.2. Architecture

Table 1: Network architecture used in the simulation. The stride (S) is kept to 2 in convolution layers, and the padding scheme is to ensure reducing the length to half.

name	IL	IC	K	OL	OC	Act.
conv1	32	1	4	16	16	ReLU
conv2	16	16	4	8	32	ReLU
conv3	8	32	4	4	32	ReLU
name	IL*IC			OL*OC		Act.
fc1	4*32		–	64		ReLU
fc2	64		–	64		ReLU
fc3	64		–	4		None

Table 1 and Table 2 give the network architectures at the layer level used in the simulation study (Section 4) and experiment (Section 5). Each of the architectures is divided into two parts, the convolution layers and the regression layers. The convolution layers, without the assistance of max pooling, operate as a nonlinear

Table 2: Network architecture used in the experiment. The stride (S) and the padding scheme are the same as those used in the simulation.

name	IL	IC	K	OL	OC	Act.
conv1	64	1	4	32	8	ReLU
conv2	32	8	4	16	16	ReLU
conv3	16	16	4	8	32	ReLU
conv4	8	32	4	4	64	ReLU
conv5	4	64	4	2	64	ReLU
name	IL*IC			OL*OC		Act.
fc1	2*64		–	64		ReLU
fc2	64		–	64		ReLU
fc3	64		–	4		None

filter and feature encoder to generate the embedding of original signal in a noisy setting. The regression layers, made up of fully-connected matrix multiplication, establish the mathematical function between the regression target and the feature embedding. In combination, the architecture is proved to work effectively for regression tasks aimed at 1D signals in nuclear detectors.

3.3. Optimization strategy

When optimizing the parameters of the neural network through back-propagation, we need an optimization target, or loss function, to judge how well the network model fits the desired mapping. Assume we have M regression targets, each of which needs two outputs (predictive mean and predictive variance in Equation 1). With N i.i.d. examples, the loss function is given by Equation 2:

$$\mathbf{f}_{\text{NN}}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = [\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x})^2], \quad \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 \in \mathbb{R}^M, \quad \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 > 0 \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{1}{2\sigma_j(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})^2} \left\| y_j^{(i)} - \mu_j(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) \right\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \log \sigma_j(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})^2 \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{f} is the mapping function of the neural network model, \mathbf{x} is the input time series of signal, \mathbf{y} is the ground-truth label indicating the desired output, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is the trainable parameters of the neural network, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2$ are predictive mean and predictive variance, respectively.

In practice, in order to force σ_j^2 to be positive without explicit constraints, we let the network to output $\log(\sigma_j^2)$ and use the exponential function when computing the loss. This ensures the predictive variance always to be positive. Because both the time and energy are desired simultaneously, we use $M = 2$ and design the output length of the neural network to be 4 (Table 1 and Table 2).

3.4. Ensemble learning

A single neural network is sufficient to model aleatoric uncertainty due to the noise of measurement. However, it is unable to describe epistemic uncertainty regarding how well our neural network model understands the data. To model epistemic uncertainty, an ensemble considering the variations of network parameters is needed. Besides, ensemble learning combines the individual results of several weak models and thus improves the stability when generalizing to test data. The formation of the ensemble from individual neural networks is shown in Fig. 1(b). In the training stage, several independent neural networks are initialized with different parameters and trained separately. In the test stage, the same input data is fed to each neural network in the ensemble, and the results are combined at the other end. The comprehensive mean and variance are determined as follows:

$$\mu_{j,*}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mu_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}_t}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (3)$$

$$\sigma_{j,*}(\mathbf{x})^2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\sigma_{j,\theta_t}(\mathbf{x})^2 + \mu_{j,\theta_t}(\mathbf{x})^2) - \mu_{j,*}(\mathbf{x})^2 \quad (4)$$

where T is the number of individual models, θ_t is the trainable parameters of the t -th model, $\mu_{j,\theta_t}, \sigma_{j,\theta_t}^2$ are mean and variance outputs for the j -th regression target in the t -th model, and $\mu_{j,*}, \sigma_{j,*}^2$ are the combined mean and variance for the j -th regression target.

For the predictive mean, the introduction of ensemble learning can improve the robustness to over-fitting and make the model generalize well to unseen examples. For the predictive variance, it is an effective way to quantize epistemic uncertainty by exploring variations of the model parameters.

4. Simulation Study




Figure 2: Normalized calibration plots for different conditions in the simulation. The blue lines with circle markers represent curve fitting, and the magenta lines with square markers represent ensemble of neural networks.




Figure 3: Distribution of uncertainty predictions for curve fitting (blue, diagonal) and ensemble of neural networks (orange, back diagonal), in the multimodal conditions. Each of the green dashed lines represent best achievable variance (Cramér Rao lower bound) of regression under a certain noise level.

Table 3: Quantitative results of predictive performance for different conditions in the simulation.

		time					energy				
		NLL	B-UCE	A-UCE	bias (ns)	precision (ns)	NLL	B-UCE	A-UCE	bias	precision
unimodal	fit	-4.243e-01	2.542e-03	1.547e-03	0.007	0.166	-1.681e+00	4.179e-04	9.110e-04	0.013%	1.552%
uncorrelated	ensem.	-4.318e-01	5.559e-03	3.233e-03	-0.003	0.163	-1.697e+00	3.776e-04	4.505e-03	-0.083%	1.535%
multimodal	fit	1.800e-01	3.244e-02	2.233e-03	0.011	0.390	-1.133e+00	2.329e-03	4.885e-04	0.082%	3.485%
uncorrelated	ensem.	9.253e-02	2.417e-02	4.291e-03	0.005	0.342	-1.148e+00	2.015e-03	3.637e-03	0.117%	3.329%
unimodal	fit	8.113e-01	5.304e-02	9.149e-02	0.001	0.277	-6.417e-01	3.461e-03	8.731e-02	0.043%	2.528%
correlated	ensem.	-3.097e-01	5.877e-03	9.465e-03	-0.009	0.185	-1.338e+00	6.154e-04	1.900e-03	-0.024%	2.196%
multimodal	fit	1.441e+00	3.242e-01	9.060e-02	0.022	0.665	-1.301e-01	1.697e-02	7.239e-02	0.273%	5.624%
correlated	ensem.	2.254e-01	2.166e-02	1.584e-03	0.012	0.402	-8.060e-01	3.168e-03	6.299e-03	0.474%	4.600%

In this section, we study the possibilities and advantages of neural networks and ensemble learning to characterize uncertainty of nuclear detector signals. This is done by comparing neural networks to nonlinear least squares curve fitting when the signals have a precise mathematical function. In certain conditions (uncorrelated noise), curve fitting gives the near-optimal estimation of uncertainty; in other conditions (correlated noise), curve fitting is sub-optimal and unable to estimate the uncertainty precisely. By observing the behaviors of neural networks and curve fitting in different conditions, we can gain understandings of the propose method both qualitatively and quantitatively.

We use the following CRRC waveform (generated by step function passing through a CRRC circuit) in the simulation study:

$$s(t) = K \left(\frac{t - t_0}{\tau} \right) e^{-(t-t_0)/\tau} u(t - t_0) \quad (5)$$

where τ is the shape coefficient related to the resistance and capacitance in the CRRC circuit, t_0 is the start time of the waveform (timing label), K is the amplitude of the waveform (energy label), and $u(t)$ is the step function. The waveform is sampled at a fixed interval to produce the input time series. Throughout the simulation, we use $\tau = 10$ ns, and sample 32 points with 2 ns interval (500 MSPS). When generating the datasets, K is sampled from a uniform distribution between 2.0 and 4.0, and t_0 is sampled from a uniform distribution between 0 ns and 4 ns.

When training neural networks, we use 8000 examples in the training set and 2000 examples in the test set. With the batch size of 64, we train for 40 epochs using the Adam [24] optimization algorithm at 0.001 learning rate to minimize the loss in Section 3.3. We use an ensemble of 5 neural networks throughout the paper. The software is implemented with Keras [25], an open-source deep learning framework, on a desktop computer with RTX 2060 Super GPU (8 GB video memory).

4.1. Unimodal uncorrelated condition

In this setting, a random Gaussian white noise with 0.05 standard deviation is added to the sampling points. Since noises at different times are completely uncorrelated, nonlinear least squares curve fitting gives the maximum likelihood estimation [11] with reasonable standard errors of fitting parameters. It should be noted that this condition is a strong assumption and very idealized since the underlying mathematical function is unknown and variable in reality.

To assess the overall quality of predictive uncertainty, we draw the normalized calibration plots [26] to visualize observed confidence levels at different expected confidence levels (refer to Algorithm 1). When the uncertainty is perfectly calibrated, the above two confidence levels should match at any interval, resulting in a straight line from (0, 0) to (1, 1). In the first column of Fig. 2, it can be seen that both curve fitting and ensemble of neural networks achieve good calibration, while curve fitting is slightly better, in the unimodal uncorrelated condition. This is further proved by the A-UCE (explained later) column in Table 3, which is a direct measure of the deviation to the straight line in the normalized calibration plot.

Algorithm 1 Computation of performance metrics and normalized calibration plot (NCP).

Input: data $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(N)} \in \mathbb{R}^L$, ground-truth label $\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(N)} \in \mathbb{R}^M$, predictive model: $f: \mathbb{R}^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2M}$

Input: normal density: $p(x; \mu, \sigma)$, normal distribution: $F(x; \mu, \sigma)$, number of uncertainty levels: N_B, N_A

Output: NLL, B-UCE, A-UCE, bias, precision and NCP

for $i = 1$ **to** N **do**

propagate $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ throughout the model: $(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{2(i)}) \leftarrow f(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{2(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^M$

end for

for $j = 1$ **to** M **do**

$$\text{NLL}_j \leftarrow -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log p(y_j^{(i)}; \mu_j^{(i)}, \sigma_j^{(i)})$$

$$\check{\sigma}_j^2 \leftarrow \max \sigma_j^{2(\cdot)} \text{ and } \bar{\sigma}_j^2 = \min \sigma_j^{2(\cdot)}$$

$$\mathcal{U}_k \leftarrow \left\{ i \mid (\check{\sigma}_j^2 - \bar{\sigma}_j^2) \cdot \frac{(k-1)}{N_B} + \bar{\sigma}_j^2 \leq \sigma_j^{2(i)} < (\check{\sigma}_j^2 - \bar{\sigma}_j^2) \cdot \frac{k}{N_B} + \bar{\sigma}_j^2 \right\} \text{ for } k = 1, 2, \dots, N_B$$

$$\text{B-UCE}_j \leftarrow \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N_B} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}_k} \|y_j^{(i)} - \mu_j^{(i)}\|^2 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}_k} \sigma_j^{2(i)} \right|$$

$$\mathcal{V}_k \leftarrow \left\{ i \mid F(y_j^{(i)}; \mu_j^{(i)}, \sigma_j^{(i)}) < \frac{k}{N_A} \right\} \text{ for } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N_A$$

$$\text{A-UCE}_j \leftarrow \sum_{k=0}^{N_A} \left(\frac{k}{N_A} - |\mathcal{V}_k| \right)^2 \text{ and plot } \left\{ \left(\frac{k}{N_A}, |\mathcal{V}_k| \right) \right\}_{k=0}^M \text{ as NCP}_j$$

$$\text{bias}_j \leftarrow \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\mu_j^{(i)} - y_j^{(i)} \right)$$

$$\text{precision}_j \leftarrow \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\mu_j^{(i)} - y_j^{(i)} - \text{bias}_j \right)^2}$$

end for

In Table 3, we list negative log-likelihood (NLL) [3], binned uncertainty calibration error (B-UCE) [5], accumulated uncertainty calibration error (A-UCE) [26], bias and precision for time and energy prediction in each condition. All these metrics are explained in Algorithm 1. In them, NLL on the test set is a comprehensive index to judge how well the model estimates the true value and assigns uncertainty to each estimation, B-UCE/A-UCE measures the results by integrating the predictive variance and the actual error, and bias/precision mainly deals with the predictive mean. The smaller values of these measures, the better, except for the bias which needs a small absolute value.

The first two rows of the table compare curve fitting with ensemble of neural networks in this condition. In general, ensemble of neural networks performs at least as well as curve fitting (reflected by NLL and precision). The reason why ensemble can be even better is that curve fitting may stop at a position which is not the global minimum during the numerical optimization process. In contrast, ensemble of neural networks is more robust given sufficient training examples.

4.2. Correlation

Correlation is pervasive in nuclear detector signals because of dependence between sampling points. To study this condition, a random Gaussian white noise with 4.0 standard deviation is injected at the source side before the CRRC circuit. After filtered by the bandpass CRRC shaper, the noise is significantly attenuated and rendered a low-frequency behavior. Because of correlation, curve fitting is no longer the maximum likelihood estimation so that it may give sub-optimal fitting results and unreasonable standard errors. However, because of the highly nonlinear mapping, neural networks are competent to work well even though the input data is correlated [11].

In the third and fourth columns of Fig. 2, it can be seen that the calibration plots of curve fitting deviate from the straight line apparently. In comparison, ensemble of neural networks still keeps to the straight line just as it does in the former condition. This shows the advantage of neural networks and ensemble learning when the statistical distributions of input data are not independent.

The last four rows in Table 3 give quantitative results in the correlated setting. Ensemble of neural networks is consistently and significantly better than curve fitting in all measures except for the bias which is not a serious issue in this problem. Among them, large improvements of NLL and precision are observed. These further demonstrate the advantage of the proposed method.

4.3. Multi-modality

In the discussions above, the noise is assumed to have a single standard deviation. It is worthwhile to investigate the condition when the noise fluctuates and takes variable values to reveal the multimodal adaptability. For this purpose, we add noise with the original value and the three-fold value of standard deviation at equal probabilities. The standard deviation only varies *between* examples; for a single example, the noise is kept as the same.

In the second and fourth columns of Fig. 2, it can be seen that multi-modality does not change the performance of studied methods in a noteworthy way. When the noise is uncorrelated, curve fitting is slightly better; when the noise is correlated, ensemble of neural networks is significantly better. Similar conclusions can be drawn from Table 3.

Fig. 3 illustrates multimodal distributions of predictive variance when the standard deviation of noise takes two distinct values. We also annotate the Cramér Rao lower bound [14] for each value of standard deviation. When the noise is uncorrelated, the distributions of predictive variance show good accordance to two modalities. When the noise is correlated, ensemble of neural networks performs steadily, while curve fitting tends to underestimate the larger variance especially for energy regression. This demonstrates that ensemble of neural networks can adapt to multi-modality as well as correlation.

5. Experiment



Figure 4: A photograph of the test beam scene of the NICA-MPD electromagnetic calorimeter at DESY.

We applied 1 GeV electron test beam to study the characteristics of ECAL at Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron (DESY), Germany. The detector response signal was recorded and digitized by 5-GSPS 4-channel DRS4 data acquisition board. Three channels were used to generate triggers and provide timing labels, and the other one was connected to the detector. The test system is shown in Fig. 4.

To train the neural networks, we construct a dataset of valid detector signals along with their timing labels and energy labels. The original waveform is sub-sampled with a ratio of 10:1 (500 MSPS). Here, the




Figure 5: (a) Normalized calibration plots for comparison of traditional methods and neural networks in the experiment. The numbers in the brackets are A-UCF scores. (b) Examples of normal and outlying waveform observed in the experiment. The inset axes are waveform segments used to feed neural networks. (c) Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves for several network hyper-parameters based on the predictive variance of time and energy. (d) ROC curves for several quantization schemes based on the predictive variance of time and energy.

Table 4: Quantitative results of predictive performance for different conditions in the experiment.

	time			energy		
	NLL	precision (ns)	AUC	NLL	precision	AUC
baseline	-5.965e-01	0.142	0.932	-4.064e+00	0.60%	0.950
dCFD & int.	1.382e+00	0.878	–	1.948e+00	0.64%	–
baseline	-5.965e-01	0.142	0.932	-4.064e+00	0.60%	0.950
3 conv. layers	-5.853e-01	0.142	0.932	-4.460e+00	0.41%	0.966
1 conv. layer	-5.546e-01	0.149	0.919	-4.775e+00	0.29%	0.985
2 fc layers	-5.825e-01	0.142	0.940	-4.138e+00	0.55%	0.958
baseline	-5.965e-01	0.142	0.932	-4.064e+00	0.60%	0.950
8-bit quant.	-5.358e-01	0.149	0.936	-3.749e+00	0.89%	0.968
6-bit quant.	-4.801e-01	0.158	0.861	-3.255e+00	1.22%	0.905

energy label is determined by measuring the pulse integral value before sub-sampling as in the simulation. This generates an energy precision (in Table 4) independent of the intrinsic energy resolution of the detector. Then the dataset is divided into the training set, comprising 8000 examples, and the test set, comprising 2000 examples. We train for 600 epochs with a batch size of 128, and another 300 epochs of quantization-aware training if quantization is used (in the last two rows of Table 4). Other configurations are the same as Section 4. We apply bias-cancelling and sigma-scaling [5] on the network outputs to improve the consistency of the test results.

5.1. Predictive performance

In Table 4, we list major test results in the experiment. The first two rows compare the baseline (ensemble of neural networks with architecture in Table 2) and traditional methods, which use digital constant fraction discrimination (dCFD) for time measurement and waveform integration for energy measurement. The energy precision of waveform integration is close to the baseline, while the timing precision of dCFD is much worse than the baseline. Besides, the estimated NLL values of traditional methods are much bigger than ensemble of neural networks. This is validated by Fig. 5(a), where dCFD and waveform integration show larger deviation to the straight line than the baseline. These demonstrate the limitation of traditional fixed algorithms being unable to characterize uncertainty precisely with unknown mathematical models.

In the next 7 rows in Table 4, we list test results using ensemble of neural networks with different configurations. In all conditions except 6-bit quantization, the timing precision achieves better than 150 ps, and the best figure is 142 ps, which is significantly better than 212.4 ps reported in [27]. Also in most cases, the energy precision is trivial compared to reported 4.5% energy resolution, which means that using ensemble of neural networks will not cause significant resolution loss for energy. These results confirm the outstanding accuracy of the proposed method when applying to experimental detector signals.

5.2. Out-of-distribution detection

A very noticeable enhancement enabled by uncertainty estimation is the ability to detect out-of-distribution examples. By setting a threshold for predictive variance, new signals unlike training data will be distinguished. No explicit statistical assumptions are needed in the process, and all knowledge about the data distribution is implicitly inherited in the neural network model. The difference between what is done here and pulse shape discrimination is that we *do not* know the data distribution of out-of-distribution examples and *do not* use them to train neural networks.

In Fig. 5(b), we show some samples of normal and outlying waveform, and also the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves by time/energy criteria in Fig. 5(c) and Fig. 5(d). By inspecting the outliers, they are either (i) overflowing above the dynamic range; (ii) displaying distinct vibration; or (iii) too small in amplitude. The normal signals, used to train the neural networks, show good uniformity and little deformation. In ROC curves, we change the variance threshold to get background rejection (the ratio of outliers above the threshold) vs. signal efficiency (the ratio of normal signals below the threshold).

It can be seen in the ROC curves that the proposed method achieves satisfactory separation between normal signals and outliers. All curves are well above the neutral straight line from (0, 1) to (1, 0), indicating distinct differences in variance distributions and small overlapping regions. Area under curve (AUC) is a numerical index to judge an ROC curve. In Table 4, most AUC values are above 0.9 (with only one exception), and AUC values by energy criterion are better than corresponding AUC values by time criterion.

5.3. Hyper-parameter sensitivity

Neural networks are compute-intensive models. To customize the network architecture, it is worthwhile to explore different hyper-parameter settings with an emphasis on their impact on performance. In the middle four rows of Table 4, we compare three more compact models with the baseline: reducing convolution layers to the upper three, reducing convolution layers to the upper one, and reducing fully-connected layers to two (the middle layer is removed). It can be seen that these compact models do not suffer obvious performance degradation. Actually, in the energy section, compact models exhibit some advantage with the experimental dataset being used (the best case is 1 convolution layer). In general, removing redundant layers will restrict the hypothesis space and alleviate the problem of over-fitting. However, one should bear in mind that dedicated structure and enough model capacity are essential to work in more complicated situations. In [11], it was demonstrated that a fully-connected feedforward neural network is unable to predict time in intense random Gaussian noise. Usually timing prediction is more challenging than energy prediction, and well-structured network architecture is vital for network convergence in harsh situations.

5.4. Quantization effect

It has been demonstrated above that the proposed method can work well as a computer software when waveform samples are present. Beyond being used offline, deploying the algorithm on front-end electronics is appealing because feature extraction can reduce the transmitted data substantially and thus decrease power consumption in the nuclear detector dataflow. For digital integrated circuits, it is much more economical to use low bit-width fixed point operations than floating point operations commonly used in computer software. To evaluate the effect of quantization, we quantize the weights and activations of the network to 8-bit fixed point and 6-bit fixed point, respectively. The results are shown in the bottom three rows of Table 4. In summary, using 8-bit quantization will shrink the performance slightly and the degradation is totally acceptable; using 6-bit quantization is more aggressive so as to influence the performance more obviously. One should judge the most appropriate quantization scheme as a balance of cost and accuracy.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, a novel method based on data science and artificial intelligence, namely ensemble of neural networks, is proposed for uncertainty estimation of nuclear detector signals. The network architecture is specially designed to produce predictive mean and predictive variance of physics-related features with the help of a dedicated loss function. Both simulations and experiments prove that the method gives not only satisfactory predictions of features, but also justified uncertainty of predictions. The application of the method is multi-faceted and far-reaching. We hope this work will benefit the community for conceptualization and design of future detector systems in physical experiments.

Acknowledgements

This research is supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (under project no. 2020YFE0202001). This research is also supported by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (under grant no. 2021M690088).

References

- [1] S. Landsberger, N. Tsoufanidis, N. Tsoufanidis, *Measurement and Detection of Radiation*, 4th Edition, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2015. doi:10.1201/b18203.
- [2] A. Shrestha, A. Mahmood, Review of Deep Learning Algorithms and Architectures, *IEEE Access* 7 (2019) 53040–53065. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2912200.
- [3] B. Lakshminarayanan, A. Pritzel, C. Blundell, Simple and Scalable Predictive Uncertainty Estimation using Deep Ensembles, in: I. Guyon, U. von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. M. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, R. Garnett (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017*, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA, 2017, pp. 6402–6413.
- [4] A. Kendall, Y. Gal, What Uncertainties Do We Need in Bayesian Deep Learning for Computer Vision?, in: I. Guyon, U. von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. M. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, R. Garnett (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017*, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA, 2017, pp. 5574–5584.
- [5] M. Laves, S. Ihler, J. F. Fast, L. A. Kahrs, T. Ortmaier, Well-Calibrated Regression Uncertainty in Medical Imaging with Deep Learning, in: T. Arbel, I. B. Ayed, M. de Bruijne, M. Descoteaux, H. Lombaert, C. Pal (Eds.), *International Conference on Medical Imaging with Deep Learning, MIDL 2020*, 6-8 July 2020, Montréal, QC, Canada, Vol. 121 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, PMLR, 2020, pp. 393–412.
- [6] X. Fabian, G. Baulieu, L. Ducroux, O. Stézowski, A. Boujrad, E. Clément, S. Coudert, G. de France, N. Erduran, S. Ertürk, V. González, G. Jaworski, J. Nyberg, D. Ralet, E. Sanchis, R. Wadsworth, Artificial neural networks for neutron/ γ discrimination in the neutron detectors of NEDA, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 986 (2021) 164750. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2020.164750>.
- [7] R. Gladen, V. Chirayath, A. Fairchild, M. Manry, A. Koymen, A. Weiss, Efficient machine learning approach for optimizing the timing resolution of a high purity germanium detector, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 981 (2020) 164505. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2020.164505>.

- [8] X.-Y. Zhao, F. Liu, Z. Deng, Y.-N. Liu, GERO: a general SCA-based readout ASIC for micro-pattern gas detectors with configurable storage depth and on-chip digitizer, *Nuclear Science and Techniques* 30 (9) (2019) 131. doi:10.1007/s41365-019-0659-2.
- [9] W. Liu, X. Zhao, Z. Deng, F. Li, X. Gu, Y. Li, H. Qi, WASA: a low power front-end ASIC for time projection chambers in 65 nm CMOS, *Journal of Instrumentation* 15 (05) (2020) P05005–P05005. doi:10.1088/1748-0221/15/05/p05005.
- [10] F. Wang, D. Han, Y. Wang, Y. Yu, P. Lyu, B. Guo, The study of a new time reconstruction method for MRPC read out by waveform digitizer, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 954 (2020) 161224, symposium on Radiation Measurements and Applications XVII. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2018.09.059.
- [11] P. Ai, D. Wang, G. Huang, N. Fang, D. Xu, F. Zhang, Timing and characterization of shaped pulses with MHz ADCs in a detector system: a comparative study and deep learning approach, *Journal of Instrumentation* 14 (03) (2019) P03002–P03002. doi:10.1088/1748-0221/14/03/p03002.
- [12] J.-L. Chen, P.-C. Ai, D. Wang, H. Wang, N. Fang, D.-L. Xu, Q. Gong, Y.-K. Yang, FPGA implementation of neural network accelerator for pulse information extraction in high energy physics, *Nuclear Science and Techniques* 31 (5) (2020) 46. doi:10.1007/s41365-020-00756-z.
- [13] P. Ai, D. Wang, G. Huang, F. Shen, N. Fang, D. Xu, H. Wang, J. Chen, PulseDL: A reconfigurable deep learning array processor dedicated to pulse characterization for high energy physics detectors, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 978 (2020) 164420. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2020.164420.
- [14] P. Ai, Z. Deng, Y. Wang, L. Li, Neural network-featured timing systems for radiation detectors: performance evaluation based on bound analysis, *Journal of Instrumentation* 16 (09) (2021) P09019. doi:10.1088/1748-0221/16/09/p09019.
- [15] C. Shen, D. Xiao, Y. Wang, B. Wang, H. Miao, Y. Li, D. Han, I. Tyapkin, Z. Zou, Y. Li, Development of shashlik electromagnetic calorimeter for the NICA/MPD, *Journal of Instrumentation* 14 (06) (2019) T06005–T06005. doi:10.1088/1748-0221/14/06/t06005.
- [16] A. Semenov, S. Bazylev, E. Belyaeva, M. Bhattacharjee, B. Dabrowska, D. Egorov, V. Golovatyuk, Y. Krechetov, A. Shutov, V. Shutov, S. Sukhovarov, A. Terletskiy, I. Tyapkin, Electromagnetic calorimeter for MPD spectrometer at NICA collider, *Journal of Instrumentation* 15 (05) (2020) C05017–C05017. doi:10.1088/1748-0221/15/05/c05017.
- [17] MPD NICA technical design report of the electromagnetic calorimeter (ECal), http://mpd.jinr.ru/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/TDR_ECAL_v3.6_2019.pdf, accessed: 2021-5-24.
- [18] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, G. E. Hinton, ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks, *Commun. ACM* 60 (6) (2017) 84–90. doi:10.1145/3065386.
- [19] C. Szegedy, W. Liu, Y. Jia, P. Sermanet, S. E. Reed, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, V. Vanhoucke, A. Rabinovich, Going deeper with convolutions, in: *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2015, Boston, MA, USA, June 7-12, 2015*, IEEE Computer Society, 2015, pp. 1–9. doi:10.1109/CVPR.2015.7298594.
- [20] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, J. Sun, Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition, in: *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2016, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 27-30, 2016*, IEEE Computer Society, 2016, pp. 770–778. doi:10.1109/CVPR.2016.90.
- [21] P. Ai, D. Wang, G. Huang, X. Sun, Three-dimensional convolutional neural networks for neutrinoless double-beta decay signal/background discrimination in high-pressure gaseous Time Projection Chamber, *Journal of Instrumentation* 13 (08) (2018) P08015–P08015. doi:10.1088/1748-0221/13/08/p08015.
- [22] O. Abdeljaber, O. Avcı, S. Kiranyaz, M. Gabbouj, D. J. Inman, Real-time vibration-based structural damage detection using one-dimensional convolutional neural networks, *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 388 (2017) 154–170. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsv.2016.10.043.
- [23] B. Xu, N. Wang, T. Chen, M. Li, Empirical Evaluation of Rectified Activations in Convolutional Network (2015). arXiv:1505.00853.
- [24] D. P. Kingma, J. Ba, Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization, in: *Y. Bengio, Y. LeCun (Eds.), 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings, 2015*.
- [25] F. Chollet, Keras, <https://github.com/keras-team/keras> (2015).
- [26] V. Kuleshov, N. Fenner, S. Ermon, Accurate Uncertainties for Deep Learning Using Calibrated Regression, in: *J. G. Dy, A. Krause (Eds.), Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018, Vol. 80 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, PMLR, 2018, pp. 2801–2809*.
- [27] Y. Li, D. Han, Y. Wang, C. Shen, V. Golovatyuk, I. Tyapkin, B. Dabrowska, Y. Krechetov, Z. Zhou, Y. Li, Beam test results of two shashlyk ECal modules for NICA-MPD, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 958 (2020) 162833, proceedings of the Vienna Conference on Instrumentation 2019. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2019.162833.