

# CBOL-Tuner: Classifier-pruned Bayesian optimization to explore temporally structured latent spaces for particle accelerator tuning

**Mahindra Rautela**

*Applied Electrodynamics Group (AOT-AE), Los Alamos National Laboratory*

MRAUTELA@LANL.GOV

**Alan Williams**

*Applied Electrodynamics Group (AOT-AE), Los Alamos National Laboratory*

AWILLIAMS@LANL.GOV

**Alexander Scheinker**

*Applied Electrodynamics Group (AOT-AE), Los Alamos National Laboratory*

ASCHEINK@LANL.GOV

## Abstract

Complex dynamical systems, such as particle accelerators, often require complicated and time-consuming tuning procedures for optimal performance. It may also be required that these procedures estimate the optimal system parameters, which govern the dynamics of a spatiotemporal beam – this can be a high-dimensional optimization problem. To address this, we propose a Classifier-pruned Bayesian Optimization-based Latent space Tuner (CBOL-Tuner), a framework for efficient exploration within a temporally-structured latent space. The CBOL-Tuner integrates a convolutional variational autoencoder (CVAE) for latent space representation, a long short-term memory (LSTM) network for temporal dynamics, a dense neural network (DNN) for parameter estimation, and a classifier-pruned Bayesian optimizer (C-BO) to adaptively search and filter the latent space for optimal solutions. CBOL-Tuner demonstrates superior performance in identifying multiple optimal settings and outperforms alternative global optimization methods.

**Keywords:** Classifier-pruning, Bayesian optimization, Latent evolution models, Spatiotemporal learning, Charged particle beam dynamics, Accelerator tuning

## 1. Introduction

Tuning or optimizing the system parameters of complex dynamical systems is a challenging problem, as achieving optimal performance often requires navigating high-dimensional, stochastic, and non-linear parameter spaces. In the context of particle accelerators, the spatiotemporal dynamics of charged particle beams are governed by hundreds to thousands of interconnected components designed to focus, guide, and accelerate intense charged particle beams to high energies (Wiedemann (1994)). During a tuning or maintenance period, prior to the operation of the accelerator for various scientific applications, system parameters are manually adjusted to achieve optimal performance metrics, such as minimizing beam loss. This tuning process is time-consuming and often results in suboptimal performance due to the inherent complexity arising from high dimensionality, non-linearity, and distribution shifts (Scheinker et al. (2023)).

From a physics perspective, charged particle dynamics represent a multi-scale spatiotemporal phenomenon, where millions of charged particles evolve under the influence of internal and external electromagnetic forces as they traverse different accelerating sections (Batygin (2021)). The limitations of non-destructive measurements and the computational challenges associated with physics-based simulations have driven the research community toward data-driven solutions. In recent years, machine learning has played a significant role in addressing forward, inverse, optimization, and control problems in beam physics (Boehnlein et al. (2022); Edelen et al. (2020)).

Various adaptive and machine learning-based techniques have been employed for tuning particle accelerators. [Scheinker et al. \(2018\)](#) applied adaptive machine learning approaches by integrating a deep neural network with model-independent feedback for the automated control of the longitudinal phase space of intense electron beams in the LCLS Free Electron Laser (FEL). [Li et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Wan et al. \(2019\)](#) introduced K-means clustering to enhance the performance of the multi-objective genetic algorithm (MOGA) for optimizing the dynamic aperture of the NSLS-II storage ring. Further advancements in real-time control were demonstrated by [Scheinker et al. \(2020\)](#), who showcased multi-objective optimization for simultaneous emittance and beam orbit control in the AWAKE electron beamline. [Huang et al. \(2019\)](#) developed a Gaussian process regression (GPR)-based multi-objective, multi-generation model for design optimization. [Edelen et al. \(2020\)](#) proposed neural network-based surrogates to facilitate MOGA simulations for accelerator studies, while [Wan et al. \(2020\)](#) proposed a neural network-driven MOGA approach for optimizing the Touschek lifetime and dynamic aperture of the high-energy photon source. [Williams et al. \(2023, 2024\)](#) studied safe extremum-seeking controllers for online tuning at the LANSCE facility.

Bayesian optimization (BO) has emerged as a powerful technique for accelerator tuning, with several studies demonstrating its effectiveness across different particle accelerators ([Duris et al. \(2020\)](#); [Jalas et al. \(2021\)](#); [Kirschner et al. \(2022\)](#); [Hwang et al. \(2022\)](#); [Ji et al. \(2024\)](#)). BO works by constructing a probabilistic model of the objective function and strategically selecting evaluation points to balance exploration and exploitation ([Rautela et al. \(2023\)](#)). However, the application of Bayesian optimization to tuning high-dimensional state and action spaces remains a significant challenge ([Moriconi et al. \(2020\)](#)).

Recent studies have investigated latent space-based generative models for solving forward problems. [Scheinker et al. \(2021, 2023\)](#) proposed a Sim2Real framework based on adaptive manipulations of the latent space, utilizing partially observable states from experiments. In our previous works, we explored latent evolution models and their modifications to predict spatiotemporal beam dynamics and estimate system parameters ([Rautela et al. \(2024c,b,d,a\)](#)).

Variational autoencoder (VAE)-based generative models provide a smooth and continuous lower-dimensional latent space, which can be explored for tuning purposes. The structured latent space enables generation through conditional sampling and decoding, while also estimating corresponding system settings ([Rautela et al. \(2024a\)](#)). For the task of tuning system parameters (action space), exploration of the latent space to identify optimal latent points and corresponding system settings requires a reward function. [Williams et al. \(2023\)](#) demonstrated the minimization of beam loss along the accelerator as an objective function for an extremum-seeking tuner. Beam loss is a promising candidate for a reward or objective function due to its simplicity in computation and experimental measurability.

We propose a Bayesian Optimization (BO) approach with a beam loss minimization objective (or equivalently, maximizing the negative beam loss) for exploring the latent space to identify optimal state spaces (latent representations) and corresponding action spaces (system settings). However, this methodology heavily relies on a well-defined latent space, where every point can be decoded into realistic physical signals. Achieving such an ideal latent space is challenging, especially when the network is trained on sparse datasets, a common limitation in many scientific and engineering problems.

In this paper, we introduce the CBOL-Tuner, a classifier-pruned Bayesian Optimization framework for exploring temporally structured latent spaces to tune the LANSCE linear accelerator. The CBOL-Tuner employs a pretrained ResNet50-based classifier to map phase-space projections of the

beam to their respective classes – the 48 modules of the accelerator at LANSCE. This classifier acts as a filter, ensuring that only reconstructed projections belonging to true classes are selected. The architecture of the CBOL-Tuner is depicted in Fig. 1 and consists of the following components:

1. **Latent evolution model:** A spatiotemporal learner comprising a spatial learner (CVAE) and a temporal learner (LSTM). The CVAE projects beam behavior ( $X \in \mathbb{R}^{48 \times 15 \times 256 \times 256}$ ) and module number ( $m \in \mathbb{R}$ ) into a compact latent space ( $z \in \mathbb{R}^8$ ). The LSTM models the temporal dynamics in the latent space using autoregressive techniques.
2. **Estimator:** A small dense neural network (DNN) that takes the latent space ( $z$ ) as input and maps it to the corresponding system settings ( $y \in \mathbb{R}^8$ ).
3. **Classifier-pruned Bayesian optimizer (C-BO):** A Bayesian optimizer that sequentially explores the latent space to maximize the negative of the total beam loss (or minimize the total beam loss). The exploration history is filtered through a pretrained ResNet50 classifier to eliminate non-physical signals.




Figure 1: Architecture of the CBOL-Tuner for beam optimization in particle accelerators.

The concept of exploring the latent space of VAEs has been studied in various applications, including material design and discovery spanning micro to macro scales (e.g., [Cheng et al. \(2021\)](#); [Ren et al. \(2022\)](#); [Rautela et al. \(2022\)](#); [Wang and Dowling \(2022\)](#)). However, most of this research focuses on the optimal design of materials using one-dimensional (1D) or two-dimensional (2D) spatial or temporal data describing physical or chemical behavior. To the best of the authors' knowledge, there are little to no studies that explore temporally-structured latent spaces capturing complex, multi-scale, six-dimensional (6D) spatiotemporal behavior.

The novelty of the current research can be assessed on two major fronts: contributions to the broader latent exploration literature and advancements within the machine learning (ML) for accelerator physics community. The key contributions of this research are as follows:

1. Proposed a BO-based framework for exploration in temporally-structured latent spaces of spatiotemporal learners.
2. Introduced a classifier-pruned BO to filter estimated latent trajectories that do not belong to the true class.
3. Applied the CBOL-Tuner framework for the optimization of charged particle beams in particle accelerators.

## 2. Theoretical Background: CBOL-Tuner

The forward discretized spatiotemporal beam dynamics can be written as  $X_t = H(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{t-1})$ , where  $H$  is an unknown nonlinear function,  $X$  is the high-dimensional state of the system at time  $t$ . This can be learned as a joint probability distribution of all the states as,  $P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t, \dots, X_T)$ . The distribution can be factorised using the chain rule of probability, as  $P(X_t|X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{t-1})$ . However, in particle accelerators,  $X$  is a high-dimensional object representing 6D phase space comprising of positions and momentum of billions of particles. Using variational autoencoders (VAEs), the higher-dimensional distribution can be projected to a lower dimension (Kingma and Welling (2013)). Now,  $P(z_t|z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{t-1})$  can be learned using a LSTM as  $f_\theta(z_t|h_{t-1}, c_{t-1})$ , where the hidden and memory states,  $(h_{t-1}, c_{t-1}) = g(z_{t-1}, h_{t-2}, c_{t-2})$  are calculated through previous hidden states, memory states and observations (Toneva et al. (2022)). This CVAE-LSTM architecture also called latent evolution model (LEM) is a self-supervised learner for spatiotemporal beam dynamics (Rautela et al. (2024c)). The above formulation intentionally omits the use of labels i.e., parameter-space or the action space to learn the spatiotemporal dynamics.

The mapping from the state space  $X$  to the parameter space ( $y$ ) can be thought of a directed acyclic graph (DAG) i.e.,  $X \rightarrow y$  (Heckerman (2008)). With the introduction of the latent space ( $z$ ), DAG becomes  $X \rightarrow z \rightarrow y$ . Therefore, instead of learning  $P(y|X)$  using a neural network, we can learn it as  $P(y|X) = P(z|X)P(y|z)$ . The  $P(z|X)$  is already learned with a latent evolution model as  $P(z_1, \dots, z_t, \dots, z_T)$  and  $P(y|z)$  can be learned by a small DNN.

Generative models like VAEs provide a structured latent space which can be conditionally sampled and decoded to obtain new realistic images. The latent space exploration for optimality is an optimization problem, which is called tuning problem for complex dynamical systems like accelerators. It can be formulated as

$$y^*, z^* = \arg \min_z L_{bt} = \arg \min_z (w(m) \cdot L_b(X_m)) \quad (1)$$

Here,  $L_{bt}$  is the total beam loss, which is a weighted sum of beam loss across different modules (or dot product of weighting function and beam loss function).  $(y^*, z^*)$  are the optimal values, where  $y^* = \text{Estimator}(z^*)$  and  $X_m = \text{Decoder}(z_m)$ . The beam loss is calculated as the summation of all the particles in 11th projection ( $E - \phi$ ), which is approximately a measure of the total number of particles which have not been lost (the simulation contains up to  $\sim 1.04$  million particles).

Bayesian Optimization is a probabilistic, gradient-free, sequential decision-making framework designed to optimize expensive, black-box functions. It builds a probabilistic surrogate model, such

as a Gaussian Process, and uses an acquisition function to balance exploration and exploitation when selecting the next point to evaluate (Raina et al. (2023)). We have used expected improvement (EI) as the acquisition function for maximizing the negative of the total beam loss, mentioned in Eq. 1.

$$EI(z) = \begin{cases} [\mu_f(z) - f^+(z) - \xi] \Phi(\tilde{z}) + \sigma_f^2(z) \phi(\tilde{z}) & \text{if } \sigma_f^2(z) > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma_f^2(z) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$\tilde{z} = \frac{\mu_f(z) - f^+(z) - \xi}{\sigma_f(z)}.$$

In this context,  $z$  represents the design parameter. The mean prediction from the Gaussian Process at point  $z$  is denoted by  $\mu_f(z)$ , while  $\sigma_f^2(z)$  represents the variance (uncertainty) of the prediction at  $z$ . The best observed value so far is  $f^+(z)$ . The exploration parameter,  $\xi$ , controls the exploration-exploitation trade-off during optimization. The standardized improvement is  $\tilde{z}$ . Here,  $\Phi(\tilde{z})$  is the cumulative density function of the standard normal distribution, and  $\phi(\tilde{z})$  is its probability density function.

Bayesian Optimization (BO) operates on the latent space of a Variational Autoencoder (VAE) and assumes a well-defined, continuous space for effective exploration. However, achieving an ideal latent space where every randomly sampled point corresponds to realistic physical signals is challenging. To prevent BO from exploring infeasible regions of the latent space, a classifier can assist by either excluding such regions from the explorer’s memory or penalizing the optimizer when these regions are encountered. For simplicity, we eliminate these infeasible regions from BO’s exploration history using a pretrained ResNet50 classifier. The classifier is trained with high accuracy ( $\sim 0.99989$ ) to map phase space projections ( $X$ ) across different modules into 48 classes ( $m$ ). Classifier-pruned BO is designed to discard explored points ( $z_{1:48}$ ) if their decoding ( $X_{1:48}$ ) does not belong to the true classes. The CBOL-Tuner algorithm is outlined in Alg. 1.

In the algorithm,  $z_1$  is conditionally sampled from the learned latent distribution using a uniform distribution defined by upper and lower bounds for module 1:  $z_1 \sim p_\theta(z, m = 1) \sim U(a, b)$ . A Gaussian Process (GP) prior  $h$  is initialized to map  $z_1$  to the total beam loss. At each iteration, the LSTM predicts  $z_{2:48}$ , which are concatenated with  $z_1$  and decoded to obtain  $X_{1:48}$ . The total beam loss is computed, and the acquisition function is maximized to identify the next query point  $z'_1$ . The GP model is then updated with the new data  $h : z'_1 \mapsto L_{bt}$ . If  $X_{1:48}$  passes the classifier, the point is appended to the history  $S$ . This process is repeated for  $N$  iterations. Additionally, the algorithm supports multiple independent runs with the same number of iterations, each initialized with a new  $z_1$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** CBOL-Tuner
 

---

**Input:** Models/Functions: CVAE, LSTM, DNN, BeamLoss, EI, Classifier;  $N, \xi, w_{1:48}$ 
**Output:** Optimized system,  $\mathcal{S}^*: \{L_{bt}^*, z_{1:48}^*, y_{1:8}^*\}$ 

Initialize:

 $z_1 \sim p_\theta(z, m=1)$  // Conditional latent sampling

 $h: z_1 \mapsto L_{bt}$  // Prior GP

**for**  $iterations \leftarrow 0$  **to**  $N$  **do**

      $z_{2:48} \leftarrow LSTM(z_1)$  // Autoregressive forecasting

      $z_{1:48} \leftarrow z_1 \cup z_{2:48}$  // Concat

      $X_{1:48} \leftarrow Decoder(z_{1:48})$  // Decoding

      $y_{1:8} \leftarrow DNN(z_{1:48})$  // Estimate RF settings

      $L_{1:48} = BeamLoss(X_{1:48})$  // Beam Loss

      $L_{bt} = w_{1:48} \cdot L_{1:48}$  // Total beam loss

      $z'_1 \leftarrow \arg \max_{z_1 \in Z_1} EI(z_1; h, \xi)$  // Select new query point

      $h: z'_1 \mapsto L_{bt}$  // Update GP

      $z_1 \leftarrow z'_1$ 

// Classifier-pruning

**if**  $Classifier(X_{1:48}) = X_{true_{1:48}}$  **then**

         |  $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \mathcal{S} \cup \{L_{bt}, z_{1:48}, y_{1:8}\}$  // Store results

     **end**
**end**
**return**  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}^*$ 


---

### 3. Results

In particle accelerators, the Vlasov-Maxwell equations describe the self-consistent evolution of a system of charged particles in phase space, where the state of the system is represented by both the position  $(x, y, z)$  and momentum  $(p_x, p_y, p_z)$  of the particles. In the dynamics of particle beams, the relativistic Vlasov equation describes the dynamics of the particle distribution function  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}, t)$  in the presence of fields  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ , while Maxwell’s equations determine how the fields evolve based on the charge and current densities  $\rho$  and  $J$  generated by the particles. This coupling is nonlinear and high-dimensional, making the system challenging to solve.

High-Performance Simulator (HPSim) is an open-source, GPU-accelerated code developed at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) for simulations of multi-particle beam dynamics (Pang and Rybarcyk (2014)). The software is designed to replicate the accelerator and, therefore, provides a realistic representation of the true beam used at the Los Alamos Neutron Science Center (LAN-SCE). The beam behavior in each module is manipulated by two RF settings, i.e., amplitude and phase set-points. The beam passes through 48 modules, including 4 modules of a 201.25 MHz drift tube linac and 44 modules of an 805 MHz coupled cavity linac.

We generated the dataset by randomly sampling the RF set points of the first four modules (i.e., 8 settings) from a uniform distribution with  $\pm 5\%$  variation bounds, while keeping the RF set points of the remaining 44 modules (88 settings) constant. The simulator outputs a 6D beam, which is subsequently projected into 2D to obtain 15 unique projections for each of the 48 modules. A total of 1400 simulations were performed to generate the training data, and an additional 700 simulations were conducted for testing, resulting in datasets of size  $[48, 15, 256, 256]$  for both training and test-

ing. The module numbers ( $m$ ) and projections ( $X$ ) were normalized to the range  $[0, 1]$ , while the RF settings ( $y$ ) were normalized to  $[-0.5, 0.5]$ . The dataset has been made publicly available as an open-source resource on Zenodo (Rautela et al. (2024e)). An example showcasing three projections across the 48 modules is presented in Fig. 2. The figure highlights the complex, nonlinear, and multi-scale spatiotemporal evolution observed in the projections of the 6D beam phase space.




Figure 2: Three out of 15 2d projections of 6d phase space of charged particle beam in the LANSCE linear accelerator. Accelerating modules - 1 to 4 are 201 MHz drift tube linac (DTL) and 5 to 48 are 805 MHz coupled cavity linac (CCL). The beam serves various scientific areas like isotope production facility (IPF), ultra-cold neutrons (UCN), proton radiography (PRAD), weapons neutron research (WNR), proton storage ring (PSR).

The CBOL-Tuner (Fig. 1 and Alg. 1) is designed to search for optimal latent points that minimize the total beam loss in the accelerator. The total beam loss is computed as the dot product of the weighting vector ( $w \in \mathbb{R}^{48}$ ) and the beam loss vector ( $L_b \in \mathbb{R}^{48}$ ). For simplicity,  $w$  is chosen as a step function, which is zero for the first 47 modules and unity for the last module. This choice aligns with the current accelerator setup, where downstream scientific applications demand a high-quality beam at the accelerator’s exit.

The CBOL-Tuner integrates four pretrained deep learning models: CVAE, LSTM, DNN, and ResNet50. The CVAE maps high-dimensional phase space projections ( $X \in \mathbb{R}^{48 \times 15 \times 256 \times 256}$ ) and module numbers ( $m \in \mathbb{R}$ ) to a compact latent space ( $z \in \mathbb{R}^8$ ). The LSTM learns the temporal dynamics of the system through autoregressive modeling in the latent space. A DNN maps the latent representations to system settings ( $y \in \mathbb{R}^8$ ), enabling a coupled CVAE-LSTM-DNN framework to model the spatiotemporal dynamics of the beam. The core of the CBOL-Tuner is the classifier-pruned Bayesian Optimization (BO), which explores the CVAE’s latent space for optimality and prunes explored points using a pretrained ResNet50 classifier. The BO is executed for 10 indepen-

dent runs, each with  $N = 1000$  iterations, employing the Expected Improvement (EI) acquisition function with  $\xi = 0.1$ .




Figure 3: Target vs parameter search space for Bayesian optimization and classifier-pruned BO. Classifier-pruning eliminates latent trajectories which doesn't qualify the selection threshold.

Figure 3 illustrates the BO search space for a single run. The figure shows 8-dimensional  $z_1$  and the corresponding values of the objective function,  $L_{bt}$ . The search space is highly nonlinear, non-convex, and high-dimensional. The x-ticks in each of the eight subplots represent the bounds of  $z_1$ , which constrain BO's exploration within the feasible set. As shown in the figure (gray dots), BO successfully explores the entire 8-dimensional latent space. Blue dots represent the subset of  $z_1$  points that, when forecasted to  $z_{2:48}$  and decoded to  $X_{1:48}$ , yield trajectories classified as valid by the ResNet50 classifier. Notably, many latent space points corresponding to the lowest beam loss,  $L_{bt}$ , are rejected by the classifier for failing to represent realistic beam states. This rejection stems from the limited size of the training dataset, which results in a latent space that lacks perfect continuity and smoothness everywhere. This sparsity leads to zones in the latent space that generate unrealistic or hallucinated beam states, some of which may yield low beam loss values.

The optimal results obtained from the BO framework are compared against those from another global optimization method, namely Random Search (RS). Both methods incorporate classifier pruning and execute the same number of runs and iterations. However, RS operates as an exploration-only optimization method, whereas BO balances exploration and exploitation through the parameter  $\xi$ . The comparative results are presented as boxplots in Fig. 4.

The results clearly demonstrate that BO outperforms RS by achieving a lower median loss and improved mean performance. Furthermore, BO exhibits reduced variability in the optimal results, indicating that RS has a higher likelihood of converging to suboptimal solutions. Notably, BO






Figure 4: Boxplot comparison of different latent search methods: Bayesian optimization vs random search.

also achieves a smaller minimum loss than RS. BO’s consistent performance and lower variability underscore its robustness as an optimization approach compared to RS.

#### 4. Discussions

We present CBOL-Tuner as a robust framework for exploring latent spaces in beam tuning applications. To evaluate its performance, we conduct five additional independent runs, each comprising 1,000 iterations, and compare the identified optimal latent points ( $z^*$ ) with the corresponding true values derived from HPSim. The algorithm computes the optimal latent points ( $z^*$ ), which are subsequently decoded to obtain the optimal total beam losses ( $L_{bt}^*$ ). These beam losses are recorded as [0.1721, 0.1710, 0.1718, 0.1638, 0.1673]. The corresponding optimal RF settings ( $y^*$ ) are predicted by the DNN using  $z^*$  as input. To validate these results, the predicted RF settings ( $y^*$ ) are input into HPSim to simulate the true 6D beam, yielding true total beam losses of [0.2070, 0.2197, 0.2193, 0.2186, 0.2187]. While a minor offset is observed between the predicted and true optimal values, CBOL-Tuner demonstrates consistent performance, producing significantly lower values of total beam loss. The discrepancy between true and predicted optimal losses can be improved by training the CVAE-LSTM-DNN architecture on a larger dataset.

A notable advantage of the proposed methodology is its ability to generate multiple optimal RF configurations, which is particularly beneficial for tuning particle accelerators. With additional runs, the CBOL-Tuner can identify a broader range of such optimal configurations, further enhancing its utility in accelerator tuning applications.

We see that the Bayesian Optimization (BO) also explores regions within the latent space that decode into hallucinated solutions, some of which result in significantly lower beam losses. To address this, classifier pruning is employed to filter out such hallucinations. Currently, the method is implemented as a post-processing step, meaning it does not directly influence the exploration process of BO. However, the classifier can be integrated into the BO framework to actively guide its sequential decision-making process, enhancing its overall effectiveness.

The BO-based latent search method demonstrates superior performance compared to other optimization techniques applied to the same latent space with classifier pruning. One such comparison

is conducted against random search, which operates as an exploration-only optimization method. Additionally, we examine a gradient-based method (Adam), which is inherently more local in nature and places greater emphasis on exploitation. We noticed that if  $X_{1:48}$  fails to pass through the classifier during the initial iteration, subsequent gradient steps are likely to confine the search within unfavorable regions. However, this issue can be mitigated by integrating classifier pruning into the optimization loop, where it penalizes unsuitable regions during gradient updates.

Currently, the optimization framework employs total beam loss as the sole objective within a single-objective optimization setup. While this approach has proven effective, it can also accommodate other important parameters of beam dynamics that are essential for beam optimization. Additional objectives such as minimizing beam emittance, controlling its growth, reducing energy spread, and optimizing beam size, can be incorporated into the framework. Incorporating these objectives would extend the problem into a multi-objective optimization problem, demanding Pareto front analysis to effectively navigate and balance trade-offs among competing objectives.

As part of future research, we plan to investigate multi-objective optimization problems by integrating classifier pruning into the Bayesian Optimization (BO)-based exploration strategy. Additionally, we aim to enhance the performance of the CVAE-LSTM-DNN model by incorporating a larger and more diverse dataset, which is expected to improve its generalization and predictive capabilities.

## 5. Conclusions

In this paper, we propose a classifier-pruned Bayesian Optimization (CBOL-Tuner) framework for exploring temporally structured latent spaces. This methodology is specifically applied to the beam optimization and tuning problem in particle accelerators. The CBOL-Tuner integrates multiple pre-trained deep learning models, including a convolutional variational autoencoder (CVAE) for latent space representation, a long short-term memory (LSTM) network for temporal dynamics, a dense neural network (DNN) for parameter estimation, and a ResNet50-based classifier for filtering non-physical latent trajectories. These components collectively enable computationally efficient and adaptive exploration of the latent space. The CBOL-Tuner provides a significant advantage by identifying multiple optimal solutions, which can be utilized for real-time tuning applications. Compared to traditional random search methods, our approach demonstrates superior performance by achieving a lower median and mean optimal loss and reduced variability in the optimization results. The results of this study underline the potential of combining Bayesian optimization with advanced latent space modeling techniques for challenging optimization tasks in science and engineering.

## Acknowledgments

LANL is operated by Triad National Security, LLC, for the national Nuclear Security Administration of the US Department of Energy (Contract No. 89233218CNA000001). This work was supported by the LANL LDRD Program Directed Research (DR) project 20220074DR.

## References

Yuri K Batygin. Six-dimensional matching of intense beam with linear accelerating structure. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, 995:165074, 2021.

- Amber Boehnlein, Markus Diefenthaler, Nobuo Sato, Malachi Schram, Veronique Ziegler, Cristiano Fanelli, Morten Hjorth-Jensen, Tanja Horn, Michelle P Kuchera, Dean Lee, et al. Colloquium: Machine learning in nuclear physics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 94(3):031003, 2022.
- Yu Cheng, Yongshun Gong, Yuansheng Liu, Bosheng Song, and Quan Zou. Molecular design in drug discovery: a comprehensive review of deep generative models. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, 22(6):bbab344, 2021.
- Joseph Duris, Dylan Kennedy, Adi Hanuka, Jane Shtalenkova, Auralee Edelen, P Baxevanis, Adam Egger, T Cope, M McIntire, S Ermon, et al. Bayesian optimization of a free-electron laser. *Physical review letters*, 124(12):124801, 2020.
- Auralee Edelen, Nicole Neveu, Matthias Frey, Yannick Huber, Christopher Mayes, and Andreas Adelman. Machine learning for orders of magnitude speedup in multiobjective optimization of particle accelerator systems. *Physical Review Accelerators and Beams*, 23(4):044601, 2020.
- David Heckerman. A tutorial on learning with Bayesian networks. *Innovations in Bayesian networks: Theory and applications*, pages 33–82, 2008.
- Xiaobiao Huang, Minghao Song, and Zhe Zhang. Multi-objective multi-generation gaussian process optimizer for design optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.00250*, 2019.
- Kilean Hwang, Tomofumi Maruta, Alexander Plastun, Kei Fukushima, Tong Zhang, Qiang Zhao, Peter Ostroumov, and Yue Hao. Prior-mean-assisted bayesian optimization application on FRIB front-end tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.06400*, 2022.
- Sören Jalas, Manuel Kirchen, Philipp Messner, Paul Winkler, Lars Hübner, Julian Dirkwinkel, Matthias Schnepf, Remi Lehe, and Andreas R Maier. Bayesian optimization of a laser-plasma accelerator. *Physical review letters*, 126(10):104801, 2021.
- Fuhao Ji, Auralee Edelen, Ryan Roussel, Xiaozhe Shen, Sara Miskovich, Stephen Weathersby, Duan Luo, Mianzhen Mo, Patrick Kramer, Christopher Mayes, et al. Multi-objective bayesian active learning for mev-ultrafast electron diffraction. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):4726, 2024.
- Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- Johannes Kirschner, Mojmir Mutný, Andreas Krause, Jaime Coello de Portugal, Nicole Hiller, and Jochem Snuverink. Tuning particle accelerators with safety constraints using bayesian optimization. *Physical Review Accelerators and Beams*, 25(6):062802, 2022.
- Yongjun Li, Weixing Cheng, Li Hua Yu, and Robert Rainer. Genetic algorithm enhanced by machine learning in dynamic aperture optimization. *Physical Review Accelerators and Beams*, 21(5):054601, 2018.
- Riccardo Moriconi, Marc Peter Deisenroth, and KS Sesh Kumar. High-dimensional bayesian optimization using low-dimensional feature spaces. *Machine Learning*, 109:1925–1943, 2020.
- Xiaoying Pang and Larry Rybarcyk. Gpu accelerated online multi-particle beam dynamics simulator for ion linear particle accelerators. *Computer Physics Communications*, 185(3):744–753, 2014.

- Deepak Raina, SH Chandrashekhara, Richard Voyles, Juan Wachs, and Subir Kumar Saha. Robotic sonographer: autonomous robotic ultrasound using domain expertise in bayesian optimization. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 6909–6915. IEEE, 2023.
- M Rautela, A Scheinker, and A Williams. Accelerator system parameter estimation using variational autoencoded latent regression. *Proc. IPAC’24*, pages 902–905, 2024a.
- M Rautela, A Scheinker, and A Williams. Towards latent space evolution of spatiotemporal dynamics of six-dimensional phase space of charged particle beams. *Proc. IPAC’24*, pages 906–909, 2024b.
- Mahindra Rautela, J Senthilnath, Armin Huber, and S Gopalakrishnan. Towards deep generation of guided wave representations for composite materials. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, 2022.
- Mahindra Rautela, S Gopalakrishnan, and J Senthilnath. Bayesian optimized physics-informed neural network for estimating wave propagation velocities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14064*, 2023.
- Mahindra Rautela, Alan Williams, and Alexander Scheinker. A conditional latent autoregressive recurrent model for generation and forecasting of beam dynamics in particle accelerators. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):18157, 2024c.
- Mahindra Rautela, Alan Williams, and Alexander Scheinker. Time-inversion of spatiotemporal beam dynamics using uncertainty-aware latent evolution reversal. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.07847*, 2024d.
- Mahindra Rautela, Alan Williams, and Alexander Scheinker. 6D phase space of charged beam in particle accelerator, March 2024e. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10819001>.
- Zekun Ren, Siyu Isaac Parker Tian, Juhwan Noh, Felipe Oviedo, Guangzong Xing, Jiali Li, Qiaohao Liang, Ruiming Zhu, Armin G Aberle, Shijing Sun, et al. An invertible crystallographic representation for general inverse design of inorganic crystals with targeted properties. *Matter*, 5(1):314–335, 2022.
- Alexander Scheinker, Auralee Edelen, Dorian Bohler, Claudio Emma, and Alberto Lutman. Demonstration of model-independent control of the longitudinal phase space of electron beams in the linac-coherent light source with femtosecond resolution. *Physical review letters*, 121(4):044801, 2018.
- Alexander Scheinker, Simon Hirlander, Francesco Maria Velotti, Spencer Gessner, Giovanni Zevi Della Porta, Verena Kain, Brennan Goddard, and Rebecca Ramjiawan. Online multi-objective particle accelerator optimization of the AWAKE electron beam line for simultaneous emittance and orbit control. *AIP Advances*, 10(5), 2020.
- Alexander Scheinker, Frederick Cropp, Sergio Paiagua, and Daniele Filippetto. An adaptive approach to machine learning for compact particle accelerators. *Scientific reports*, 11(1):19187, 2021.

- Alexander Scheinker, Frederick Cropp, and Daniele Filippetto. Adaptive autoencoder latent space tuning for more robust machine learning beyond the training set for six-dimensional phase space diagnostics of a time-varying ultrafast electron-diffraction compact accelerator. *Physical Review E*, 107(4):045302, 2023.
- Mariya Toneva, Tom M Mitchell, and Leila Wehbe. Combining computational controls with natural text reveals aspects of meaning composition. *Nature computational science*, 2(11):745–757, 2022.
- Jinyu Wan, Paul Chu, Yi Jiao, and Yongjun Li. Improvement of machine learning enhanced genetic algorithm for nonlinear beam dynamics optimization. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, 946:162683, 2019.
- Jinyu Wan, Paul Chu, and Yi Jiao. Neural network-based multiobjective optimization algorithm for nonlinear beam dynamics. *Physical Review Accelerators and Beams*, 23(8):081601, 2020.
- Ke Wang and Alexander W Dowling. Bayesian optimization for chemical products and functional materials. *Current Opinion in Chemical Engineering*, 36:100728, 2022.
- Helmut Wiedemann. Particle accelerator physics. *Physics Today*, 47(7):61, 1994.
- Alan Williams, Alexander Scheinker, En-Chuan Huang, Charles Taylor, and Miroslav Krstic. Experimental safe extremum seeking for accelerators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15584*, 2023.
- Alan Williams, Alexander Scheinker, En-Chuan Huang, Charles Taylor, and Miroslav Krstic. Safe extremum seeking applications in particle accelerators. In *2024 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 4314–4319. IEEE, 2024.