

STREAMLINE

Signal separation for single crystal and serial crystallography

Jérôme Kieffer ESRF - Grenoble (France)

Image analysis for single crystal frames

- **Lossy data compression**
- Peak-finding
- Conclusions

First diffraction image obtained with Jungfrau detector

NE has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation prog. under grant agreement No. 870313.

= *signal*

normalization

 $\overline{I}_r =$

i∈*bin*_{*r*}

 $V = \sum \omega \cdot v = \sum c \cdot signal$

Ω=∑ω⁼∑*c*⋅*normalization*

 $\Omega \Omega = \sum \omega^2 = \sum c^2$ ·normalization²

Average pixels along Debye-Scherrer rings

F⋅Ω⋅*P*⋅*A*⋅*I* ⁰

• Pixel intensity needs to be corrected:

Pixel splitting: $c_{i,r}$ is the fraction of pixel *i* in the

 $I_{cor} = \frac{I_{raw} - I_{dark}}{F_{c} \Omega_{c} P_{c} A_{c}}$

- Normalization issue due to polarization, …
- \rightarrow this is a weighted average: implemented in pyFAI
- Use of accumulators:
	- Simplifies notation
	- Suitable for parallel reduction

The ring
$$
r
$$

\n
$$
\frac{\sum_{i \in bin_r} c_{i,r} \cdot signal_i}{\sum_{i,r} \cdot normalization_i} = \frac{V_{bin_r}}{\Omega_{bin_r}}
$$

Radial bin Pixels falling into the radial bin (without pixel splitting)

 $r_{\rm min}$ $r_{\rm max}$

Uncertainties in azimuthal integration (1)

- Uncertainties on the average value
	- Called sem and reported by pyFAI
	- Not of interest for background evaluation
- Uncertainties on pixel value
	- Called std and larger than sem by a factor \sqrt{N}
- Poisson error model:
	- For all pixels belonging to a common distribution: $variance =$
	- Usually simplified in:

Erich Schubert and Michael Gertz. 2018. Numerically Stable Parallel Computation of (Co-)Variance. SSDBM '18: 30th Intl. Conf. on Sci, & Statistical DB Mangt.

$$
\begin{cases} variance_i = signal_i \\ VV = \sum c^2 \cdot signal \end{cases}
$$

 $\sigma(I_r) =$ ∣∠ (\sum *i*∈*bin*^{*r*} *ci* 2 ⋅*varianceⁱ* $\sum c_i^2$ ·*normalization*² *i*∈*bin^r* $=\sqrt{\frac{V}{\Omega}}$ *VV ^r* $\overline{\Omega\Omega_{r}}$ $\sigma(\overline{I_r})=$ $\sqrt{\sum}$ *i*∈*bin*^{*r*} *ci* 2 ⋅*varianceⁱ* ∑ *i*∈*bin ci*⋅*normalizationⁱ* = \sqrt{VV}_r Ω*r*

> $V = \sum \omega \cdot v = \sum c \cdot signal$ Ω=∑ω⁼∑*c*⋅*normalization* $\Omega \Omega = \sum \omega^2 = \sum c^2$ ·normalization²

Example on an insulin diffraction frame:

Sigma-clipping into the radial bin Sigmand Clipping (without pixel splitting) ESRF

- Iterative algorithm:
	- Integrate to calculate \overline{I} and $\sigma(I)$
	- Mask out any pixel with: $|I \bar{I}| > n \cdot \sigma(I)$
- Removes both tails from the distribution:
- **Good approximation of the background**
- Number of iterations:
	- 3 to 5 are common
- Cut-off parameter (SNR)
	- Default value provided by Chauvenet:
	- Discard at worse 1 pixel per ring per cycle on a normal distribution
	- Depends on the size, thus on the number of bins: $SNR_{clip} = 2.7 \sim 3.5$

Radial bin

Sigma-clipping with Poisson error-model

400

STREAMLINE

Uncertainties in azimuthal integration (2)

- Limits of the Poisson error model:
	- Requires all pixels in a ring to be from the **same** distribution
	- Thus incompatible with Bragg-peaks!
	- Consider for example a distribution of 2 pixels of value 1 and 99:
		- Mean: 50, std: 10, both pixels are at $5\sigma \rightarrow$ empty ensemble
- Azimuthal error model:

$$
\begin{aligned}\n\text{variance}_{i} &= \omega_{i}^{2} \cdot \left(v_{i} - \overline{v_{r}} \right)^{2} \\
\text{VV} &= \sum \omega^{2} \cdot \left(\frac{\text{signal}}{\text{normalization}} - \frac{\text{V}}{\Omega} \right)^{2}\n\end{aligned}
$$

Single-pass implemented with:

$$
VV_{A \cup b} = VV_A + \omega_b^2 \left(v_b - \frac{V_A}{\Omega_A} \right) \left(v_b - \frac{V_{A \cup b}}{\Omega_{A \cup b}} \right)
$$

$$
V_{A \cup b} = \sum \omega \cdot v = V_A + \omega_b \cdot v_b
$$

$$
\Omega_{A \cup b} = \sum \omega = \Omega_A + \omega_b
$$

 $\Omega \Omega_{A \cup b} = \sum \omega^2 = \Omega \Omega_A + \omega_B^2$

Comparison of error-models for σ-clipping ESRF

Hybrid error-model: ESRF

- Use azimuthal model for σ-clipping
	- Robust to Bragg-peaks
- Use Poisson model for subsequent analysis
	- Less noisy
	- Limits of Poisson when count \rightarrow 0

Save only intensity of pixel of interest

- **Lossy data compression**
- Peak-finding
- Conclusions

Sparsification: lossy compression ESRF

- Sparsification:
	- Store positive outlier with SNR $>$ threshold $_{0.30}$
	- Record also its position
	- Record background avg (μ) & std (σ)
	- Compression-rate can be estimated assuming a normal distribution
	- Implemented using OpenCL in pyFAI
- Densification:
	- Available as part of FabIO
	- Restores frames with (or without) background noise
	- Implemented in C (GIL-free) + multi-threading

Validation of sparsified dataset:

- Raw dataset: Insulin acquired at SLS with an Eiger4M
- Comparison of quality indicator from XDS
- Sparse data compressed with:
	- Poissonian error-model
	- SNR_{clip}: automatic
	- SNRpick: 1σ
	- SNRpeak: 5σ
	- Cycles: 5

Performances & quality:

- Compression of a factor: **5x** when cut-of at 1σ
- Compression speed: **250 fps** (GPU)
- Decompression speed: **200 fps** (CPU)
- Limits of the Poisson model at low count rate : $\mu=0 \rightarrow \sigma=1$

Peak finding algorithm on a diffraction frame ESRF

- Image analysis for single crystal frames
- **Lossy data compression**
- Peak-finding
- Conclusions

Layout of the peak-picking algorithm: ESRF

- Subtract background intensity (from σ-clipping)
	- Clip to 0 negative values. Those are all discarded.
	- **Pixel is a peak if:**
		- Maximum within the local neighborhood (3x3 or 5x5)
		- Subtracted signal is greater than a picking threshold (SNR_{pick})
		- At least 2 or 3 other pixels in the neighborhood meet the SNR_{pick} criteria
- Then:
	- Sum subtracted intensities on the neighborhood (+ uncertainties propagation)
	- Calculate the center of mass of the peak
- Implemented on GPU using OpenCL
	- Same execution time as sparsification

Comparison with PeakFinder8 ESRF

Exaction with CrystFEL / XGANDALF

1000 micro-crystal from HEWL Lysozyme collected on an Eiger 4M at ESRF-ID30a3

Conclusion

- Separation of Bragg-peaks from amorphous background using σ-clipping
	- Several error-models: Poisson, azimuthal and hybrid
	- Performance critical section for all algorithms (\sim 3-4 ms for 4 Mpix)
	- Sparse & lossy data compression for single crystal diffraction
		- Compression rate $5-100x$ (tuneable thanks to SNR_{pick})
		- Compression speed: 250 fps, single GPU stream
		- Decompression on CPU with background reconstruction
		- Data quality validated with XDS reduction software
	- Peak-finder
		- Similar in many point to the PeakFiner8 from Cheetah (Barty, 2014)
		- Implemented on GPU @ 250 fps
		- Peak-position validated by indexing with CrystFEL

Thank you

Schematic of the processing ... ESRF

Profiling (ms) Quadro A5000 / PCIe v3 16x

전통

STREAMLINE

Total OpenCL execution time : 12016.502 ms

STREAMLINE has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation prog. under grant agreement No. 870313. 22