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Data Quality Monitoring (DQM)

- guarantees high-quality data for physics analyses:
  - online monitoring: live feedback during data acquisition;
  - offline monitoring: certify the data quality using offline processing;

- online DQM identifies emerging problems:
  - comparison to reference distributions;
  - comparison supported by predefined tests;
  - tests perform data reduction tasks (summary plots with alarms);
  - shifters and detector experts inspect histograms to spot problems;
  - tests designed to identify known failure modes;

- challenges of online monitoring, relevant to machine learning:
  - the latency of the evaluation process;
  - absolute normalization of the histograms is not possible;
  - granularity of the problems to spot;
  - no availability of the ground truth (labels).

Details on the infrastructure used for this Data Quality Monitoring (DQM) are given in [1].
Why machine learning?

The aim of this project is to **automatize** the CMS online DQM (with machine learning), solving or reducing many of the problems below. The goal is to improve the current protocol.

- **Latency**: human intervention and thresholds require sufficient statistics.
- **Volume budget**: amount of data a human can process in a finite time.
- **Static thresholds don’t scale**: assumptions on potential failure scenarios.
- **Human driven decision process**: alarms based on shifter judgment.
- **Changing running conditions**: reference samples change over time.
- **Manpower**: the effort to train a shifter and maintain instructions.
**Test case**: Drift Tube (DT) hit occupancy

**Test case**: data recorded by the DT chambers of the muon spectrometer.

- Monitoring **pattern**: histogram-based image classification.
- Hit occupancy contains the total **number of electronic hits at each readout channel**. It is a 2-dimensional array organized along layer (row) and channel (column) indices:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Channel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

- At any time CMS DQM visualizes 250 DT occupancy histograms.
- Current test summarizes alarms in **one plot** based on the **fraction of dead cells** (zero hits).
Test case: Drift Tube (DT) hit occupancy

- **Expected**: small variance of hit occupancy between neighboring channels.

- **Anomalous**: noisy or inefficient area (example: low occupancy across all the 12 rows).
Approaches to the anomaly detection

- exploit the **geographical information** and detect different types of anomalies at **different scales** (ranging from a few channels to collective behaviors of big portion of the DT system);

Pipeline of fault detection:

- **local**: data collected in each chamber layer are treated independently from the other layers;
- **regional**: extend the local approach to account for **intra-chamber problems**; simultaneously consider **all layers in a chamber**, but each chamber independently from the others;
- **global**: simultaneously use the information of **all the chambers** for a given acquisition run; the position of the chamber in the CMS detector impacts expected occupancy distribution of the channel hits.

![Approaches to the anomaly detection](image-url)
Dataset Preprocessing

The occupancy 21000 occupancy histograms were preprocessed.

- *Standardization* of the chamber data: the number of channels in a chamber layer varies. Force **fixed-input dimensionality** with a row-by-row one dimensional linear interpolation.

![Raw Occupancy](image1)

![Standardized Occupancy](image2)

Standardization of the occupancy histogram
Dataset Preprocessing

- **Smoothing**: according to CMS DT experts *isolated* misbehaving channels are **not considered a problem**. One dimensional median filter is applied.

![Graph showing raw and smoothed occupancy](image)

Smoothing of the occupancy histogram

- **Normalization**: the need for comparing data across chambers or across runs; the input data set depends on the **integration time** and on the **LHC beam configuration and intensity**.
Local strategy: Scope & Method

- filters out most of the anomalies;
- assessing the (mis)behavior with high-granularity (few channels);
- data collected in each muon chamber layer are treated independently from the others to detect intra-layer problems;
- labels were provided by experts: 5668 good and 612 bad (∼0.1 positives).

In this experiment, we compare the performances of the following:

- **unsupervised** with a simple statistical indicator (variance within the muon chamber layer), and an image processing technique, (maximum value of the vector obtained by applying a variant of an edge detection Sobel filter \[2\]: \[S_i = \max([-101] \ast X_i)\]);
- **semi-supervised learning**, with Isolation Forest \[3, 4\], and \(\mu\)-SVM \[5\] (both validated with 5 stratified folds);
- **supervised learning**, with a fully connected shallow neural network (SNN), and a convolutional neural network (CNN) \[6\].
Local strategy: CNN details

- *rectified linear units* and *softmax* as activations, trained with Keras/TensorFlow, *Adam optimizer* and *early stopping* (patience = 32 epochs);
- *class weight* to account for class imbalance; the weight $\lambda$ for a sample in class $\psi \in \{0, 1\}$ is: $\lambda_\psi = \frac{|S|}{2|S_\psi|}$, $S = S_0 \cup S_1$.

Loss function as a function of the number of epochs (left) and architecture of the CNN model (right)
Local strategy: Results

- convolutional neural network (CNN) outperforms other methods;
- performance of the CNN in low statistics region is different than the production test.

Left: ROC (Receiver Operating Characteristic) curve and AUC of the different models;
Right: stability of the CNN model and the current production test as a function of time (lumisection is approx. 23 s)
Regional strategy: Scope

- extends local strategy to filter out anomalies not seen by the previous approach;
- accounts for **intra-chamber** problems: simultaneously consider all layers in a chamber;
- the occupancy pattern within a chamber depends on the layer (row) information;
- example of use: identify layers with low efficiency (lower voltage).

Examples of chambers having low efficiency in chamber layer 9
Regional strategy: Method

- semi-supervised autoencoder [7] variations:
  - bottleneck,
  - denoising,
  - sparse,
  - convolutional;
- all chambers without any chamber layers labeled as faulty by the CNN local model were used for training (8424 matrices);
- all models minimize the mean squared error $\epsilon$ of input $x$ and reconstructed $\hat{x}$ samples: $\epsilon = \frac{1}{ij} \sum_{i,j}(x_{i,j} - \hat{x}_{i,j})^2$;
- a model will have a high reconstruction error $\epsilon$ on samples with voltage problem.
**Regional strategy: Results**

ROC and AUC of the different autoencoder models

Convolutional autoencoder MSE between reconstructed and input samples for chamber layer 9 (left) and chamber layer 3 (right).
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Global strategy: Scope & Method

- simultaneous use of all the chambers data;
- the position impacts expected occupancy pattern;
- with autoencoders, a compressed representation of chamber data is learned;
- when the bottleneck of the autoencoder is 3-dimensional one can visually inspect those representation.
Global strategy: Results

- the representations **cluster** depending on their position in the CMS detector (left: distance from the interaction point);
- the same chamber **changes** representation when problem occurs (right).

Compressed representations of the chamber-level data
Concluding:

- the local approach has satisfactory performance and was successfully **implemented** in production (the DT experts still test it);
- the proposed strategy is **generic** enough to be applicable to other kinds of CMS muon chambers, as well as to other sub-detectors.

Future work:

- there is other sub-detector efforts to apply similar strategy (HCAL, ECAL)*;
- addresses next monitoring pattern: failure detection in time evolution of sequential stream of DQM data.

* See: "Improving the use of data quality metadata via a partnership of technologies and resources between the CMS experiment at CERN and industry" (Track 1: Tuesday, 12:15) and "Monitoring tools for the CMS muon detector: present workflows and future automation" (Poster Session: Tuesday)
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