## **Post-processing for High-Contrast Imaging:** ground-based instruments





### **Faustine Cantalloube**

Institut de Planétologie et d'Astrophysique de Grenoble <u>faustine.cantalloube@cnrs.fr</u>







### **Direct imaging** with ground-based telescopes



Wednesday 11.00am J.-B. Ruffio



#### Friday 11.00am Steph Sallum

Friday 8.30am Guillaume Bourdarot



### **Direct imaging** with ground-based telescopes





Ground based telescopes (8-m class) Near - thermal infrared (H-band, 1.6µm to N-band, 10µm)

High-dynamic



## High-contrast imaging

### High Angular resolution few milliarcseconds & High Contrast more than 10-6









## High-contrast imaging









### Bright starlight residuals !



Light-rays **interfere** in the focal plane



### Summary of our task



Thursday 11am Julien Milli

### Tailored image processing techniques to carve out the residual starlight —> 10-6 contrast

### What do we want / need:

- **Detection**: discriminate  $H_0$  from  $H_1$  + confidence level
- Characterisation: astrometry & photometry + uncertainties
- **Detection limit**: algorithm performance (astro-centered)
- **Comparison**: apply different algorithms (algo-centered)
  - Maximizing True positives, minimizing False negatives
- For point source (substellar companions) & extended source (circumstellar disks)





## **Differential imaging 101**

Find a different behaviour between (1) the astrophysical signals

Exploit this **diversity** to recover the signal !





This step is critical !!!

Whitens the residuals !

# and (2) the starlight residuals





## Differential imaging 101

Need a specific observing strategy & calibration procedure Provide with various diversities

> **Binary** Differential Imaging: Rodigas et al., 2015 Ruane et al. 2019 **Polarimetric** Differential Imaging: Kuhn et al. 2001

**Reference** Differential Imaging: Mawet et al., 2009, Rameau et al. 2012 multi-Reference Differential Imaging: Xuan et al. 2018, Bohn et al. 2019, **Spectral** Differential Imaging: Racine et al. 1999, Sparks and Ford 2002 Coherence Differential Imaging: Baudoz et al. 2005 Angular Differential Imaging: Marois 2006, Davies 1980

### Focus on ADI-based techniques !

 $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ 

## **Angular Differential Imaging**

### Pupil tracking mode:

For an alt-az mount telescope Disable the field derotator



### Observing time

Pupil field Optics / wavefront remain in the same direction

### It brings angular diversity

#### ADI is a technique, not an observing mode or data set type

### **Observing time**

Image field Field of view rotates w/ parallactic angles

© F. Cantalloube - ESO/SPHERE





## **1.Estimating the star image** The basic approach

#### **Pairwise subtraction:**

The closest frames in time are the most correlated while not self-subtracting the signal



frame (t1)



frame (t2)



The optimal  $\Delta \alpha$  is **0.5 lambda/D** 



#### **Temporal median:**

The median represents the 'typical' image while the moving signal is not taken into account

Marois et al., 2006



Temporal median



frame (t1) -median



It comes with various flavours: smart-ADI, annular-ADI And variations: Image Rotation Subtraction Dou et al., 2015





## 1. Estimating the star image The classic approach

### **Principal Component Analysis (PCA):** Linear combination of the images of the cube

decomposed over orthogonal basis (eigen-images)

Soummer et al., 2012

Amara & Quanz 2012



And also... smart-PCA, Absil et al., 2013 LLGS, Gonzalez et al., 2016 AMAT, Daglaya et al., subm. NMF, Ren et al., 2018 Space-Time KLIP, Lewis et al., 2023



### Locally Optimized Combination of Images (LOCI): Find the linear combination that minimises the residuals while the moving signal is not taken into account Lafrenière et al., 2007 Model ! Min( $\sigma_{res}^2$ ) = Min $\sum m_i$ **Binary mask** Coefficients All the images (t) Images And also... Template-LOCI, Marois et al., 2014 Adaptive-LOCI, Currie et al., 2012 Matched-LOCI, Wahhaj et al., 2015 Damped-LOCI, Pueyo et al., 2016



## 1. Estimating the star image Half Sibling Regression



Gebhard et al., 2022

Exclusion region





## 1. Estimating the star image Signal Safe Speckle Subtraction (4S)



#### **Explainable Machine Learning**







#### AF Lep b (2011)



#### Auto-Grad against signal loss

Bonse et al., 2024

![](_page_14_Picture_12.jpeg)

## 2. Residuals after subtraction

Also called 'subtraction residuals', 'differential imaging' residuals, 'post-processing residuals'

### The noise distribution of the residuals is sub-exponential (and not Gaussian) > hence the high number of false positives !

![](_page_15_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_7.jpeg)

## 2. Residuals after subtraction Beyond the 5- $\sigma$ contrast curve for non-Gaussian noise

#### **1. Observation & Measurement**

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_4.jpeg)

 $SNR = T_{obs} = 2.28$ 

![](_page_16_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_8.jpeg)

#### Jensen-Clem et al., 2017

Bonse et al., 2022

3. Statistical Test & Conclusion

It is essential to have a realistic estimate of the distribution of the residual noise **Confidence** level

![](_page_16_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_15.jpeg)

### 3. Combining the images

### Mean combination

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

There is no formal proof that one is better than the other...

![](_page_17_Picture_4.jpeg)

### Median combination

![](_page_17_Picture_6.jpeg)

## 3. Combining the images

### Noise weighted combination

Bottom et al., 2017

Optimal weight 
$$F_{opt} = rac{1}{\sum_i rac{1}{\sigma_i^2}} \sum_i rac{F_i}{\sigma_i^2}$$

Pairet et al., 2019

STIM = 
$$\frac{\hat{\mu}_g}{\hat{\sigma}_g}$$

Normalization factors to optimize SNR

### **Empirical normalisation**

![](_page_18_Figure_10.jpeg)

### Statistical testing

Mawet et al., 2014

Accounting for small-sample statistics

Similar to adapting the threshold

### Multinest approach

Golomb et al., 2020

Nested sampling to compute the evidence for H0 and H1.

### **SNAP** approach

Thompson & Marois, 2021

Optimisation of the S/N ratio

**Balance noise reduction** vs. self-subtraction

![](_page_18_Picture_24.jpeg)

### 3. Combining the images

### STIM Largest Intensity Mask (SLIMask):

### Pairet et al., 2021 (PhD thesis)

![](_page_19_Picture_3.jpeg)

Mask to apply on STIM-maps: Average location of the largest entries for a range of ranks

![](_page_19_Picture_6.jpeg)

### **Regime Switching Model (RSM):**

Dahlqvist et al., 2020, 2021ab, 2022

![](_page_19_Picture_9.jpeg)

### Build a time series in residual cubes: Probability of H<sub>1</sub> at t, knowing state at t-1

![](_page_19_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_16.jpeg)

## 4. Detection map Supervised binary classification

Supervised exOplanet detection via Direct Imaging with deep Neural Networks (SODINN)

**Binary Classifier** after a PCA subtraction

![](_page_20_Figure_3.jpeg)

Gomez Gonzalez et al., 2018

![](_page_20_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **Noise Adaptative SODDIN** (NA-SODINN)

#### Add SNR curves to support the training process

![](_page_20_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_13.jpeg)

### Characterization of the point-sources

**Forward Modeling** 

(inclusing assumption on noise distribution)

#### **1. Estimate** the star image

![](_page_21_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_6.jpeg)

### **Negative Fake Companion** injection (NEGFC) + minimization

direct SNR map estimate  $SNR = f_p / \sigma(f_p)$ 

### Forward Modeling of the planetary signal Basic concept Also called "inverse problem" or "Match Filtering" approach

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Maximum likelihood estimation:

$$L(r_0, a) \propto exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left\|\frac{\Delta(r, k) - a p(r, k; r_0)}{\sigma_{\Delta}(r)}\right\|$$

### ANDROMEDA

Mugnier et al., 2009

Cantalloube et al., 2015

![](_page_22_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_10.jpeg)

## Forward Modeling of the planetary signal Better subtraction ?

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)

Image at t<sub>1</sub>

![](_page_23_Picture_3.jpeg)

**Linear Combination** of first PCs

![](_page_23_Picture_5.jpeg)

### Maximum likelihood estimation:

$$L(r_0, a) \propto exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left\|\frac{\Delta(r, k) - a p(r, k; r_0)}{\sigma_{\Delta}(r)}\right\|$$

### FMMF

Pueyo et al., 2016

Ruffio et al., 2017

![](_page_23_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_14.jpeg)

Forward Modeling of the planetary signal Better differential residuals model?

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_2.jpeg)

### r-ANDROMEDA

Cantalloube et al., subm. in 2019

![](_page_24_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_8.jpeg)

## Forward Modeling of the planetary signal Not even subtraction ?

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

H<sub>1</sub>: model planet signature h off-axis PSF

**H**<sub>0</sub>: model of the background f Multivariate Gaussian

![](_page_25_Figure_4.jpeg)

### Maximum likelihood estimation with multivariate Gaussian noise:

$$\mathrm{p}_f(\{m{f}_{\lfloor \phi_t 
ceil,t}\}_{t=1:T}) = \prod_{t=1}^T \mathcal{N}ig(m{f}_{\lfloor \phi_t 
ceil,t} ig|m{m}_{\lfloor \phi_t 
ceil}ig)$$

### PAtch COvariance (PACO)

Flasseur et al., 2018

![](_page_25_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_12.jpeg)

Empirical mean <u>and</u> covariance on temporal patches

![](_page_25_Figure_14.jpeg)

 $_{\downarrow ]}, \mathbf{C}_{\lfloor \phi_t 
bracket}$ 

![](_page_25_Picture_16.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_18.jpeg)

## **Forward Modeling** Temporal Reference Analysis of Planets (TRAP)

### **Temporal PCA model** of the starlight + Forward Modeling

![](_page_26_Picture_2.jpeg)

Samland et al., 2021

![](_page_26_Picture_4.jpeg)

## Penguin interlude

### That's a lot !

![](_page_27_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

## **Exoplanet Imaging Data Challenge** a community-wide effort

![](_page_29_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Started in 2019!
- First phase launched in Sept. 2019 Workshop HCI post-processing, Berlin, Germany
- First phase closed in Oct. 2020
- Publication SPIE 2020
- Second phase (characterization) launched Apr. 2022 Third phase (disk imaging) for ~2025 Fourth phase (high resolution spectroscopy) for ~2026

![](_page_29_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_16.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_17.jpeg)

https://exoplanet-imaging-challenge.github.io/

![](_page_29_Picture_19.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_2.jpeg)

## Post-processing techniques performance assessement

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

Gomez Gonzalez et al., 2016

Counting True and False positives

### **Detection map + threshold + posterior (spectro)-photometry**

![](_page_31_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)

- True positive rate: TPR = TP/(TP+FN)
- False discovery rate: FDR = FP/(FP+TP)
- False positive rate: FPR = FP/(FP+TN)

At the submitted threshold, we compute:

• F1-score = 2 TP / (2 TP+FP+FN)

![](_page_32_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_9.jpeg)

### SADI-based characterization: Data type

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Multispectral image cube

(spectro)-photometryAstrometry

![](_page_33_Figure_7.jpeg)

### 1. Astrometry of point sources

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

Х

#### Thursday 9.15am Sarah Blunt

![](_page_34_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Final "ranking"

Method	PCA-NEGFC			ANDROMEDA		
	planet b	planet c	all	planet b	planet c	all
Astrometry	0.37	0.03	0.20	1.95	0.06	1.01
Spectro-photometry	16.98	1.03	9.00	35.67	2.29	18.99

![](_page_35_Picture_5.jpeg)

EIDC	websi
EIDC	websi

![](_page_35_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_1.jpeg)

## Penguin interlude #2

## **Circumstellar extended structures:** Protoplanetary disks and debris disks

![](_page_37_Picture_1.jpeg)

Garuffi et al., 2017

### Total intensity image in IR:

- Face-on circular disks
- Structures on edge-on disks
- Spiral structure
- Shadows, dips, gaps...
- Disentangling planets-disks

### Towards EIDC Phase 3 !

![](_page_37_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_12.jpeg)

### **Classic approaches**

Breaking down optimisation regions enforcing positivity and sparcity

Model Classical 75°

NMF

KLIP

![](_page_38_Figure_4.jpeg)

### Mask the signal Analyse the ADI-made distortion

![](_page_38_Figure_8.jpeg)

Milli et al., 2012 Ren et al., 2020a

Stapper & Ginsky, 2022

### Iterate the ADI subtraction to minimize self-subtraction

### Pairet et al., 2018

![](_page_38_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_15.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_16.jpeg)

### Image reconstruction approaches

#### MAYONNAISE

Pairet et al., 2020

Morphological Component Analysis: -Disk in shearlet space -Planet in direct space

![](_page_39_Picture_4.jpeg)

Mask the ambiguous region due to rotation (not known)

![](_page_39_Picture_8.jpeg)

### **MUSTARD**

Juillard et al., 2023

#### REXPACO

Flasseur et al., 2021

PACO framework to estimate noise Iterates on the disk estimation

![](_page_39_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_15.jpeg)

To go further ! Building the reference PSF multi-Reference RDI: Using a library of images as a database Using Data Imputation with NMF Ren et al., 2018 Using Structure Similarity Index Ruane et al., 2019 ConStruct (Auto-encoders based) Wolf et al., 2023 Data Imputation Poster #27 Sandrine Juillard with semi-supervised CNN Juillard et al., 2024 **Poster #8** Cao Fangyi IPCA: Combine ADI + RDI

### **Observing strategies for RDI:** Using another reference star

Snapshot of similar targets

Star-hopping observations

Wahhaj et al. 2021

Poster #32 Pengyu Liu

**Poster #47** Richelle Cvan Capelleveen

![](_page_40_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_9.jpeg)

## To go further ! Building the reference PSF

![](_page_41_Figure_1.jpeg)

### **Estimation with an instrumental model**

**Poster #18** Rodrigo Ferrer-Chavez

![](_page_41_Picture_4.jpeg)

## Pipelines

![](_page_42_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Preprocessing tools
- Library of post-processing algo PCA, LOCI, ANDROMEDA, PACO
- Characterization tools NEGFC, MCMC...

Library of algorithms ! https://vip.readthedocs.io

![](_page_42_Picture_6.jpeg)

**PyKLIP** 

- Ready-made configuration GPI, CHARIS, SPHERE, NIRC2, VisAO
- Characterization FM (disk incl.)

![](_page_42_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_14.jpeg)

 Post-processing algo + detection maps KLIP, mRDI + *planetevidence* (multinest)

- Complete toolbox FM-based
  - https://pyklip.readthedocs.io

- Preprocessing tools w/ pre-configuration files SPHERE, NaCo
- Post-processing algo PCA mainly, in-house PACO...
- Characterization tools NEGFC, MCMC...
  - Large data sample management !
  - https://pynpoint.readthedocs.io
- And also, CHARIS, GRAPHICS, SPHERE-DC, Data Cruncher etc. You can use all these beautiful tools !

![](_page_42_Figure_24.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_25.jpeg)

## Summary of key points: post-processing is essential to gain > 1mag

- Understanding the limitations of HCI: temporal stability is key
- Relies on specific observing strategies and calibration
- Characterising the starlight residuals and differential residuals distribution
- All algorithm provide different outputs requiring different interpretation • Assessing the performance is <u>not</u> obvious at all
- Data challenges are a great tool for homogeneous comparison

Advanced post-processing techniques are available and documented ! Use several concept to achieve better astrophysical input

faustine.cantalloube@cnrs.fr

![](_page_43_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_12.jpeg)