

Context

- Huge continental radio facilities: LOFAR, MeerKAT/SKA, ASKAP
- The need for robust transient detection tools at all temporal scales
- The recent framework of Compressed Sensing / Sparse representation / Convex optimization

Radio transient vs. observation techniques

Technique	< 1ms	1s	10s	~1m	H	Days	Weeks	M	Y
« Fast » transient sources	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
« Slow » transient sources	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Beamforming

- Good time resolution
- Narrow angular resolution
- Low instantaneous SNR
- Very samples for imaging

Imaging

- Poor time resolution
- Wide angular resolution
- Good integrated SNR
- Enough samples for imaging

We are proposing a novel approach to address the deconvolution of interferometric images accounting for the spatial AND temporal dependency of the data.

Sparse representation ? Compressed Sensing?

Theoretical « sparse » signal
 very few non-zero entries

Natural signal ?
 A natural signal may not be sparse itself, but can be « sparsified » in a dictionary Φ

$X = \Phi\alpha$

Sparse signal representation
 Compressed Sensing as a sampling theorem

underdetermined system

Requirements:

- Sparsity
- Incoherence between the sensing basis H and the dictionary basis Φ

Sparse recovery

“Signals with exactly K components different from zero can be recovered perfectly from $\sim K \log N$ incoherent measurements” (Candes et al. 2006, Donoho 2006)

Sampling with an interferometer ~ Compressed Sensing

Simple 2D-1D sparse modeling for radio interferometry

Visibilities $y(t)$, Measurement matrix $H(t)$ (Fourier + Sampling), Sky $x(t)$

Both the sky and masking operator are time dependent
 The time varying sky is supposed to be sparse in Φ

ill-posed inverse problem: $y = Hx + N = MFx + N$

Sparse recovery: $x = \Phi\alpha$ (e.g. Wavelet Tr.)

Dictionaries for 2D-1D sparse signal representation

Hypothesis: spatial and temporal information are independent

2D-1D dictionary: $\psi(x,y,t) = \psi^{(x,y)}(x,y)\psi^{(t)}(t)$

• Dictionary

- 2D spatial signal: W_1 (Starlets (Starck et al. 2011)), W_2 (isotropic Undecimated Wavelet Transform)
- 1D temporal signal: Quantified signals (e.g. Haar), Semi-continuous (e.g. CDF 9/7)

Starlets (Starck et al. 2011)

Quantified signals (e.g. Haar)

Semi-continuous (e.g. CDF 9/7)

$I(k,l) = c_{j,k,l} + \sum_{j=1}^J w_{j,k,l}$

2D-1D wavelet decomposition

I -axis

$\psi_{j_0,j_1}(x,y,t) = \psi_{j_0}^{(x,y)}(x,y)\psi_{j_1}^{(t)}(t)$

Total number of pixels: $N_p = k_{2D} N_x N_y$

Overcomplete dictionary

$\Phi = \{\psi_{j_0,j_1}^{(t)}\}$

Proximal algorithms to the rescue

If the problem has the form $\arg \min_x f(x) + g(x)$

Not solvable with gradient methods!

Hopefully, we now have tools to address this problem:

• Proximal calculus

At a point x , the proximal operator is defined by:

$$\text{prox}_x(x) = \arg \min_{y \in \Omega} \|y - x\| + \lambda \|y\|$$

The prox operator is a « generalized » projection operator when $g(x)$ is differentiable

$\text{prox}_x(x) = x - \lambda \nabla g(x)$ a gradient step of the function g

x is in domain Ω update step = gradient step towards the minimum
 x out of domain Ω update step = orthogonal projection on the boundary

• Forward-Backward (Combettes and Wajs 2005)

Problems with this method

- Not explicit proximity operator in analysis Framework: $g(x) = \|\Phi^T x\|$
- How to include more constraints (e.g. positivity)

• Condat-Vu primal-dual algorithm (Condat 2013; Vu 2013)

- Deal with two constraints (sparsity, positivity)
- Avoid the implicit evaluation of analysis sparsity operator

Application: $\min_x \frac{1}{2} \|y - Hx\|^2 + \lambda \|\Lambda \circ \Phi^T x\|_1 + i_{\Omega}(x)$ $H = MF$

Initialize $x^{(0)}, u^{(0)}$

Evaluate X : $x^{(n+1)} = \text{Prox}_x(x^{(n)} - \tau(\Phi u^{(n)} - \tau H(y - Hx^{(n)})))$

Evaluate U : $u^{(n+1)} = (Id - S_{\tau})u^{(n)} + \eta \Phi^T (2x^{(n+1)} - x^{(n)})$

Λ automatically set for each scale, derived from a noise-driven strategy from the residuals.

M. Jiang, J. Girard, J.-L. Starck, S. Corbel and C. Tasse, "Compressed Sensing and Radio Interferometry", EUSIPCO 2015, Nice

Numerical experiments

Detection robustness towards

- noise level σ
- num of frames N_t

Metrics

- Transient source SNR
- Error on transient profile

Simulation

Time integrated images

Snapshot images

Number of frames N_t

Test #1: SNR

Dirty cubes

Marginal improvement of SNR with time
 SNR turn-over below $N_t = 40$
 → temporal dilution

CLEANed cubes

Higher SNR at low noise
 Temporal dilution effect reduced

2D-1D Sparse cube

Higher SNR at low & high noise
 Slow decrease of SNR due to dilution

One order of magnitude improvement in SNR

Test #2: Temporal profiles

Dirty & CLEAN

Higher RMSE in high noise snapshots
 Similar error

2D-1D Sparse cube

Higher RMSE in high noise snapshots
 Better overall profile reconstruction

Factor of ~3 reduction of the RMSE of transient profile

Test #3: Real data: pulsar B0355+55 with the VLA

Frame 122 - Pulsar OFF

Frame 100 - Pulsar ON

Normalized & centered reconstruction

On-going work

Peaks are successfully detected CS 2D-1D less biased than frame-by-frame reconstruction

Period $P_{B0355+55} = 156ms$

res. $\delta t = 5ms$

λ -band (1.4 GHz) Pihl et al. 2015

Conclusions/Perspectives

- Novel spatio-temporal sparse method
- Based on Condat-Vu primal-dual method
- 2D-1D dictionary for sparse signal representation
- Automatic setting of relaxation parameters
- Radio transients detection
- Sensitivity: one order of magnitude improvement in SNR
- Temporal profile: factor of 3 improvement in the profile reconstruction error
- Preliminary validation on real data
- Improvements/Applications
- Validation on spatially resolved transient sources (e.g. VLBI radio cores)
- Code acceleration: Embarassingly parallelisable => HPC
- Integrate into radio transients detection pipeline

References

M. J. A. Heulemans et al., 2006, Information Theory, IEEE, 52, 498
 Corbelli et al., 2007, Science, 318, 1777
 Loinard et al., 2012, MNRAS, 417, 472
 Condat et al., 2010, Proceedings of the IEEE, 97, 1482
 Donoho et al., 2006, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 52, 1289
 Fender, R. P. & Bell, M. E., 2011, Bulletin of the Astr. Soc., 33, 315
 Girard, J.-N., Girard, J.-N., Starck, J.-L., et al., 2015, A&A, 575, A86
 van Haaren, M. P., Wills, M. W., Orosz, A. W., et al., 2013, A&A, 558, A2
 Hough, J. A., 1974, A&AS, 4, 417
 Starck, J.-L., et al., 2011, Astronomical Data Processing (Springer), 1480-1501
 Starck, J.-L., et al., 2011, Astronomical Data Processing (Springer), 1480-1501
 Thornton, D., Blake, T. D., Mottram, G. J., et al., 2011, A&C, 11, 25
 Thornton, D., Blake, T. D., Blake, M., et al., 2013, Science, 341, 52
 Vu, B. C., 2013, Advances in Computational Mathematics, 38, 867