

Towards Deep Learning Based Predictive Models for Laser Direct Drive on the Omega Laser Facility

R. Ejaz, V. Gopalaswamy, A. Lees, and R. Betti
University of Rochester, Laboratory for Laser Energetics

Summary

Neural network models were developed to predict the fusion yield of OMEGA direct-drive DT-layered implosions

- A deep neural network (DNN) model is developed by first building a model that emulates simulations, which is subsequently calibrated/retrained using limited experimental data*
- This enables making changes directly in input space (laser pulse shape and target specifications) and assess' effects on implosion performance
- An autoencoder is used to represent the laser pulse shape
- A second deep neural network (DNN) is developed that is trained on the measured fusion yield and uses the same parameters from 1-D simulations and experiments of the statistical mapping model** of V. Gopalaswamy et al.

Prediction 1 has "instant" inference times

Motivation

We are investigating if DNN's can provide more-accurate predictions than the statistical mapping model of V. Gopalaswamy et al.*

- OMEGA implosions are currently designed using a statistical model that maps experimental results into a simulation database**
- $YOC_{exp} = \frac{Y_{exp}}{Y_{sim}}$
- \hat{T}_i is the degradation used for $i = 1$ perturbations from target offset and mispointing
- Fill age is the time between DT fill and shot time

$$YOC_{exp} \approx F_{SM} (1\text{-D simulation inputs+outputs}, \hat{T}_i, \text{fill age})$$

*V. Gopalaswamy et al., Nature 565, 581 (2019);
**A. Lees et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 105001 (2021);
SM: statistical model

DNN Model 2

The neural network (NN) model uses 1-D simulation inputs+outputs and experimental data to predict degradations on OMEGA ICF experiments

- Experimental data used are $\hat{T}_i = \frac{T_{max}}{T_{min}}$ measurements and fill age
- Fill age is the time between DT fill and shot time
- \hat{T}_i is the degradation parameter used for shot-to-shot degradations from target offset and mispointing which leads to $i = 1$ perturbations*
- Fill age causes He³ to accumulate in the vapor region; the degradation is represented through the parameter* $\xi_{He} = \frac{Y_{1D,He}}{Y_{1D}}$

$$YOC_{exp} \approx F_{NN} (1\text{-D simulation inputs+outputs}, \hat{T}_i, \text{fill age})$$

*A. Lees et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 105001 (2021).

The two DNN's are (1) trained on simulations and transfer learned to experiments, (2) trained on experimental outputs through selected 1-D-simulated parameters (same as SM)

Two DNN models have been developed

- (Prediction 1) DNN is trained on a 1-D simulation database degraded according to the SM predictions that depends exclusively on 1-D simulated parameters, subsequently the model is transfer learned to experiments

$$YOC_{exp} \approx F_{NN} (\text{laser pulse shape, target specs})$$

- (Prediction 2) DNN is trained directly on the data and 1-D-simulated parameters

$$YOC_{exp} \approx F_{NN} (1\text{-D simulation inputs+outputs}, \hat{T}_i, \text{fill age})$$

*V. Gopalaswamy et al., Nature 565, 581 (2019);
**A. Lees et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 105001 (2021).

DNN Model 1

The NN model uses experimental inputs (laser pulse and target specifications)

An autoencoder is used to parameterize the laser pulse for use as DNN input

DNN Model 2

The architecture of the NN is informed by synthetic experiments done to understand degradation dependencies*

1-D simulation outputs + experimental data

Exponential fit to ASTER
Power law fit to experiment
Range of OMEGA data
ASTER

Synthetic experiments show that degradations due to $\ell = 1$ modes have an exponential dependence on \hat{T}_i , this "physics" informs DNN architecture.

*V. Gopalaswamy et al., Phys. Plasmas 28, 122705 (2021).

DNN Model 1

A 1-D simulation database is used for training; a degradation term calculated from the SM* is also included since it brings simulations closer to "reality"

Train NN on simulation database

Simulation inputs

Yield 1D Simulation Predictions

DNN model hyperparameters

Hidden layers	10
Hidden layer units	27-150-500 x 5-150-50-15
Learning rate	0.001
Batch size	7000
Epochs	1022

Simulation outputs + YOC_{SM}

$YOC_{exp} \approx YOC_{SM} = YOC_h YOC_p YOC_i YOC_f = YOC_{res}$

The NN model and SM model are both able to fit the training data

DNN model

YOC Predictions

YOC EXP Predicted NN

Error mean = -0.016
Error std = 0.037

SM model

YOC Predictions

YOC EXP Predicted SM_1D

Error mean = -0.006
Error std = 0.101

DNN Model 1

Transfer learning is used to integrate the NN model with experiments

Simulation inputs

Experiment inputs

Transfer learning

Simulation outputs + YOC_{SM}

Experiment outputs + YOC_{exp}

$YOC_{exp} = \frac{YOC_{exp}}{YOC_{f=1}^{SM} YOC_{f=1}^{NN}}$

The DNN model and SM model are both able to fit the training data

DNN model

YOC Experimental Predictions

YOC EXP Predicted NN

Error mean = 0.021
Error std = 0.069

SM model

YOC Experimental Predictions

YOC EXP Predicted SM

Error mean = -0.002
Error std = 0.076

The NN model and SM model are both able to predict the test data to within an acceptable error

DNN model

YOC Predictions

YOC EXP Predicted NN

Error mean = 0.001
Error std = 0.066

SM model

YOC Predictions

YOC EXP Predicted SM_1D

Error mean = -0.025
Error std = 0.065

The NN Model and SM model are both able to predict the test data to within an acceptable error

DNN model

YOC Experimental Predictions

YOC EXP Predicted NN

Error mean = 0.019
Error std = 0.085

SM model

YOC Experimental Predictions

YOC EXP Predicted SM

Error mean = -0.017
Error std = 0.112

UNIVERSITY of
ROCHESTER