EUROfusion

Deep Learning for Plasma Tomography and Disruption Prediction

D. R. Ferreira, P. J. Carvalho, H. Fernandes, and JET Contributors
IPFN / IST, University of Lisbon, Portugal

IPFN
INSTITUTO DE PLASMAS E FUSÃO NUCLEAR
TÉCNICO LISBOA

This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium and has received funding from the Euratom research and training programme 2014-2018 and 2019-2020 under grant agreement No 633053. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

Deep Learning

- Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)





Y. Lecun et al., *Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition*, 1998





A. Krizhevsky et al., *ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks*, 2012

Deep Learning

- Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs)
  - speech recognition
  - language modeling
  - machine translation
  - time series
  - …

Simple RNN



LSTM
(Long short-term memory)



C. Olah, *Understanding LSTM Networks*, 2015

Deep Learning

- Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)
  - image processing
    - e.g. plasma tomography
- Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs)
  - time series analysis
    - e.g. disruption prediction

Plasma Tomography

- Reconstruction of the 2D plasma radiation profile





Plasma Tomography

- “Deconvolutional” neural network



D. R. Ferreira et al., *Full-pulse Tomographic Reconstruction with Deep Neural Networks,* 2018

Plasma Tomography

- Dataset
  - JET ILW pulses 80128–92504
  - ~28k sample reconstructions
  - 80% training, 10% validation, 10% test
- Training
  - loss function: mean absolute error
  - min. validation loss: 0.0128 MW m^{-3}
- Test set
  - loss: 0.0147 MW m^{-3}
  - SSIM: 0.936
  - PSNR: 35.4 dB



Keras TensorFlow NVIDIA.



D. D. Carvalho et al., *Deep Neural Networks for Plasma Tomography with Applications to JET and COMPASS,* ECPD 2019

Plasma Tomography

- Full-pulse reconstruction (92213)



Disruption Prediction

- Bolometer signals (92213)





Disruption Prediction

- Recurrent Neural Network



Disruption Prediction

- Two variants





- probability of disruption (classification)
  - output: **sigmoid activation**
  - loss: **binary cross-entropy**
  - training: **disruptive** and **non-disruptive** pulses

- time-to-disruption (regression)
  - output: **no activation**
  - loss: **mean absolute error**
  - training: **disruptive** pulses only

Disruption Prediction

- Dataset
  - bolometer data for JET ILW pulses 80128–92504
  - non-intentional disruptions from JET disruption DB
  - total 9323 pulses, 1444 disruptive (~15%)
  - 80% training, 10% validation, 10% test
  - input: random samples from each pulse
  - output (probability of disruption):
    - 1 if pulse disruptive, 0 otherwise
  - output (time-to-disruption):
    - $t_{\text{disruption}} - t_{\text{sample}}$



Disruption Prediction

- Training
  - min. validation loss
    - probability of disruption: 0.172 (binary cross-entropy)
    - time-to-disruption: 2.45s (mean absolute error)





Disruption Prediction

- Full-pulse prediction (90433)



Disruption Prediction

- Full-pulse prediction (90363)



Disruption Prediction

- Alarm-triggering thresholds
  - example: $(prd \geq 0.85) \wedge (ttd \leq 1.5)$
    - TP: 11.7% (16.8% disruptive pulses in the test set)
    - TN: 77.9% (83.2% non-disruptive pulses in the test set)
    - FP: 5.3% (false alarms)
    - FN: 5.1% (missed alarms)
    - precision: TP/(TP+FP) = 69.0%
    - recall: TP/(TP+FN) = 69.4%

  - comparison: APODIS*
    - recall: 85.4%
    - FP: 2.5% (false alarms)

* Moreno et al., *Disruption prediction on JET during the ILW experimental campaigns*, 2016

Conclusion

- Several opportunities for deep learning
  - CNNs for image processing (e.g. plasma tomography)
  - RNNs for time series analysis (e.g. disruption prediction)
- From single to multiple diagnostics
  - use (bolometer data) + (magnetic equilibrium) as input to CNN
  - use (bolometer data) + (plasma parameters) as input RNN
- From JET to other devices
  - CNN applied to JET and COMPASS (*)
  - RNN applied to JET and DIII-D (**)

(*) D. D. Carvalho et al., *Deep Neural Networks for Plasma Tomography with Applications to JET and COMPASS,* ECPD 2019
(**) J. Kates-Harbeck et al., *Predicting disruptive instabilities in controlled fusion plasmas through deep learning,* Nature, 2019