# Deep learning for the deblending of (high-redshift) galaxies

Caroline Heneka, Senior Postdoc Hamburg Observatory, University of Hamburg



arXiv:1905.01324, the COIN Cosmostatistics Initiative, project #15 (https://cosmostatistics-initiative.org/) Collaborators: Alexandre Boucaud, Emille Ishida, Rafael S. de Souza & the <u>COIN</u> collaboration

# The deblending problem

**Goal:** 'Good' photometry for surveys with high blended fraction (expected), e.g. SDSS, LSST and Euclid

Add-on: Galaxy segmentation and morphology / shape (also prior for 'classic' methods)

**Challenge**: Galaxies are 'transparent', so that separating flux in overlapping regions is difficult

z2

z1

Hubble Space Telescope •

CANDELS field

# The deblending problem

### **Goal:** 'Good' photometry for surveys with high blended fraction (expected), e.g. SDSS, LSST and Euclid - avoid bias!

low stellar density (Ross et al. 2012a). The correlation of galaxy density with stellar density is the most significant known bias on measured clustering, likely caused by incomplete deblending of detected objects in crowded fields of the SDSS imaging data. On the other hand, no significant correlation is seen between number density and potential

z2

Add-on: Galaxy segmentation and morphology / shape (also prior for 'classic' methods)

**Challenge**: Galaxies are 'transparent', so that separating flux in overlapping regions is difficult

Dawson et al. 2016

•

CANDELS field

Lily Hu et al.

2017

Hubble Space Telescope

Similar challenge: Overlapping chromosomes



Artificially blended CANDELS data 18 < mag < 24 (https://github.com/aboucaud/candels-blender) Get photometry of blended galaxies..

> Goals for our deep NNs





..Derive galaxy masks (shape measurements)

Boucaud et al., COIN collaboration MNRAS 491,2 (2020)

...do so bias-free





similar photometry for both nets, typical scatter 0.1 mag

Boucaud et al., MNRAS 491,2 (2020)

### Photometric bias and scatter - magnitude difference blend2flux (central) blend2mask2flux (central) SExtractor (central) $\Delta_{mag} = 0.015$ $\Delta_{mag} = 0.016$ $\overline{\Delta_{mag}} = 0.101$ vered 22 $\sigma_{mag} = 0.120$ Blend2Flux Blend2Mask2Flux Sextractor outliers = 0.2%Median MAPE = 0.4% Scatter Magnitude k 0.15 1.0 19 0.10 0.8 Ó -1 0.05 20 21 agnitude isolated 22 19 21 Median ( $\Delta_{mag}$ ) 20 Scatter ( $\Delta_{mag}$ ) Magnitude isolated 0.6 blend2flux (companion) 0.00 actor (companion) $\overline{\Delta_{mag}} = 0.012$ 0.4 -0.05 $\sigma_{mag} = 0.127$ Magnitude blended recovered outliers = 0.1%0.2 MAPE = 0.4%-0.10-0.150.0 -0.5 0.0 -1.5 -1.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 mag<sub>central</sub> – mag<sub>companion</sub> Ó 19 22 22 22 21 19 20 21 19 20 20 21 Magnitude isolated Magnitude isolated Magnitude isolated

1) *blend2flux* a CNN for photometry



2) *blend2mask2flux* photometry + masks



Boucaud et al., MNRAS 491,2 (2020)

small bias and scatter

mag<sub>central</sub> – mag<sub>companie</sub>

### Photometric bias and scatter - galaxy type Bulae + Disk Disks Irregular All Spheroids bias SExtractor blend2flux blend2mask2flux 0.4 0.06 0.06 0.3 0.04 0.04 0.2 0.02 0.02 Median( $\Delta_{mag}$ ) ( Jac ag) 0.1 Median( $\Delta_n$ Median( $\Delta_r$ 0.00 0.0 0.00 -0.1 -0.02 -0.02 -0.2 -0.04 -0.04 -0.3 -0.06 -0.06 -0.4 -1.5 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 -1.5 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 -1.5 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.5 1.0 1.5 mag<sub>central</sub> – mag<sub>companion</sub> mag<sub>central</sub> – mag<sub>companion</sub> mag<sub>central</sub> - mag<sub>companior</sub> blend2flux blend2mask2flux SExtractor 0.8 0.20 0.20 0.7 0.6 Scatter(Δ<sub>mag</sub>) -1.0 -1.0 Scatter(Δ<sub>mag</sub>) 01.0 Scatter( $\Delta_{mag}$ ) 0.3 0.2 0.05 0.05 0.1 0.00 0.00 0.0 -1.5 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 -1.5 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 -1.5 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5

mag<sub>central</sub> – mag<sub>companior</sub>

1) *blend2flux* a CNN for photometry



2) *blend2mask2flux* photometry + masks



small bias and scatter

mag<sub>central</sub> - mag<sub>companion</sub>

scatter

Boucaud et al., MNRAS 491,2 (2020)

Histogram of IoU (Intersection over Union - Jaccard index)



2 a) *U-net* masks, no photometry



2 b) *blend2mask2flux* photometry + masks



Dispersion broadens when optimised for photometry

Boucaud et al., MNRAS 491,2 (2020)

## Galaxy deblending with DNNs: Take-aways

### The deblending problem

- Large fraction of blends for deep photometric surveys
- Non-trivial to disentangle single galaxies
- Causes bias

### Photometry

- DNNs recover flux: low bias and high precision
- A 'simple' CNN blend2flux performs well
- Slight improvement when simultaneously constraining masks
- Mask Segmentation
  - U-Net architecture suitable to recover shapes
  - Pitfall: Train photometry + shapes end-to-end



### Limitations - Idealisations

- Pre-detected sources
- Centering
- Restricted to pairs
- Single-channel