

ctools - Feature #1769

Allow to specify an energy range for ctlike

04/19/2016 11:42 AM - Mayer Michael

| | | | |
|--|--------|------------------------|-----------|
| Status: | New | Start date: | |
| Priority: | Normal | Due date: | |
| Assigned To: | | % Done: | 0% |
| Category: | | Estimated time: | 0.00 hour |
| Target version: | | | |
| Description | | | |
| <p>I think this feature has come up already some time ago. I think it would be very nice to support hidden parameters <code>emin</code> and <code>emax</code> in <code>ctlike</code>.</p> <p>It would simplify the analysis with <code>ctlike</code>, if for any energy selection a preceding <code>ctselect</code> run could be avoided.</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>I have a dataset that was selected by energy threshold, FoV, etc. Inspecting the spectral data points from <code>csspec</code> I realise weird features for some energy bins. I therefore would like to run the fit in a particular energy range again for some more debugging information. For e.g. <code>csresmap</code>, I can already specify an energy range for the resulting map. To rerun <code>ctlike</code>, we would need to run <code>ctselect</code> (and/or <code>ctbin</code> etc) to prepare the data accordingly.</p> <p>Instead we could support sth like <code>ctlike emin=1.0 emax=3.0</code>. For binned/stacked analysis, of course, we would extract maps from the cube (like we do for instance in <code>csspec</code>).</p> <p>I guess in particular also <code>csspec</code> would be very much simplified by that feature.</p> | | | |

History

#1 - 06/03/2016 12:22 AM - Knödseder Jürgen

What I like with the actual `ctlike` tool is that its interface is extremely simple. By adding energy limits we start to mix event selection and model fitting in the same tool. The next step would then be to add temporal selection, etc.

Is there a real speed penalty of running `ctselect` before `ctlike`? You can always combine both in a script and then call the script for getting the combined behavior. But I really would like to keep the tools as fundamental as possible.

#2 - 06/14/2016 03:45 PM - Mayer Michael

Sorry for the slow response.

I agree that the simplicity of this tool should indeed be kept the way it is.

When running analyses interactively via the command line, an additional run of `ctselect` slows down the computation quite a bit since one has to:

1. Load the observation container into memory (can take up to 1-2 minutes for about 600 observations - large dataset)
2. Create a place to store the newly selected events (1 file per obs, i.e. need to create a new folder somewhere)
3. Reload observation container into memory for `ctlike` (another 1-2 minutes)

I guess the simplest workaround would be a `cscript` that can take additional selection arguments `emin`, `emax`, `tmin`, `tmax`, maybe even `ra`, `dec` and `rad` to `selects` and runs `ctlike` in-memory. Or do you think such a script would be too specific?

#3 - 06/17/2016 08:34 PM - Knödseder Jürgen

I'm wondering whether it would be better to add this as a `obsutils` function?

On the other hand, I'm not sure whether we really want to support in the long run the obsutils module. At the end, people will want to adapt this level of scripts to their own needs, or may write their own Python scripts that do exactly what they want. That's somehow the entire goal for having modular tools.

#4 - 06/18/2016 10:07 AM - Mayer Michael

To be honest, I have never used the obsutils module. Most of the times it is more convenient to have full control over the individual tools.

I guess such things as fits in a certain energy range can be easier accomplished with workflows. We might for instance think about an enhanced workflow manager that can also run in-memory and pass the outcome from one tool to another.