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NNSA/NA-24 sponsored the development of a UOC sourcing capability

- The U-sourcing database provides the empirical foundation for developing a comparative signature approach

- The Uranium Sourcing Database contains >300 physical UOC samples and “material fingerprints” for over 4000 samples from >30 countries

- ~50 discrete signature variables
  - Major and trace element abundances
  - Isotopic composition (U, Pb, Sr, Nd, C, N, O)
  - Molecular species ($U_3O_8$, $UO_4$, ADU, AUC, …)
  - ~190,000 individual entries (data)

- Discriminant Analysis Verification Engine (DAVE) uses Partial Least Squares Discriminant Analysis (PLSDA) to query the database
Database design, administration, and personnel considerations: internal vs. external database developer

- **External - advantages**
  - Experience, specialization
  - Efficiency
  - Potential cost savings (less training)
  - Reduced burden on internal staff

- **External – disadvantages**
  - Unfamiliar with NF db needs
  - Still R&D; not production; internal staff will still need to administer and modify db

- **Internal – advantages**
  - Greater familiarity with NF db data and requirements
  - Increased interaction between developer and analytical staff likely to result in more successful design
Designing a database for nuclear forensics

- Flat vs relational database format
  - Flat: easy, familiar, single user, limited scale, limited queries
  - Relational: complex, unfamiliar to most, multiple user, unlimited scale, sophisticated queries, industrial strength

- The benefits of simplicity in design
  - Not a production environment; frequent changes likely
  - More transparent = more efficient for humans
  - Production environment – commuting to work
    - Get a Tesla. Sophisticated, powerful, efficient, impossible to work on
  - R&D environment – driving across the tundra
    - Get a Jeep. Slower, more robust, fewer features (which you don’t really need), easy to diagnose, fix, and alter
A data model for nuclear forensics data

- Many ways to organize data; good structure mirrors inherent relationships in data
- Iterative design process led to current structure of Uranium Sourcing Database
  - Primary tables: Sample and Result
  - Numerous satellite tables
    - Primarily “lookup tables” – standardized lists to enforce consistency
Analytical Laboratory to Database Interface

- U Sourcing Database effort includes lab analysis
- Analytical database lead
  - Receives
  - Vets
  - Formats
  - Uploads
- External analysis reports generated by database queries
- Database also used for tracking status of analyses
The U-Sourcing Database Organizes Samples According to Chemical, Physical and Isotopic Properties

**Bimodal core data model:** *Samples and Results*

- **Samples**
  - Sample ID
  - Mass
  - Source
  - Material type
  - Current Location

- **Results**
  - Analysis
  - Result
  - Uncertainty
  - Parameter
  - Units

**Each sample may have ~70 results (measurements)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>0.00733</td>
<td>$^{234}$U/$^{238}$U</td>
<td>Atom ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$\mu$g/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>wt. %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Database structure allows rapid querying of samples

- Sample properties (data) are contained in a bimodal core structure holding variable measurements/sample
- Related tables contain meta-data and supporting information
Database Architecture Allows Both Simple and Multi-faceteded Queries

- Simple query: find source & sample ID for all \( \text{U}_3\text{O}_8 \) with \(^{234}\text{U}\) greater than 57 \(\mu\text{g/g}\)
Selecting a database platform

- Many choices of relational database platform
  - Microsoft SQL Server
  - MySQL
  - Microsoft Access
  - Etc...

- Desirable features
  - User friendly
  - Multi-user (excludes MS Access)
  - Conventional (for ready supply of developers; excludes FileMaker Pro)
  - Existing institutional support

- Free versions of most platforms available
  - No customer support
  - But generally good “crowd sourced” support (forums)
Database data types

- Broad categories of data type
  - Text (text, varchar, char, etc...)
  - Numeric (int, bigint, tinyint, float, double, long, etc...)
  - Time/date (date, time, timestamp, etc...)

- The problem of significant figures
  - There is no numeric data type that meets the specific requirements of nuclear forensic analytical data
    - Numeric data types won’t preserve significant figures properly
    - Rounding issues
    - Text will preserve sig figs, but at a cost (can’t sort or do calcs)
    - Best solution we’ve found is to use text and implement a workaround for associated issues
Populating a NF database

- Units and conventions
  - Two ways to deal with units/reporting
    - Just import as is and then convert units as necessary after making a query
      - Requires less up-front work
      - Reduces potential for conversion errors creeping into database
      - Makes it much harder to perform searches on data
    - Standardize before importing to database
      - Requires more up-front work
      - Makes database much more useful
      - Can use file repository to preserve original data
The file repository

- All data is likely to be received in some document
- Those documents used to populate the database should be permanently stored in a file repository
- Database fields can point to source documents
- Uranium Sourcing Database does this by use of a document field in the Result table
  - Links to the document table
  - Links to the document file in the repository
Data Entry

- Manual vs batch/bulk upload
  - Some fields best updated manually
  - Most better with batch upload
    - Use a SQL (Structured Query Language) script -command line interface
    - Use upload utility in graphical user interface

- Preparation for upload
  - Data not likely received in database format
  - Manual copy and paste re-formatting tedious and error prone
  - Automation of standardized reporting template from analysts is ideal (e.g., MS Visual Basic macro in Excel)
Database user interface(s)

- Two categories of user interface
  - Off the shelf (OTS)
    - No development work necessary
    - Powerful
    - General purpose
    - Relatively difficult for non-specialist to use
  - Custom
    - Best for end-user with repetitive query needs
    - Requires significant development effort
  - Best solution is probably off-the-shelf admin interface and custom user interface(s) for non database specialists
Example OTS Interface: phpMyAdmin and MySQL
Database utilization

- Queries
  - Query is only the beginning; subject matter expert review/interpretation is essential
  - Technical experts should directly query the database
    - For input to technical reports to external request originator
    - For research and development
  - For complex (e.g., multivariate) signatures, post-processing will be necessary
    - Export to Excel or analysis environment (e.g., MATLAB) for analysis
    - UOC signatures well suited to multivariate analysis
      - PCA
      - PLS-DA
Database summary reports

- Particular type of query with special requirements
- Two types of summary information
  - That which can be derived by a direct query of the data
    - E.g., number of samples in the database from a specific location
    - Should be easily accomplished with well designed database
  - That which requires synthesis and interpretation of database contents
    - E.g., number of sources added to the database in the past year
    - Requires a date added field in the appropriate table(s)
    - May require interpretation of whether a source is new
  - Recommend trying to anticipate such requests during development, since may require less than obvious fields
Two ways to link analysis application to database

- Direct queries of database
  - Requires rigorous cleansing and standardizing of database
  - Most flexible
- Queries of “cached” data in form of datasets
  - Easier to ensure quality control of data utilized by application
  - Easier to track/document exactly which data were used as training set for a particular analysis/conclusion
  - More robust; no direct interface with database
  - Requires periodic re-construction of datasets (not automatic)
The Uranium Sourcing Database and iDAVE

- iDAVE is the pattern classification application that utilizes the data stored in the Uranium Sourcing Database
- Example of advanced post-processing of a database query
The Uranium Sourcing Database and iDAVE

**Prediction Summary**
- Declared Source: 
- Predicted Source: Kazakhstan (Area 1)
- Number of Iterations: 5

**Model statistics**
- Q residual /Q residual 95% limit: 3.71E-1
- Hotelling T^2 /T^2, 95% limit: 9.41E-2
- Unknown ID: unkNums
- Number of available parameters: 3
- Parameters Used:
  - Cr
  - Fe
  - Mo

**Iteration 3 Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>YPred-Threshold</th>
<th>bhatt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan (AREA 1)</td>
<td>0.2232</td>
<td>0.25188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA (Area 4)</td>
<td>0.023223</td>
<td>0.55566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan (Area 4)</td>
<td>0.0098048</td>
<td>0.28023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan (Area 1)</td>
<td>0.00020297</td>
<td>0.45456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan (Area 5)</td>
<td>0.0016502</td>
<td>0.30772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (Area 1)</td>
<td>-0.0090852</td>
<td>0.34067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Y-Predicted − Decision...**

- Uzbekistan (AREA 1)
- USA (Area 4)
- Kazakhstan (Area 4)
- Kazakhstan (Area 1)
- Kazakhstan (Area 5)
- Australia (Area 1)
Conclusions

- All but the most elementary nuclear forensic database should use a relational database system
- Internal vs. external database development entails trade-offs
- Simpler db structure is easier to maintain/modify
- Iterative design process recommended
- Preserving significant figures in database is tricky
- File repository is highly recommended
- At least two user interfaces recommended
- NF data may be best utilized with multivariate analysis
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