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Abstract

With the increasing interest in twisted bilayer graphene (TBLG) of the past years, fast, reliable, and non-destructive methods to precisely determine the stacking angle are required. Raman spectroscopy potentially provides such method, given the large amount of information about the state of the graphene that is stored in its Raman spectrum. However, changes in the Raman spectra induced by the stacking order can be very subtle, thus making the angle identification tedious. In this work, we propose the use of machine learning (ML) analysis techniques for the automated classification of the Raman spectrum of TBLG into a selected range of stacking angles. The ML classification proposed here is low computationally demanding, providing fast and accurate results with over a 99% of agreement with the manual labelling of the spectra. The flexibility and non-invasive nature of the Raman measurements, paired with the predictive accuracy of the ML, is expected to facilitate the exploration of the nascent research of TBLG. Moreover, the present work showcases how the currently available open-source tools facilitate the study and integration of ML-based techniques requiring only a minimum programming knowledge.
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Research on twisted bilayer graphene (TBLG) has gained interest in the past few years, sparked in part by the finding of superconductive states at small stacking angles.[1] This interest has also expanded to include twisted stacks of other van der Waals (vdW) materials, giving birth to a novel research field called twistronics.[2–5] In general, determining the stacking angle of TBLG or other twisted vdW stacks is not a trivial task. Techniques like TEM/STEM [6–11] or scanning probe microscopies such as STM/STS [12,13], SNOM [14] and others,[15] provide the most accurate angle determinations, with precisions that can be below ~0.01°. However, these measurements are time-consuming and require of either a free-standing sample or at least supported on a conductive substrate. Moreover, they provide very local information on sub-micron sized areas, although the twist angles can vary considerably within a few μm.[16,17] Thus, these techniques are not suitable for practical applications that require large-area characterizations on arbitrary substrates in relatively short times. Similar accuracies can be obtained from transport measurements of devices under magnetic fields at low temperatures,[1] but the complexity of the measurements and their limitation to small areas make them unsuitable in practical applications. LEEM/LEED can provide information about the number of layers and their stacking orientations with sub-degree accuracy for areas that can be larger than those obtained from TEM and STM measurements, although they generally require a conductive substrate and high vacuum conditions.[2,16,17] In the case of isolated BLG grains with hexagonal shapes it is also possible to determine the stacking angle by optical microscopy.[18] This technique is simple and provides an accuracy of ~1°, but it cannot be applied to the case of BLG with high coverages or with non-hexagonal shapes, as generally happens for chemical vapor deposition (CVD) grown graphene.

Raman spectroscopy is a powerful technique widely used in the characterization of graphene and that provides extensive information about the characteristics, quality, and electronic state of the graphene.[19] Some of the main advantages of Raman spectroscopy include its non-invasive nature, flexibility regarding the kind of substrate and environment in which the measurement is done, and the possibility to examine relatively large areas in reasonably short periods of time. It is widely known that the characteristics of the Raman spectrum of graphene greatly depend on the number of layers and on their relative orientation.[6–8,10,18–23] The case of Bernal and rhombohedral few-layer graphene (FLG) has been extensively studied, owing to their high occurrence in samples obtained from exfoliated natural graphite. The intensity of the Raman G band provides a clear indication of the number of layers,[17,20,24] while the shape of the Raman
2D band can be used to determine the stacking order.[21] Breathing modes in the spectral region at 1650 – 1800 cm\(^{-1}\) can also be used to find the layer number up to a few layers, as well as discriminating between Bernal and orthorhombic stackings.[21,22]

However, the determination of the layer number and stacking angle for twisted FLG by Raman spectroscopy is more complicated, given the increased complexity of the spectra and the subtle differences involved.[6,7,9,10,16,23] A precise determination of the number of layers from the G band intensity is not possible in the presence of twisted layers, due to a resonance for certain angles and excitation wavelengths.[6,7,10,18] But information on the stacking angle of TBLG is encoded in the Raman spectrum.[10,18] However, the variations of the spectra for different angles can be very subtle, e.g. involving small changes in the positions, widths, and/or intensity ratios of the different peaks. These differences are frequently imperceptible at first glance and might easily be overlooked, requiring a careful inspection of the spectrum. Perceiving some of them rely on the obtention of high quality spectra with large signal-to-noise ratios, as it is case for the subtle changes in the spectral region between the G and 2D bands or at low Raman wavelengths.[18,23,24] In general, determining the stacking angle requires the simultaneous comparison of several features of the Raman spectrum. Moreover, the electronic, chemical, and structural state of the graphene can significantly alter its Raman spectrum, such as the presence of defects, strain and doping.[19] This further difficult the stacking angle determination, as each angle is represented by a broad dispersion of spectra instead of by a single-ideal spectrum. Hence, manual determination of the stacking order is time consuming and not practical. As the stacking angle of CVD-grown TBLG can greatly vary point to point,[17] it is necessary to introduce automated Raman-based analysis methods for the fast and reliable determination of the stacking order for large areas.

Machine-learning (ML) comprises a series of techniques that rely on statistics to make predictions based on a previous training (supervised ML) or to categorize unknown data (unsupervised ML).[25] ML-based methods are being actively introduced in different aspects of the research and handling of 2D materials.[26–29] Recently, ML methods have proved to be effective in determining the stacking angle of simulated portions of the Raman spectrum around the G band.[30] However, real Raman spectra can differ significantly from the simulated ones, with the positions, widths, and relative intensities of the most characteristic Raman peaks being heavily affected by things like strain and doping.[19] ML has also been used to identify limited
stack angles of BLG made by artificially stacking SLG.[31] Clustering, an unsupervised ML paradigm, has been used with unlabeled Raman data to cluster the spectra into groups that roughly correspond to different kinds of graphene, including AB-stacked BLG (BLG-AB) and TBLG, but with no sensitivity towards the stacking angle.[32]

In this work, we propose an easy, fast, and low computationally demanding ML-based method to determine the stacking order of TBLG from its Raman spectrum. The method involves extracting selected features of the TBLG Raman spectra that provide enough information to train a ML model to infer the stacking angle within some predefined ranges. The accuracies of the ML predictions exceed a 99% of agreement with the manual labelling of the spectra. Pairing this predictive accuracy with the flexibility and non-invasive nature of the Raman measurements provides a method expected to facilitate and accelerate the nascent research of TBLG. The present work also presents an example of how currently existing available open-source tools allow an easy and effective integration of ML-based techniques with regular research methods, requiring only minimum programming knowledge while potentially increasing the efficiency of the research.[33]

Results and Discussion

Several of the characteristics of a given graphene sample can be obtained by the inspection of its Raman spectrum. It is thus almost straightforward to determine the thickness of AB-stacked graphene for up to a few layers, given the linear increase of the Raman G-band intensity with the number of layers (Fig. S1).[17,20,24] Given the strong effect of the stacking angle of the BLG in the Raman spectrum, it is possible to roughly estimate it from the Raman characteristics.[10,18] Figure 1a shows the average spectra for CVD-grown BLG with different twist angle ranges and for SLG, after being transferred to SiO2 substrates. These average spectra were obtained by estimating the stacking angle of thousands of Raman spectra collected from our CVD-graphene. The graphene used here was grown in different CVD batches, to obtain the wider possible range of angles and to counteract small sample to sample differences, such as unintentional variations of strain or doping levels. Careful inspection of each individual Raman spectrum allowed us to assign them to one of eight different classes that include SLG, BLG-AB and different ranges of stacking angles of TBLG. This classification was done attending to the specific characteristics of the given spectrum, which was then compared with spectra reported in the literature and precisely labelled by alternative experimental techniques.[10,18] This manual process to classify the Raman spectra
is laborious and prone to errors, and given that the stacking angle can greatly vary over the BLG surface,[17] it is difficult to scale it up for large CVD-grown BLG areas.

Figure 1. (a) Average spectra for each of the classes included in the training set, measured under a 532 nm excitation. The stacking angles were determined by comparison with existing literature. The spectra are normalized to the 2D band intensity and vertically shifted. (b, c) Distribution of $I_{2D/G}$ (b) and $FWHM_{2D}$ (c) for the different classes. (d) Scatter plot of the $FWHM_{2D}$ vs the intensity ratio $I_{2D/G}$ for each of the determined stacking angles. The probability distributions are included at the top ($FWHM_{2D}$) and right ($I_{2D/G}$) edges of the graphic.
Instead of working with the full spectra, we extracted a few measurable features from each spectrum. The features selected here include the shift ($\omega$) and width (FWHM) of each of the main graphene Raman bands (G and 2D), the relative intensities $I_{2D/G}$ and $I_{D/G}$, and the presence and characteristics of other minor bands, such as the R and R’ bands. Table I shows the average values of each of these features for the different assigned twist angle ranges. The last row of Table I corresponds to the values for the mutual information between each feature and the assigned labels for the stacking angle,[34] which is a measure of the shared information between the corresponding feature and the angle label. Hence, the features with the largest values are expected to be the most relevant to determine the stacking angle. Taken separately, none of these features allow to unambiguously determine the stacking angle (Figure S2). For the two features with the largest mutual information values, $I_{2D/G}$ and FWHM$_{2D}$, the first is not sensitive to angles between 0° (BLG-AB) and 9° (Fig. 1b), while the latter fails in discriminating stacking angles between 13° and 30° (Fig. 1c). Therefore, improving the sensitivity requires the combination of several features. Plotting pairs of these features show that each of the classes cluster together, as can be seen in Fig. 1d for the two best features and in Figure S3 for the complete set of feature pairs. Note that this provides a faster way to label new experimental data as compared with the manual inspection of the whole spectrum. However, some of these clusters still overlap when using only a pair of features, as shown in Figure S4, thus preventing an unequivocal determination of the stacking angle by simply using those specific features. The overlap of the clusters is reduced by further increasing the number of features ($n$), as they will now be embedded in a $n$-dimensional hyperspace. Thus, by combining all the available features (in the present case the 8 features already

Table I. Average values (with the standard deviations) of the Raman features for each of the stacking angle ranges used to train the ML models. The intensity ratios $I_{R/G}$ and $I_{R'/G}$ were extracted only from stacking angles showing noticeable R and R’ bands, while for the rest of angles the ratios are considered to be 0. The last row shows the mutual information of each of the features and the labels for the twist angle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Twist angle</th>
<th>$\omega_{G}$ (cm$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>FWHM$_{G}$ (cm$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\omega_{2D}$ (cm$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>FWHM$_{2D}$ (cm$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$I_{2D/G}$</th>
<th>$I_{D/G}$</th>
<th>$I_{R/G}$</th>
<th>$I_{R'/G}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLG</td>
<td>1587.02 ± 3.17</td>
<td>14.82 ± 1.45</td>
<td>2680.27 ± 3.31</td>
<td>30.15 ± 2.2</td>
<td>2.18 ± 0.5</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLG AB</td>
<td>1583.35 ± 2.08</td>
<td>15.17 ± 1.15</td>
<td>2694.60 ± 2.5</td>
<td>53.55 ± 1.25</td>
<td>0.66 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–5°</td>
<td>1584.24 ± 0.65</td>
<td>15.34 ± 0.79</td>
<td>2693.05 ± 1.21</td>
<td>45.03 ± 2.21</td>
<td>0.46 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9°</td>
<td>1586.77 ± 0.05</td>
<td>13.31 ± 1.60</td>
<td>2685.43 ± 2.39</td>
<td>35.55 ± 2.3</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.14</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–13°</td>
<td>1582.91 ± 1.23</td>
<td>15.89 ± 2.29</td>
<td>2691.08 ± 5.66</td>
<td>37.65 ± 4.92</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.12</td>
<td>0.01 ± 0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–20°</td>
<td>1584.98 ± 1.83</td>
<td>15.41 ± 1.73</td>
<td>2692.60 ± 0.01</td>
<td>25.66 ± 2.42</td>
<td>1.55 ± 0.48</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–28°</td>
<td>1587.04 ± 1.12</td>
<td>12.03 ± 1.45</td>
<td>2688.75 ± 2.43</td>
<td>25.20 ± 1.88</td>
<td>2.26 ± 0.36</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28–30°</td>
<td>1583.44 ± 1.34</td>
<td>15.39 ± 1.28</td>
<td>2688.84 ± 2.61</td>
<td>23.03 ± 2.01</td>
<td>4.47 ± 0.49</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shown in Table I), it is possible to increase the accuracy in the determination of the stacking angle. To confirm this, the graphene region shown in Figure 2a was mapped by Raman, with the maps for $I_{2D/G}$ and $FWHM_{2D}$ shown in Fig. 2b,c and the whole set of features in Figure S5. The contrast in the Raman mappings evidence the existence of several differentiated graphene regions, being especially apparent for the features shown in Fig. 2b,c. Combining the data from all these maps allows to assign a class to each of the spectra, as shown in the Fig. 2d. All the spectra were classified according to the characteristics previously indicated, except for a few points marked in grey that are usually found in limits between two different regions. This approach still requires a considerable manual input and a careful inspection of the Raman data in an n-dimensional hyperspace. Moreover, it can also hinder the identification of finer details that might potentially go unnoticed, thus preventing to reach a higher precision in the determination of the stacking angle.

Figure 2. (a) Optical image of CVD-grown graphene consisting of SLG (light) and BLG (dark) areas. (b, c) Raman mappings of $I_{2D/G}$ (b) and $FWHM_{2D}$ (c) for the same area as (a). (d, e) Mapping of the stacking angle determined manually by inspecting the characteristics of the Raman spectra (d) and by a trained random forest ML model (e). The predicted values coincide with the manually labeled ones in ~99.02 %, excluding the gray points in (d) that could not be manually labelled. (f) Probability assigned by the random forest model to each of the predictions shown in (e).
The processing speed and precision of the labeling can be improved by applying ML methods, as the kind of n-dimensional data from the processed Raman features can be easily interpreted and processed by relatively simple ML models. The first step is to train the ML model using Raman data that has already labelled, in what is known as supervised learning. The models used here are multiclass classifiers for which the training data is categorized into a finite set of classes. These classes correspond to SLG, BLG-AB and TBLG with several stacking angles, as previously mentioned. The dataset used to train the ML model was obtained from the set of spectra shown in Figure S6. Each of these spectra was assigned a class and the relevant Raman features were extracted, as shown in Fig. S2 and Fig. S3. It is worth noting that the spectra were used without any further preprocessing, such as noise reduction or background subtraction. Each ML model have a different set of internal variables, known as hyperparameters, that have a large impact on the performance of the model but cannot be derived during the training process. For tuning these hyperparameters, the dataset used for training was split into a train and a test dataset. The train dataset was then used to adjust the model hyperparameters via a cross-validation procedure,[35] while the test dataset was only employed to evaluate the performance of the trained model. This procedure allowed to obtain optimized values for the hyperparameters, which in turn provided the best possible predictive performances of the trained models.

Once that it has been trained, the model is ready to predict the stacking angle of BLG and discriminate between BLG and SLG. It is important to note that all the ML predictions done in this work are for data that is not present in the training set. This ensures that the model can generalize to new unseen data, and that the high predicting accuracies are not due to problems like overfitting of the training data.[35] To carry out the prediction, an n-dimensional vector containing the Raman features of data unseen by the trained model is used as input. Unlike in the training process, here the value of the stacking angle is not supplied to the model. The model is thus unaware of the result of the manual labeling for the data to be predicted, which can then be used to validate the accuracy of the prediction. The prediction corresponds to one of the classes for which the model was trained. In the case of the graphene shown in Fig. 2a, the trained model was supplied with the maps containing the Raman features for each point (Fig. 2b,c and S5). The prediction using a random forest model is presented in Fig. 2e, coinciding in ~ 99.02% with the values obtained by manually labelling of Fig. 2d. In these examples we have used a random forest classification algorithm, as it is a commonly employed model that performs well on a wide range
We also studied the performance of other algorithms, with the results of the predictions being shown in Figure S7. After adjusting their corresponding hyperparameters, all the selected models clearly outperformed the results obtained from the dummy models that were also included in Figure S7.

In general, during the prediction the model assigns a probability for the input data to belong to each of the classes, with the predicted class being that with the highest value. It must be noted that some of the ML models employed here are designed for binary classification and do not inherently support multiclass, such as the support vector machines (SVM), although the subtleties of this are beyond the scope of the present work. Figure 2f shows the probabilities assigned by the random forest model to the classes shown in Fig. 2e, which can be interpreted as a confidence of the model in the predicted values. The areas with the lower probabilities mostly coincide with areas in which the manual labelling was not possible, such as in the boundaries between different stacking regions, and with areas in which the predictions are more likely to disagree with the manual labelling.

To better understand the training and prediction processes, a random forest model was trained using only the pair of features with the largest values of mutual information, i.e., $I_{2D/G}$ and $FWHM_{2D}$, instead of the complete set of features, as shown in Figure 3a. Using just two features decreases the accuracy of the predictions but allows to plot the decision boundary of the model, which divides the feature space ($FWHM_{2D}$, $I_{2D/G}$) into regions for which different classes are predicted. The resulting decision boundary corresponds to the colored background of Fig. 3a,b. The fact that the decision boundary is not complex seems to indicate that the model is not overfitting the training set,[35] which is in accordance with the high accuracy value obtained on the hold-out test set. For comparison, in Figure S8 there are examples of decision boundaries for overfitted and underfitted SVM models. The overfitted model shows a complex decision boundary that closely follows the data from the training set. Consequently, the model has a perfect accuracy on the training set, but the much lower value obtained in the test set indicates that it does not generalize well to predict new results. Conversely, the underfitted model shows extremely simple boundaries, with similarly low accuracy values for both the training and the test sets. This result
highlights the importance of choosing suitable hyperparameters to obtain reliable predictions from the models.

**Figure 3.** (a) Scatter plot of the $FWHM_{2D}$ vs $I_{2DG}$ used for training a random forest classifier, colored with the corresponding decision boundary on the background. The numbers in parenthesis represents the accuracy of the model on the train and test sets, respectively. (b) Decision boundary for the random forest classifier trained with data shown in (a). (c) Probability assigned by the model to the most likely class for each point of the decision boundary. (d) Decision boundary with the colors determined according to the weighted average of the probabilities assigned to each of the classes. (e, f) Decision boundary with the scatter for the mapping in Figures 2b,c of the main text with the color from the real class (e) and the class predicted by the model (f). The number in (f) represents the accuracy of the model with respect to the manual labelling, excluding the gray points in (e), which represent spectra that could not be manually labeled properly.
The decision boundary in Fig. 3a,b is obtained by plotting the class with the largest probability estimated by the model, with the value of such probability being shown in Fig. 3c. This plot shows that areas with low probability values can be found especially in areas void of training data, such as the top right corner of the figure, in areas in which training data for different classes are close to each other, or in the boundaries between different classes of the decision boundary. Such uncertain regions of the model are also visible in Fig. 3d, which shows a modified decision boundary in which the color of each point is a weighted linear combination of the color of each class and the probability assigned to it in the given point. In contrast with the sharp boundaries of Fig. 3b, the boundaries between different classes are now blurred, reflecting the fact that the model is not so confident in the predictions in these regions.

Figures 3e,f show how the model trained with the pair of features $I_{2D/G}$ and $FWHM_{2D}$ classifies the Raman mapping from Fig. 2. The color of the dots in Fig. 3e follows the manual assignment of the classes shown in Fig. 2d. For Fig. 3f the color of the dots was assigned according to the predictions from the model, which can be seen in Figure S9. The class of some of the dots in Fig. 3e do not correspond with that of the decision boundary, as happens for some of the dots assigned a 20 – 28° stacking (blue dots) that can be found in the lower part of the 28 – 30° region (purple area) and at the top right part of the SLG region (yellow area). Given the way that the decision boundary plot is constructed, the prediction from the model trivially follows the regions delimited by the boundaries, and hence those dots are being mislabeled by the model and decrease its accuracy. This mislabeling mainly occurs in the boundaries delimiting the regions, which have a low probability in Fig. 3c. Other thing to note is that the model outputs a class even for dots that were not manually classified. This is especially evident for the unlabeled (grey color) dots found in the 0 – 5° region (brown area) of Fig. 3e. Although it is not possible to ascertain the accuracy of the model in these cases, the outcome seems plausible given the fact that those dots are next to BLG-AB regions (Fig. S9).

As previously mentioned, decreasing the number of features to train the model tends to lower the accuracy of the predictions. However, not all the features have the same relevancy on the predictions. Using the aforementioned $I_{2D/G}$ and $FWHM_{2D}$ features produces a relatively good accuracy of ~97.8% (Fig. 3f), only slightly lower than the value obtained when using the complete set of features ~99.02% (Fig. 2e). This value decreases a lot when selecting less relevant features,
as it is the case of $\omega_G$ and $I_{D/G}$ for which the accuracy decreases to ~77.9\% (Fig. S9). This highlights the importance of selecting features that adequate to the problem in order to obtain the best possible outcome.

Although the method presented here provides a high accuracy for the determination of the stacking angle of TBLG, the precision of the models can be further improved to obtain smaller ranges for the predicted angles. To increase the precision of the models, it is necessary to improve the quality of the dataset used for training. One way to attain this is by a more precise determination of the stacking angles of the spectra used for the training, for example by TEM/STEM measurements.[8] This would allow narrowing some of the angle ranges of the training classes by feeding more information for training the models. In this sense the R and R’ bands seem to be promising to increase the accuracy in the range of 5 – 20°, as their shift and intensities are known to be affected by the stacking angle.[8,37] Our data also points out to this possibility, as specially the shift of the R band is seen to change for different spectra shown in Fig. S6. Correspondingly, some other overlooked trends in the features might be used by the models to increase the precision while keeping high accuracies. Another unexplored possibility to narrow down the predicted angle ranges is to use complementary excitation wavelengths for the Raman measurement. The trend of the characteristics of some Raman bands, such as $\omega$, FWHM and relative intensity, can heavily depend on the wavelength of the excitation laser.[6] This provides additional information that can be used to obtain narrower angles for the classes of the training spectra. It is possible that this information can also be interpreted by the model to increase the accuracy of the predicted stacking angle. Similarly, additional Raman bands and the inclusion of different regions of the spectra can also be used to increase the angle accuracy, especially for certain angle ranges.[23] Finally, other possibility to enhance the precision can be the use of whole (or parts) of the Raman spectra. This has already been proved with spectra simulated by first principles,[30] and more recently with trainsets limited to a few selected angles of artificially stacked BLG.[31] However, the method employed here using only selected features of the spectra results in much faster and simpler calculations.

Conclusions

We have demonstrated the feasibility to integrate ML-based methods for the automated determination of the stacking angle of CVD-grown TBLG. The proposed method provides
accuracies that exceed a 99% when compared with the manual labelling of the stacking angles. Moreover, the method is not computationally demanding, providing predictions for whole Raman mappings comprising hundreds of spectra in a matter of seconds even on average desktop computers. The precision of the predicted angle ranges can be potentially increased by improving the quality of the data used for training the model. Paired with the flexibility and non-invasive nature of Raman measurements, we expect that this method facilitates the research of TBLG, with its many intriguing properties and potential applications.

**Methods**

Graphene was grown by CVD on Cu-Ni thin films supported by sapphire crystals, and then transferred to an SiO$_2$ substrate using a PMMA support film.[17] Confocal Raman spectroscopy was conducted on the transferred graphene using a 532 nm laser excitation in a Nanofinder 30 spectrometer (Tokyo Instruments Inc.).

The open-source Python library scikit-learn was used to perform the ML modeling.[33] In order to optimize the hyperparameters of the different models, the original dataset was split into a training set and a test set. The training set was then used to find the best hyperparameters via stratified k-fold cross validation, while the held-out test set was used to compare the performance of the different models.[38] The accuracy of the trained models was finally obtained by comparison of the model predictions and the manual labelling of a different set of Raman mappings that was not used during the training process.
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Figure S1. Optical image (a) and Raman G-band intensity mapping (b) of graphene including 1 to 3 layers. The stacking is AB and ABA within the regions of 2 and 3 layers, respectively. There, the G-band intensity linearly increases with the number of layers, resembling the optical image. At the boundary of the 3 L area the graphene layers are twisted, causing a sharp increase of the G band intensity.
Figure S2. Distribution of all the features used to train the ML models along with their corresponding probability densities. This data was experimentally collected from several CVD-grown graphene samples transferred to SiO$_2$ substrates. The numbers at the top right corners are the mutual information between each feature and the stacking angle.
Figure S3. Probability distribution of each feature (top diagonal) and scatter plots for each pair of features. The data is taken from the spectra used as training set.
Figure S4. Scatter plot of the FWHM\textsubscript{2D} and the $I_{2D/G}$ (left) and areas enclosing 95% of the points for each of the stacking angles (right).
Figure S5. Raman mappings of all the features used to classify the spectra of the Figure 2 of the main text.
Figure S6. Plots of all the Raman spectra used for the training. Each individual spectrum corresponds to a horizontal line, with the color representing the Raman intensity. The left column correspond to the whole spectra, while the right column are enlargements around the G-band area. The spectra are normalized to the G band intensity, and the color scale is logarithmic to better visualize the less intense bands.
Figure S7. Results of the prediction of different ML models for the same mapping data used in the Figure 2 of the main text. The top right corner of each image shows the specific classifier and scaler used, and the number in parenthesis is the accuracy when comparing the results with the manual classification. Note that these values exclude the manually undetermined Raman spectra (gray points (a)). A couple of dummy models have also been included ((h) and (i)), for which the predictions are independent of the training data. The predictions of (h) are random but respect the class distribution of the train dataset, while in (i) the most frequent class in the train dataset is always predicted.
Figure S8. Decision boundaries for overfitted (a) and underfitted (b) SVM models trained using the two most relevant features (i.e., $I_\text{2D/G}$ and $FWHM_\text{2D}$). The numbers in parenthesis at the top right corners represent the accuracy of the model on the train and test sets, respectively. For the overfitted model (a) there is a drop in the value for accuracy on the test set respect to the train set, indicating the poor ability of the model to generalize to unseen data. The underfitted model (b) cannot identify all the different classes and has similarly low accuracy values for the train and test sets.
Figure S9. Comparison of the manual classification (a), with the prediction results when training the ML model using all the features (b), the two most relevant features ($I_{2D/G}$ and $FWHM_{2D}$) (c), and two non-ideal features ($\omega_G$ and $I_{DG}$) (d). The first column represents the manual classification and the predictions of the concerning models, the middle column are the differences between the manual classification and the model prediction (differences in red), and the last column are the probabilities given to the predicted class by each model.