Adaptative Diffraction Image Registration

for 4D-STEM to optimize ACOM Pattern Matching

Nicolas Folastre^{1,4}, Junhao Cao^{1,4}, Gozde Oney^{1,2,4}, Sunkyu Park^{1,2}, Arash Jamali¹, Christian Masquelier^{1,4,5}, Laurence Croguennec^{2,4,5}, Muriel Veron³, Edgar F. Rauch³, Arnaud Demortière^{1,4,5*}

¹ Laboratoire de Réactivité et Chimie des Solides (LRCS), CNRS-UPJV UMR 7314, Hub de l'Energie, rue Baudelocque, 80039 Amiens Cedex, France.

² Institut de Chimie de la Matière Condensée de Bordeaux (ICMCB), Bordeaux

³ Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, SIMAP, F-38000 Grenoble

⁴ Réseau sur le Stockage Electrochimique de l'Energie (RS2E), CNRS FR 3459, Hub de l'Energie, rue Baudelocque, 80039 Amiens Cedex, France.

⁵ ALISTORE-European Research Institute, CNRS FR 3104, Hub de l'Energie, rue Baudelocque, 80039 Amiens Cedex, France

Corresponding Author: <u>*arnaud.demortiere@cnrs.fr</u>

Abstract: The technique known as 4D-STEM has recently emerged as a powerful tool for the local characterization of crystalline structures in materials, such as cathode materials for Li-ion batteries or perovskite materials for photovoltaics. However, the use of new detectors optimized for electron diffraction patterns and other advanced techniques requires constant adaptation of methodologies to address the challenges associated with crystalline materials. In this study, we present a novel image processing method to improve pattern matching in the determination of crystalline orientations and phases. Our approach uses sub-pixelar adaptative image processing to register and reconstruct electron diffraction signals in large 4D-STEM datasets. By using adaptive prominence and linear filters such as mean and gaussian blur, we are able to improve the quality of the diffraction pattern registration. The resulting data compression rate of 10³ is well-suited for the era of big data and provides a significant enhancement in the performance of the entire ACOM data processing method. Our approach is evaluated using dedicated metrics, which demonstrate a high improvement in phase recognition. Our results demonstrate that this data preparation method not only enhances the quality of the resulting image but also boosts the confidence level in the analysis of the outcomes related to determining crystal orientation and phase. Additionally, it mitigates the impact of user bias that may occur during the application of the method through the manipulation of parameters.

Keywords: 4D-STEM, Scanning nano-diffraction, ACOM, Image processing, Registration, data reduction, TEM, Battery materials

Introduction

The emergence of new energy materials is related to the development of highly controlled polycrystalline materials exhibiting specific and interesting phase transformation, electronic/ionic conductivity, and optical properties. For instance, knowledge of the spatial distribution of phases, orientations, grain boundaries, and strains is crucial to obtain a complete picture of the phenomena occurring over material operation. Scanning transmission electron microscopy (STEM) is one of the most developed analytical methods to characterize these polycrystals from the microscopic scale to the atomic scale.^{1,2,3,4,5} The interest of the hyperspectral STEM approach, which gathers structural and chemical information in a 4D image stack as-called hyper image, was mainly based on imaging-spectroscopy techniques such as STEM-EDX⁶ (energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy) for elemental mapping of samples and STEM-EELS⁷ (electron energy loss spectroscopy) for chemical environment or oxidation state mappings. These techniques can even gather several types of information to characterize materials, as the techniques of electron ptychography⁸ and real-time integrated center of mass⁹. The last decade, thanks to new generations of direct electron and hybrid pixel detectors¹⁰, AI computer vision¹¹, precession technique, and highly coherent electron beam, a new approach has emerged called 4D-STEM^{12,13,14,15,16,17,18}, in which a large series of diffraction patterns, in near-parallel or convergent beam, are acquired in large stacks of images. Under near-parallel beam conditions (Bragg peaks), The automated crystal orientation mapping (ACOM) turns out to be a new powerful tool to characterize polycrystalline materials at the nanoscale by mapping crystallographic properties under near-parallel beam conditions (Bragg peaks).^{19,20,21}

This 4D-STEM data analysis method based on the ACOM system of NanoMegas (Astar) ^{22,23,24,25} uses pattern matching of a scanning nano-diffraction dataset with libraries of diffraction patterns simulated from known structures extracted from CIF files. This method enables to construct crystalline phase and orientation maps to determine crystallinity^{26,27}, microstructures²⁸, structural deformation²⁹, and grain boundaries³⁰ using scanning nano-diffraction with precession mode in a nanometer resolution.^{31,32,33}

The recent use of high-speed cameras, pixelated detectors³⁴ such as CMOS cameras ^{35,} and hybrid-pixel detectors¹⁰ enabled better compromises between signal-over-noise and dwell time of acquisition. However, using such cameras in the column implies strong changes in the acquired images in comparison to the use of a NanoMegas conventional external optical camera, as the quality of the image improves with the increased electron sensitivity and resolution.³⁵ As the Astar ACOM suite has been optimized for images acquired with the optical

camera focused on the phosphorescent screen, the data preparation should be adapted to fit with images acquired using CMOS camera as Oneview Gatan camera.

The goal of the data preparation methods proposed here is to improve the quality of Astar pattern-matching using a dataset of diffraction patterns acquired with a CMOS Oneview camera. The high sensitivity of the CMOS camera and the data filtering developed here modify the diffraction images leading to a compromise between improving image quality and optimizing template-matching results.

The study utilizes a data reduction technique that employs registration methods to identify electron diffraction spots within patterns. This process enables us to filter and capture the diffraction signal and then, reconstruct the patterns before feeding them into the Astar suite pattern-matching software. A similar pre-processing workflow is used in the py4DSTEM software package from Savitzky *et al.* $(2021)^{36}$. The essential information of each reflection of a dataset such as intensity, size, and position are recorded in a few minutes with a sub-pixelar accuracy for the position of the order 10^{-3} px, with a data reduction factor of the order 10^{2} - 10^{3} , meaning the essential information of the diffraction pattern is stored in 100 to 1000 fewer times space disk. This adaptative method reduces noise and compresses nanodiffraction scanning data for ACOM and strain mapping analysis^{37,38,39}, and can also be used on electron diffraction data acquired with other techniques such as 3D electron diffraction (3DED)^{40,41}.

Firstly, modifications on inside diffraction patterns are estimated through image quality metrics such as peak signal-over-noise (PSNR), structural similarity index measure (SSIM), and root-mean-square error (RMSE). Secondly, the quality of the pattern-matching process on filtered and reconstructed images obtained by the proposed experimental data preparation method is evaluated using index and orientation reliability, as defined in the Astar software. We demonstrate that the experimental data preparation helps to improve the pattern-matching quality result, as it reduces noise overfitting, improves structural similarity index measure, and increases the orientation reliability.

This 4D-STEM study demonstrates the significance of mapping crystal structures and orientations in understanding Na-ion extraction/insertion mechanisms at the individual particles of cathode materials used in Na-ion batteries⁴², such as Na_xMnV(PO₄)₃ as studied here. ^{40,43,27} Furthermore, this image processing method, based on a large dataset of electron diffraction, enhances the reliability of phase determinations in complex cathode materials that undergo crystalline transformations and exhibit slight lattice parameter changes.

4D-STEM ACOM methods

A 200 kV Tecnai FEI TEM equipped with Astar system, and a quasi-parallel beam (semi-angle 0.8 mrad) was employed to scan the sample in 2 nm steps using the 4D-STEM technique. To minimize the weight of dynamical effects in the diffraction patterns (DP) and Kikuchi line contrast, precession of the electron beam was utilized, as described in numerous studies.^{44,46} Indeed, the dynamic effects induce a change in intensity of the diffraction spot over the entire pattern adding an extra contribution to the diffraction signal, which can be reduced using the beam precession method. As shown in **figure 1**, banks of DPs are simulated and generated for multiple orientations from crystal structure files (CIF) to be compared by cross-correlation to experimental DPs. Optimization is required for various simulation parameters of diffraction patterns, such as the precession angle, spot intensity scale, extension of reciprocal space diffraction figure, and double diffraction conditions, to enable operation.



Figure 1. 4D-STEM ACOM scheme. Global scheme of 4D-STEM technique. The main steps are :(1) the acquisition of diffraction pattern (DP) images with a precessed beam using the Stingray CCD camera or the Oneview CMOS camera in column, (2) Data preparation, (3) Pattern matching with banks of simulated DPs and, (4) Generation of orientation and phase mapping.

By utilizing a specific range of parameters, the software ensures precise similarity between the experimental and calculated patterns. The user has the ability to fine-tune these parameters using the overlay display in the pattern-matching software, selecting the optimal set that corresponds to their data. The calculated points are saved in a bank file that is optimized for performance in pattern-matching calculations. The resulting data is then organized into orientation and crystal phase maps, accompanied by reliability maps that indicate the quality of the pattern-matching results. Overall, this approach assists in determining the orientation and phase of each point on the map among the proposed structures³⁵. Given the emergence of new cameras, data preparation methods must be adapted to the use of the Astar suite. Indeed, using a CMOS camera in the column implies strong changes in the acquired images in comparison to the use of a conventional CCD camera. Additionally, users can induce bias in the process by fine-tuning the parameters leading to a dependency on the level of experience in use, which impacts the final results and the related reliability. Minimizing human bias in optimization steps is particularly important for battery materials, in which variations in lithium occupancy can lead to small changes in lattice parameters that are difficult to detect. We have devised a technique for data reduction that addresses these limitations. Our approach involves registration and reconstruction steps, coupled with adaptive prominence, background subtraction, and linear filters, to effectively improve image quality.

Registration/Reconstruction Strategy



Figure 2. ePattern_Registration full block scheme. Block scheme of the registration and reconstruction method including pre-processing, spot and amorphous detection, masking, registration and reconstruction. The full scheme of ePattern software including data pre-processing and 2D maps combination is presented in **Figure S1**.

The detailed steps of our strategy are presented in **figure 2** and the complete scheme is available in **figure S1**. Prior to registering the diffraction signal, certain preprocessing steps must be undertaken, such as converting data and aligning scans if the camera is unsynchronized. When the scan step is sufficiently small, adjacent images can be summed to increase the signal-to-noise ratio, albeit at the expense of spatial resolution. Astar enables the

integration of various dark fields via virtual detectors, such as an annular detector for mapping an amorphous phase. Concurrently, a spot detection technique is utilized to isolate and record the diffraction signal (details in SI). The diffraction signal that is captured can be utilized to mask the filtered input data, or to reconstruct the diffraction patterns in greater detail, devoid of any noise or extraneous components. These patterns play a crucial role in the pattern matching calculation for orientation and crystalline phase mapping. Additionally, the registered data is employed in creating a spot population map, which can be integrated with various other maps, as illustrated in **Figure 7**.



Figure 3. Adaptative prominence. Spot detection using adaptative prominence values. (a,b,c) Raw diffraction pattern containing different levels of noise. The standard deviation (SD) is measured at high angles in the area represented by the green overlay. (d,e,f) Corresponding profiles are integrated in the yellow area. The spots are selected if their prominence is higher than the measured standard deviation. Those selected spots are circled in blue in the raw image.

To prevent overfitting while capturing the position and intensity of reflections, the diffraction pattern needs to be appropriately filtered, accounting for the level of noise present in the image. Initially, the "Rolling ball" method is utilized to eliminate the background from the image, with a diameter larger than the largest spot in the image. This enables the isolation of background information that is sufficiently local, without integrating the diffraction signal peaks. Subsequently, a Gaussian filter is applied to facilitate peak detection. The impact of these filters is displayed in **Figures S4 and S5**. The concept of prominence is used to differentiate

reflections in the complete signal, as it determines the significance of a peak by taking into account its height compared to the largest neighboring peak.

After determining the peak positions to the nearest pixel, each reflection position is refined by computing the center of mass within its radius. Simultaneously, the radius is also refined, considering that the reflection area with the largest standard deviation encompasses the entire spot and its immediate surroundings. Consequently, the registered radius is one pixel smaller than the radius corresponding to the largest standard deviation. This convergence process initiates from the known approximate position and a radius value smaller than the distance between two spots. Thus, the reflection positions for each pattern are determined at a sub-pixel level, while the radius is known with one-pixel precision. The intensity is computed as the average of the pixels within the spot's radius in the image after removing the background.

Establishing the minimum prominence value required to detect peaks necessitates accounting for the noise level present in the image. Therefore, as illustrated in **Figure 3**, the standard deviation is measured at wide angles in the raw image, which directly serves as the minimum prominence value to prevent detecting peaks in the image noise that are not reflections. This adaptive approach to prominence causes a slight loss of information for certain reflections, which becomes more pronounced when detecting peaks at wide angles in the diffraction pattern or when the noise level is high.

Registration and Reconstruction

Our strategy for improving the adaptation of diffraction images for pattern matching involves implementing a data reduction approach that automatically registers essential information in each pattern (X_{scan} , Y_{scan}), such as the position of reflections (X_m , Y_m), their radius, and average intensity, as presented in **Table 1**. The data reduction information (*z*-latent) obtained from this reflection registration can subsequently be utilized to generate fresh diffraction patterns with high signal-to-noise ratio. The approach adopts a neural network-like structure consisting of an encoder that extracts the most pertinent features (for registration), a latent space that is the data reduction representation (for parameter table), and a decoder (for reconstruction) that to reconstruct the data from the result of latent space but lacks the ability for iterative training.

The top portion of **Figure 4b** depicts the usage of a Gaussian filter on the image to enhance the profile of the diffraction peaks and accurately detect their positions. The positions of the peaks, whose prominence exceeds the standard deviation in the raw image at high angles, are recorded to the nearest pixel. In the subsequent step, we refine the precise positions of these peaks by computing their center of mass (X_m , Y_m), while simultaneously

calculating the radius by considering the standard deviation variation around the center of mass.

The average gray level within a specified radius is used to measure the intensity of the spot, as depicted in the lower portion of **Figure 4b**. The resulting table includes one line for each reflection spot, sorted automatically by significance, as indicated in Table 1. This table displays the most prominent reflections of the same pattern, with the first being the direct beam spot. **Figure 4** illustrates the process of registration and reconstruction using this strategy.



Figure 4. Registration and reconstruction. (a) the raw diffraction pattern, (b) Registration and (c) reconstruction. The top of image (b) shows the gaussian filtering applied to detect the local maxima with a pixel accuracy (position spot, blue cross) and the bottom shows the reading of the average intensity of the peaks on the refined positions (intensity spot, red circle). The position, intensity, and size of the reflections of the patterns are recorded in a table which is used to reconstruct the signal in a new so-called reconstructed hyper image. (d) The accuracy of the position of the spots according to the filtering applied beforehand. (e) Conservation of relative intensities of peaks in one diffraction pattern between the reconstructed image and the raw image with subtracted background. (f)

Reflection	\mathbf{X}_{scan}	\mathbf{Y}_{scan}	Xm	Ym	Radius	Mean
1	100	100	255.992	256.105	10.000	205.750
2	100	100	203.859	259.965	9.000	96.691
3	100	100	279.126	209.773	8.500	94.182
4	100	100	233.237	305.041	8.500	93.116
5	100	100	282.310	267.379	5.500	120.763

Difference in intensity between the reflections in the reconstructed image and the raw image without background. The secondary scale shows this difference normalized to 256 levels of gray.

Table 1. Registration of the first (most prominent) reflections of a diffraction pattern using a subpixel-accurate localization method based on the center of mass (Xm, Ym). The X_{scan} and Y_{scan} denote the position of the pattern in the hyper image, which is used for the reconstruction, while the X_m and Y_m positions denote the position of the reflection. The radius is determined using an algorithm detecting local standard deviation variation. The mean is the average gray value in this radius. The reflections, in this example, belong to one image that position is (100,100) in the scan.

The reduction in data size is significant, on the order of 10³, as observed in a typical 4D-STEM dataset comprising 40,000 8-bit images of size 512*512 pixels (200*200*512*512), which are compressed into a table containing 4 parameters for approximately 50 reflections per pattern (200*200*4*50). However, as depicted in **figure S10**, as the number of reflections per pattern increases, the compression rate decreases, whereas fewer reflections per pattern result in a higher compression rate. For the dataset described in this paper, the data reduction factor attained for data written to disk is 614, with an average of 10.5 reflections registered per diffraction pattern.

In Astar approach, pattern matching involves comparing templates in the form of compressed text files containing points with a stack of diffraction images stored. Therefore, it is necessary to reconstruct the isolated diffraction signal in the form of images from the registered signal. This reconstruction method offers precise and customizable control over parameters such as image scale, reflection radius, and reciprocal radius of the diffraction pattern, depending on the specific study. **Figure 4c** displays a reconstructed image derived from the registered signal in **Figure 4a**, demonstrating a clear background in comparison to the raw image.

The position offset between the original diffraction pattern and the reconstructed one is in the range of 10⁻² to 10⁻³ pixels, as illustrated in Figure 4d. Moreover, registration with the removed background yields a smaller shift in position than with the original image. The center of mass of the spots in the original image depends on the topology of the background, which takes the form of a centered halo, causing the center of mass of the spots to tend towards the center of the image. Thus, to achieve subpixel-level accuracy (10⁻² to 10⁻³ px) in spot position, this registration technique is applied only to images with the background removed.

To achieve subpixel accuracy in controlling the position of an object in an image, an interpolation function is utilized. This function adjusts the intensity of pixels in the image and neighboring pixels in two stages (Figure 4). First, the object is moved to the nearest pixel from its final accurate position, where X and Y are integers. Second, a wider zone is selected around this point, and the interpolated movement occurs by assigning new intensities to the original and neighboring pixels. By redistributing the gray values, this function moves a group of pixels containing and neighboring the object by a subpixel amount along the X and Y directions in the image. It should be noted that this subpixel precision is more useful in motion vector analysis software that requires fine image reconstruction for strain mapping than in pattern matching software like Astar.

Figure 4e demonstrates that the relative intensity between peaks within the same diffraction pattern is well maintained after reconstruction. The intensity relationship between each peak before and after reconstruction is preserved. However, according to **Figure 4f**, some peaks may exhibit absolute intensity variations of up to +-5% of the total scale of gray levels. Moreover, the intensities of the reconstructed image are, on average, lower than those of the original image. This trend might be due to the pixel-level resolution of the spot size, which is determined during the refinement of reflection center positions. If the found radius is not precise enough, the registered averaged intensity might be influenced by darker pixels surrounding the reflections.

The registration and reconstruction process was optimized for speed by opening the data on stacks of images that correspond to a single scan line. The number of iterations required to refine the position of the reflections was reduced, and the reconstruction was done by writing reflections in small stacks in series to limit the amount of RAM required. The masking method mentioned earlier was also implemented to save time. Additional information about the program, functions, and plugins used can be found in the supporting information.

To measure the efficiency of our method, let us consider a stack of 40,000 images with a resolution of 512 px * 512 px. It takes roughly 30 minutes to register the data with an average of 10 reflections per frame. After registration, the reconstruction from this data takes around 10 minutes. It is worth noting that we can adjust various parameters such as the size of the final image and the radius of the reflections to enhance the precision of template matching, particularly when differentiating between closely spaced crystalline phases.

The masking method is a time-saving alternative to registration and reconstruction, which sacrifices some precision in spot position. Instead of refining the radius or position of the spots, this method quickly identifies their position to mask the rest of the image. This is achieved by modifying pixel values in already-open images before writing them. For a stack of

10

200*200 *images* of 512*512 px with about 10 reflections per image, masking can be completed in approximately 20 minutes (Figure 2, orange block).

Results in ACOM-Astar

The ACOM suite provides orientation and phase maps of crystals, along with associated reliability maps, as a result of calculating cross-correlation. For each point in the scan, the matching index or cross-correlation score is calculated for each orientation of each proposed crystalline phase. This score, denoted by Q, is obtained by summing the products of the points in a pre-calculated diffraction pattern i (known as a template) represented by the function Ti(x, y) and the points in the acquired diffraction pattern represented by the function P(x, y).

$$Q(i) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m} P(x_j, y_j) T_i(x_j, y_j)}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} P^2(x_j, y_j)} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} T_i^2(x_j, y_j)}}$$
(5)

The highest value of Q provides the orientation solution. The reliability can be calculated by comparing the best index Q1 with the second-best index Q2 using the following equation:

$$R_{orientation} = 100 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{Q_2}{Q_1}\right), \quad Q_1 > Q_2 \tag{6}$$

Greater reliability results in a higher ability to differentiate between two similar orientations on a diffraction pattern, as the ratio between the two highest index solutions is increased.

In **Figure 5**, the quality of pattern matching results is compared for different data preparation strategies: no filters (raw), Astar filters, and the ePattern method presented in this study. The original scan (**Fig. 5a**) is indexed without any filter from Astar or external filter. The Astar filter parameters used are softening loops, spot enhance loops, and noise threshold. Their functions are to enlarge the spots, enhance the contrast of spots with the background, and threshold the image, respectively. Two results using Astar filters with default (Fig. 5b) and optimized (Fig. 5c) parameters show the impact of parameter choice on enhancing pattern matching quality. Finally, the "register and rebuild" result (Fig. 5d) only utilizes the reconstruction method described in this study, without any Astar filters. The grain ROI is defined by a threshold of 5 reflections on the spot count map, which is intended to isolate the crystalline regions from the rest of the map where we find the amorphous grid membrane. Figure 5a-d demonstrates that our ePattern method outperforms other methods in accurately identifying the structural phase in the crystal.

The index values provide a raw score for pattern-matching and can indicate trends in noise overfitting, especially in regions with no grain, too much diffusion, or poor crystallinity. Lower minimal index values suggest less overfitting. **Figure 5e** demonstrates that Astar filters and the reconstruction method lead to a significant decrease in noise overfitting, with minimal index values dropping to 0. Furthermore, the distribution of mean index values shifts towards lower values with Astar filters and even lower with the reconstruction method.



Figure 5. Reliability maps of grains using (a) no filter, (b, c) ASTAR filters with 2 different sets of parameters and (d) reconstruction using registration of subpixel-accurate positions, radius, and intensity of reflections. (e) Index of the full maps and (f) orientation reliability statistics of the full maps and of grains ROI. The grain ROI is defined by a threshold of 5 reflections on the spot count map.

The results in Figure 5f indicate that the mean OR value for the grain ROI is 29.4 using the reconstruction method, which is a 96% improvement compared to no filter (15.0) and a 48% improvement compared to Astar filters (20.7). Furthermore, although the average OR value is higher for the reconstruction method than for the Astar filters in the grain ROI, the mean OR value for the entire scan is lower for the reconstruction method (9.1 < 11.1) due to the lower reliability assigned to non-crystalline regions. Assigning a non-zero reliability value to non-crystalline areas would result in an artificially high average OR value for the entire map. It is worth to notice that the optimization of the Astar filter parameters leads to an increase in orientation reliability (OR) compared to using no filter. However, it is essential to optimize the parameters to effectively reduce overestimated index values caused by noise overfitting and improve OR in the grain region of interest (ROI).

Furthermore, a higher average phase reliability value for the grain ROI indicates greater confidence in the correct matching of crystals with templates. Therefore, a larger difference

between the average reliability of the grain ROI and the full map suggests less overestimation of reliability. **Figure 5f** shows that the ePattern approach significantly reduces overfitting during template matching and that using an unsuitable set of Astar parameters, such as (1,2,0), can cause considerable overfitting in non-crystalline areas compared to using another set of parameters, such as (1,4,10). These observations highlight the effectiveness of various filtering methods in enhancing pattern-matching quality results. Moreover, the ePattern method has the potential to minimize the influence of human bias during the process by adjusting the parameters, which results in independence from the user's level of experience and improves the reliability of the final outcomes.



Figure 6. Crystal orientation and corresponding reliability maps of Pbl₂ grains in liquid water (liquid cell TEM holder) using (a,b) raw images or (c,d) reconstructed images for pattern matching in Astar. (e,f) Histogram of corresponding reliability maps. g) Raw diffraction patterns containing different levels of noise and h) corresponding reconstructed images.

Figure 6 emphasizes the noise-adaptive nature of the registration method. Specifically, sections g) and h) showcase the unprocessed images filtered in Astar and the reconstructed images of various regions of the scan, respectively. These regions feature varying degrees of noise resulting from different phenomena, such as electron beam multi-scattering in the grains (and liquids), which are dependent on their respective thicknesses. Consequently, it is necessary to consider the noise level specific to each diffraction pattern in the scan to adjust the minimum reflection detection threshold, preserve as much diffraction signal as possible from the raw image, and minimize overfitting caused by the noise.

The crystal orientation and reliability maps demonstrate that accounting for noise inhomogeneities in a scan yields higher and more distinct reliability values (Figure 6 a-b-c-d). This manifests in a sharper distinction between highly crystalline areas and regions with insufficient signal to be included in the calculation. The reliability histograms (Figure 6 e-f)

further illustrate a shift towards higher values for the reconstructed diffraction patterns. It is worth noting that this increase is especially beneficial for populations above the reliability threshold of R=15, as this indicates that the proposed phase and orientation are deemed reliable.²⁰

Handling of result maps

During the analysis of the maps of crystalline orientations and phases, it is advisable to remove the aberrant points not resulting from the diffraction of a crystal. These points are mostly due to template matching of DPs simulated with noise. Indeed, as discussed previously, filtered data may contain artifacts, but the reduction of these artifacts is very efficient by registration and reconstruction of the DPs.

ACOM enables the creation of a virtual darkfield by integrating a portion of the image for each DP in a scan. In this study, this feature was utilized to generate an amorphous phase map, depicted in **Figure 7(c,d)**, and as a means to realign the scan due to the lack of synchronization between the CMOS camera and the beam scan. Simultaneously, the number of spots in an image can be rapidly recorded using a prominence finder algorithm, as shown in **Figure 7b**. Consequently, a map is produced by assigning each point a value based on the number of detected spots in each diffraction pattern, as illustrated in **Figure 7a**. In the future, this type of map could potentially be utilized to estimate the level of crystallinity or thickness of a sample.

The approach of differentiating between crystalline and amorphous phases provides an opportunity to mask out aberrant points, especially those resulting from artifacts in filtered images. These artifacts are typically situated in areas near the central spot, where the maxima of diffused rings can occasionally register as a small spot.

In the past, a technique employed on unfiltered data involved utilizing an index value threshold to eliminate points where the value is overestimated. However, this threshold method can prove problematic when the noise level is excessively high, and the index value is therefore overestimated. In areas with crystalline components, some points may have a lower index value than others, particularly if the DPs have only a few diffraction spots. Consequently, using this method may lead to the removal of crucial points in an attempt to eliminate outliers. Relying solely on the reliability value to threshold the result is also questionable since an image containing noise and artifacts can yield a high index score for one orientation template and a significantly lower score for others. This scenario results in a strong reliability value at a specific point, which may not be a DP.



Figure 7. Methods to mask the artefacts due to filtering. (b) Count of diffraction spots in a DP and (a) corresponding map on a scan. (d) Integration of amorphous disk to build (c) the virtual dark field (VDF) of carbon. (e) Superposition of Astar grain orientation map and dark field amorphous map. (f) Color code for crystalline orientations. (g,h) Corresponding thresholded orientation reliability and index maps respectively. The same orientation reliability threshold has been applied on the orientation map (e).

With the use of ePattern method, it is now possible to overcome the previously mentioned thresholding issues. Instead of relying on the index value, we can now use the number of registered spots to threshold the resulting map. This approach is feasible since we detect only 1 or 2 "false spots" on the amorphous rings. Thus, it is possible to obtain a map of orientation solutions and crystalline phases by thresholding the points based on the number of recognized reflections in the DP. **Figure 7g** demonstrates how the orientation reliability is thresholded between the values of 5 and 15, which respectively represent the lower limit below which the reliability is low and cannot guarantee the quality of the orientation solution and the upper limit from which the solution is well-assured.

Figure 7h displays the quality of pattern matching after combining the thresholded number of spots map (**Figure 7a**) with the index value, which is applicable in ePattern method. This combination step is crucial to remove aberrant points caused by the previously mentioned artifacts. Generally, using the Astar suite, multiple amorphous phases and crystalline phases can be mapped simultaneously by specifying angle values on the DP. However, if an amorphous phase and a crystalline phase are overlapped, the cross-correlation result usually displays a higher index for the amorphous phase, requiring careful adjustment of the index coefficient in the software for different phases. In the case of reconstruction, to represent the overlapped crystalline and amorphous phases, it is essential to separate the two results and represent them together using the pattern-matching software on reconstructed images and the virtual dark field on filtered ones, as illustrated in **Figure 7e**. The simultaneous representation

of amorphous and crystalline phase maps is crucial, for instance, to investigate ion diffusion in grains in carbon-coated active cathode materials, which is particularly important in battery material research.

Conclusions

In this study, a novel sub-pixel adaptive image processing technique, named ePattern, was developed to enhance and optimize pattern-matching for four-dimensional scanning transmission electron microscopy (4D-STEM) data analysis. The ePattern method, adapted to the use of a CMOS camera, successfully isolated the diffraction signal in the image and reduced noise and scattering contributions. Adaptive prominence coupled with background subtraction and linear filters were used to improve image quality. The filtering, registration, and reconstruction techniques used in this study increased the reliability of crystalline orientation and phase maps and, improved the reliability contrast for scans containing regions with different levels of noise. Furthermore, the signal registration compressed the data by a factor of 10³, allowing for storage and analysis of very small volumes of data with excellent precision on reflection position parameters.

This study demonstrates that the use of appropriate data preparation techniques can significantly improve the quality of the resulting image and increase confidence in the analysis of outcomes related to determining crystal orientation and phase. Moreover, the conservation of intensity ratios between the diffraction peaks enables dynamic effects in three-dimensional electron diffraction (3DED) reconstruction and automated crystal orientation mapping (ACOM) to be considered. The diffraction data can also be manipulated to quickly map displacements and changes in reflection intensity.

The ePattern method reduces the impact of human bias during its application through the manipulation of parameters, making it user-independent in terms of experience level and enhancing the dependability of the final results. Future studies may consider an unsupervised strategy (Clustering) upstream of pattern-matching on the Dimensionality reduction using non-negative matrix factorization (NNMF) or Variational AutoEncoder (VAE) to distinguish the relationship or distribution in the extents of different phases and orientations, even if they overlap in the scan. Additionally, further development of the full ACOM method using data reduction and z-latent template-matching may significantly increase cross-correlation performance. Enhancing the reliability and performance of 4D-STEM techniques through these data reduction methods will be beneficial for a wide range of energy material studies, especially those involving closed crystalline structures that are typically associated with high levels of ambiguity.

Experimental part Sample preparation

The NMVP (Na₄MnV(PO₄)₃) sample was prepared on a standard copper grid by dry powder deposition under an Argon atmosphere and mounted on a double-tilt sample holder in order to be able to orient the grains easily. The PbI₂ sample was obtained *in situ* by reaction of CsMAFA (perovskite) in water using a Protochip Poseidon sample holder and associated chips to maintain a constant and monitored water flow.

Acquisition

FEI Tecnai F20 transmission electron microscope operated at 200 kV in diffraction mode and equipped with a cold FEG and NanoMEGAS Astar system was used for 4D-STEM studies. The 4D-STEM measurements were performed at camera length set to 490 mm, spot size 5, gun lens 3 and 10µm condenser aperture (C2). The convergence angle of the electron beam is of 4 mrad. In order to reduce the dynamic effects, the electron beam was precessed using NanoMEGAS DigiSTAR unit (digital precession electron diffraction unit) and TemDPA software with precession angle of 1.4° and precession frequency of 100 Hz. All scans were performed in 200x200 pixel zone, whereas the width of one pixel ('step width') is 10 nm.

To significantly increase signal-to-noise ratio in electron diffraction (ED) patterns, the standard AVT Stingray camera supplied with Astar system was replaced by Gatan Oneview CMOS camera. The ED patterns were acquired in 512 px with an exposure time of 0.05 s per frame (20 fps). Such a low exposure time was chosen in order to avoid the sample damage from electron beam (total scan time did not exceed 20 min) and oversaturation of the camera. Due to the fact that Gatan camera was not synchronized with DigiSTAR control through the TemDPA software (NanoMEGAS software package) there was no possibility to ascertain that the acquisition rate equals the scanning rate, thus, the ED patterns were collected on fly. To overcome this difficulty, the electron beam was blanked in the end of each scan line giving the black end-of-line signatures in correlation coefficient map.

Image treatment

An overall block scheme is available in **Figure S1**. Firstly, The diffraction pattern images were converted from 32 bits dm4 to 8 bits bmp with an optimization of the histogram, as the empty levels at the beginning and the end of the histogram are cropped. The individual ED patterns were gathered in the block files using Diffrac2Block software which were further treated in Blockviewer software. The end-of-line signatures appeared as black tortuous

continuous line in a correlation coefficient map. The alignment of the corresponding block-files was performed in BlockViewer by use of local profile of the end-of-line signature and finding of all successive equivalent profile with help of semi-automatic inbuilt procedure.

Then, the images are extracted from the block to be filtered. As any operation combining images of the scan needs both the alignment of the scan and the alignment of diffraction patterns (DPs), the images have been aligned based on the subpixel registration of the central spot position. The reference position is defined as the center of the image (X=Y=256.00 for 512px*512px image size), and the images are translated using a bilinear interpolation.

Pattern matching

Simulation of ED templates banks, matching of the experimental ED with simulated templates and generation of the phase maps was performed using DiffGen2, Index2 and MapViewer2 respectively (NanoMEGAS software package). The input parameters specific to pattern matching are the calibration of the image (camera length) in scale and the filtering parameters integrated into the software (value 0 for this study). During the automatic cross-correlation calculation, the point clouds of the templates (orientations) of each bank are superimposed on the experimental images to determine an index score linked to the intensity products between the points and the corresponding aligned pixel.

To rate the quality and reliability of the performed template matching (and, thus, reliability of the obtained phase maps) two parameters were employed: the cross-correlation index (Qi) and the reliability (R). The first reveals the match between the experimental spot diffraction pattern P(x,y) and the simulated diffraction patterns for all orientations i in a bank of templates Ti(x,y) (equation 5).

The highest Qi value is the best match for the given point and is a measure for the agreement between the experimental and simulated pattern. The reliability of that match can be calculated as in equation 6 in which Q_1 and Q_2 are the best match and the second-best match respectively. R values as R < 5 are considered too low, and values as R > 15 as very reliable.

The identification of phases was made by pattern matching using CIF files of the expected pristine $Na_4MnV(PO_4)_3$ (NMVP) and PbI₂ structures.

Hardware and software

The Java-FIJI code is run on a PC with windows OS equipped with Intel Xeon CPU and Quadro P5000 GPUs. The ePattern_Registration utilized in this work is is based on several FIJI plugins and can be downloaded on github.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research presented in this paper has received support from multiple sources. Specifically, funding has been provided by the French Research Agency (ANR) as part of the DestiNaion_operando project (ANR-19-CE42-0014). The authors express their appreciation for the proofreading efforts of D. Boursier. Additionally, the UPJV and RS2E electron microscopy platform were utilized for this research. The authors acknowledge funding from the RS2E network via the STORE-EX Labex Project ANR-10-LABX-76-01. The authors would like to thank Mohammad Ali Akhavan Kazemi and Frédéric Sauvage (LRCS lab) for their assistance in providing photovoltaic perovskite materials and extend their special thanks to the NanoMegas company for their support during the acquisition process.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

N.F. and A.D. have conceived the methodology. N.F. made the conceptualization of the entire code. S.P. has provided battery materials. This work was supervised by A.D., E.F.R., M.V, C.M., L.C. The datasets were acquired and analyzed by N.F., J.C., G.O. A.J. and A.D. The ePattern software was coded by N.F. with the validation of E.F.R, M.V. and A.D.. N.F. and A.D. wrote the manuscript. All authors participated in the discussion and revision of this paper and finally approved this work. A.D. was project administration and funding acquisitor.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The 4DSTEM datasets used and generated in this contribution is available for free download at https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1_V_V8LjfcLHvkjl8Fy8xWfzVoMl2sHLT

CODE AVAILABILITY

The SegmentPy python software is available for free download at <u>https://github.com/Nicolas-Folastre/ePattern</u>

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest to declare.

REFERENCES

- 1. Kelly, D. J. *et al.* Nanometer Resolution Elemental Mapping in Graphene-Based TEM Liquid Cells. *Nano Lett.* **18**, 1168–1174 (2018).
- 2. Janicek, B. E. *et al.* Quantitative Imaging of Organic Ligand Density on Anisotropic Inorganic Nanocrystals. *Nano Lett.* **19**, 6308–6314 (2019).
- 3. Li, J., Johnson, G., Zhang, S. & Su, D. In Situ Transmission Electron Microscopy for Energy Applications. *Joule* **3**, 4–8 (2019).
- 4. Fan, Z. *et al.* In Situ Transmission Electron Microscopy for Energy Materials and Devices. *Adv. Mater.* **31**, 1–22 (2019).
- 5. Deng, Y. *et al.* Functional Materials Under Stress: In Situ TEM Observations of Structural Evolution. *Adv. Mater.* **32**, 1–10 (2020).
- 6. Slater, T. J. A. *et al.* STEM-EDX tomography of bimetallic nanoparticles: A methodological investigation. *Ultramicroscopy* **162**, 61–73 (2016).
- 7. Gázquez, J. *et al.* Applications of STEM-EELS to complex oxides. *Mater. Sci. Semicond. Process.* **65**, 49–63 (2017).
- 8. Jiang, Y. *et al.* Electron ptychography of 2D materials to deep sub-ångström resolution. *Nature* **559**, 343–349 (2018).
- Yu, C. P., Friedrich, T., Jannis, D., Van Aert, S. & Verbeeck, J. Real-Time Integration Center of Mass (riCOM) Reconstruction for 4D STEM. *Microsc. Microanal.* 1–12 (2022) doi:10.1017/S1431927622000617.
- 10. MacLaren, I. *et al.* A Comparison of a Direct Electron Detector and a High-Speed Video Camera for a Scanning Precession Electron Diffraction Phase and Orientation Mapping. *Microsc. Microanal.* **26**, 1110–1116 (2020).
- 11. Paterson, G. W. *et al.* Fast Pixelated Detectors in Scanning Transmission Electron Microscopy. Part II: Post-Acquisition Data Processing, Visualization, and Structural Characterization. *Microsc. Microanal.* **26**, 944–963 (2020).
- 12. Zhang, C. *et al.* Recent Progress of In Situ Transmission Electron Microscopy for Energy Materials. *Adv. Mater.* **32**, 1–19 (2020).
- 13. Lim, J. *et al.* Origin and hysteresis of lithium compositional spatiodynamics within battery primary particles. *Science (80-.).* **353**, 566–571 (2016).
- 14. Rummeli, M. H. *et al.* New Frontiers in Electron Beam–Driven Chemistry in and around Graphene. *Adv. Mater.* **31**, 1–22 (2019).
- 15. Wang, N., Sun, Q. & Yu, J. Ultrasmall Metal Nanoparticles Confined within Crystalline Nanoporous Materials: A Fascinating Class of Nanocatalysts. *Adv. Mater.* **31**, 1–23 (2019).
- 16. Mahr, C. *et al.* Accurate measurement of strain at interfaces in 4D-STEM: A comparison of various methods. *Ultramicroscopy* **221**, 113196 (2021).
- Lin, D. *et al.* Fast galvanic lithium corrosion involving a Kirkendall-type mechanism. *Nat. Chem.* 11, 382–389 (2019).
- 18. Hawkes, P. W. The correction of electron lens aberrations. *Ultramicroscopy* **156**, A1–A64 (2015).
- Zaefferer, S. & Schwarzer, R. A. Automated Measurement of Single Grain Orientations in the TEM / Automatisierte Messung von Einzelorientierungen im TEM. *Int. J. Mater. Res.* 85, 585– 591 (1994).
- 20. Rauch, E. & L. Dupuy. Rapid spot diffraction patterns idendification through template matching. 87–99 (2005).
- 21. Ophus, C. et al. Automated Crystal Orientation Mapping in py4DSTEM using Sparse Correlation

Matching. Microsc. Microanal. 390-403 (2022) doi:10.1017/S1431927622000101.

- 22. Rauch, E. F. & Véron, M. Automated crystal orientation and phase mapping in TEM. *Mater. Charact.* **98**, 1–9 (2014).
- Rauch, E. F. *et al.* Automated nanocrystal orientation and phase mapping in the transmission electron microscope on the basis of precession electron diffraction. *Zeitschrift fur Krist.* 225, 103– 109 (2010).
- 24. Rauch, E. F., Veron, M., Nicolopoulos, S. & Bultreys, D. Orientation and phase mapping in TEM microscopy (EBSD-TEM like): Applications to materials science. *Solid State Phenom.* **186**, 13–15 (2012).
- 25. Rauch, E. F., Harrison, P. & Véron, M. New features in crystal orientation and phase mapping for transmission electron microscopy. *Symmetry (Basel)*. **13**, 1–12 (2021).
- McCartan, S. J. *et al.* Correlative chemical and structural nanocharacterization of a pseudobinary 0.75Bi(Fe0.97Ti0.03)O3-0.25BaTiO3 ceramic. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 104, 2388–2397 (2021).
- 27. Bhatia, A. *et al.* In Situ Liquid Electrochemical TEM Investigation of LiMn1.5Ni0.5O4 Thin Film Cathode for Micro-Battery Applications. *Small Methods* **6**, (2022).
- 28. Sunde, J. K., Marioara, C. D. & Holmestad, R. The effect of low Cu additions on precipitate crystal structures in overaged Al-Mg-Si(-Cu) alloys. *Mater. Charact.* **160**, 110087 (2020).
- 29. Londoño-Calderon, A. *et al.* Local lattice deformation of tellurene grain boundaries by fourdimensional electron microscopy. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **125**, 3396–3405 (2021).
- 30. Bustillo, K. C. *et al.* 4D-STEM of Beam-Sensitive Materials. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **54**, 2543–2551 (2021).
- 31. Nicolopoulos, S. *et al.* Novel TEM microscopy and electron diffraction techniques to characterize cultural heritage materials: From ancient Greek artefacts to Maya mural paintings. *Scanning* **2019**, (2019).
- 32. Mendoza-Cruz, R. *et al.* Evaporation of Gold on NaCl Surfaces as a Way to Control Spatial Distribution of Nanoparticles: Insights on the Shape and Crystallographic Orientation. *Cryst. Growth Des.* **17**, 6062–6070 (2017).
- 33. Ponce, A., Aguilar, J. A., Tate, J. & Yacamán, M. J. Advances in the electron diffraction characterization of atomic clusters and nanoparticles. *Nanoscale Adv.* **3**, 311–325 (2021).
- Nicolopoulos, S., Gomez, A. & Das, P. Electron Crystallography in the Age of Pixelated Detectors: From Crystalline/Amorphous Organic Structural Models and Phase Mapping of Beam Sensitive Materials. *Microsc. Microanal.* 25, 1948–1949 (2019).
- 35. Jeong, J., Cautaerts, N., Dehm, G. & Liebscher, C. H. Automated Crystal Orientation Mapping by Precession Electron Diffraction-Assisted Four-Dimensional Scanning Transmission Electron Microscopy Using a Scintillator-Based CMOS Detector. *Microsc. Microanal.* **27**, 1102–1112 (2021).
- 36. Savitzky, B. H. *et al.* Py4DSTEM: A Software Package for Four-Dimensional Scanning Transmission Electron Microscopy Data Analysis. *Microsc. Microanal.* **27**, 712–743 (2021).
- Ophus, C. Four-Dimensional Scanning Transmission Electron Microscopy (4D-STEM): From Scanning Nanodiffraction to Ptychography and Beyond. *Microsc. Microanal.* 563–582 (2019) doi:10.1017/S1431927619000497.
- 38. Rouviere, J. L., Béché, A., Martin, Y., Denneulin, T. & Cooper, D. Improved strain precision with high spatial resolution using nanobeam precession electron diffraction. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **103**, (2013).
- 39. Munshi, J. *et al.* Disentangling multiple scattering with deep learning: application to strain mapping from electron diffraction patterns. 1–17 (2022).
- Karakulina, O. M., Demortière, A., Dachraoui, W., Abakumov, A. M. & Hadermann, J. In Situ Electron Diffraction Tomography Using a Liquid-Electrochemical Transmission Electron Microscopy Cell for Crystal Structure Determination of Cathode Materials for Li-Ion batteries. *Nano Lett.* **18**, 6286–6291 (2018).

- 41. Gemmi, M. *et al.* 3D electron diffraction: The nanocrystallography revolution. *ACS Cent. Sci.* **5**, 1315–1329 (2019).
- 42. Brunetti, G. *et al.* Confirmation of the domino-cascade model by lifepo4/fepo 4 precession electron diffraction. *Chem. Mater.* **23**, 4515–4524 (2011).
- 43. Kolb, U., Krysiak, Y. & Plana-Ruiz, S. Automated electron diffraction tomography Development and applications. *Acta Crystallogr. Sect. B Struct. Sci. Cryst. Eng. Mater.* **75**, 463–474 (2019).
- 44. Midgley, P. A. & Eggeman, A. S. Precession electron diffraction A topical review. *IUCrJ* **2**, 126–136 (2015).
- 45. Vincent, R. & Midgley, P. A. Double conical beam-rocking system for measurement of integrated electron diffraction intensities. *Ultramicroscopy* **53**, 271–282 (1994).

Supporting information:



Figure S1 Data preparation strategy applied to 4D-STEM data. A) Pre-processing of experimental 4D-STEM data. B) The registration and reconstruction strategy is used to keep essential diffraction pattern information as reflections positions and intensities. The masking branch consist in directly using the spot positions to mask each diffraction pattern.

Filters

To improve the quality of the diffraction images, one can first go through operations between the images of the scans. The first filter of the method is "Mean" function (μ) which normalizes the sum of *n* neighboring images based on a kernel of 3x3 sliding on the scan as described by the equation:

$$\mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \quad n = 9$$
 (1)

As this filter average images in scan, the result is a scan of an unchanged size where each image of DP is the average of n=9 neighboring images. However, using a too large kernel would result in a significant loss of spatial resolution depending on the original spatial

resolution of the scan. Then a larger scan size with a smaller spatial resolution during acquisition is an efficient solution at equal diffraction image quality.



Figure S1 Previous Filtering Strategy. (a) Mean of DP images neighbors in the scan (b) Subtraction of the local background in DP images over a disc of radius r (c) Bandpass filters using gaussian filtering in Fourier space. Diffraction Pattern (d) before filtering (e) after summing 9 DPs (f) with background subtracted and (g) with bandpass filter applied to keep a defined range of feature size.

To improve pattern matching in ACOM, we first aim to remove the noise contained between spots of the diffraction pattern. To complete this specific task, imaging tools are used that allow removing the background due to scattering effects from the image or highlighting objects of a certain size in the image as reflections in a diffraction pattern. Consequently, the second filter is the "Subtract Background Rolling Ball". The method is shown on Figure S3.



Figure S3 Substract Background "Rolling ball" method. The rolling ball slides under the signal curve and trace a path. This path is shifted by the radius of the ball to trace the background. Finally the background is subtracted from the signal. Note that this radius of rolling ball is too large, it should be smaller to be slightly bigger than the central spot size.

If the value of this difference between the raw signal and the background is negative, then the value assigned to the pixel is 0. In this way, the variations extending over large surfaces are much reduced and the background of the image is more homogeneous. This technique is then well adapted to remove quasi-completely the contribution of the scattering effect in a diffraction image and keep the contribution of the diffraction signal in the image. However, it is necessary to apply this filter using a sufficiently large kernel size (r), typically greater than the size of the objects constituting the signal in the image, in order to prevent the background value from being too influenced by the high values. of intensity and the width of the peaks. By following this recommendation, the background is more accurate even around large peaks, but remains moderately influenced by high peak values such as the central peak, as can be seen in the background profile in **Figure 4**. This filter has been widely used on powder diffraction and in 2D on high resolution - electron back scatter diffraction (HR-EBSD) images⁴⁵, in particular to characterize its angular dependence.⁴⁶

The "Bandpass" filter aims to highlight features in the image whose size is included in a defined range. A fast Fourier transform (FFT) is applied to the image, which is multiplied by a gaussian filter (**Equations 3, 4**). The reversed FFT of the result gives the filtered image.

(FFT)
$$f_j = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} x_k e^{\frac{-2\pi i}{n}jk}$$
 $j = 0, ..., n-1$ (3)

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \cdot \pi} \cdot \sigma} \cdot e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}}$$
(4)

This method enhances features whose size is covered by the bandpass filter. We typically take the size of the central spot as the upper limit and the lower size is limited to 2 pixels (px) to filter the remaining noise. The bandpass filter acts as both a high pass filter and a low pass filter, thus it respectively reduces the noise consisting of high spatial frequencies but also limits the "spreading" of objects in the image.

Indeed, the low pass filter decreases noise but attenuates the details of the image, which manifest itself as a more pronounced blur in the filtered image. On the other hand, the high pass filter emphasizes contours and image detail but amplifies noise.⁴⁷

In practice, the bandpass filter consists of a high pass filter followed by a low pass filter. The large structures of the image are filtered with a high-pass filter, the limit of which must correspond to the maximum size of the object to be preserved, which corresponds in the diffraction images to the size of the central spot. Small image structures such as indistinguishable noise from a tiny spot are filtered out by a low pass filter which should be set to the size of the smallest discernible object in the noise. Thus, if the two parameters of the band-pass filter are well adjusted, it is possible to keep the object sizes corresponding to the spots contained in the image, by limiting the addition of blurring or noise.

In addition, a threshold has to be applied to the resulting image to conserve the 1% of brighter pixels corresponding to the reflections. However, it is important to note that the FFTs on the relatively noisy diffraction images induce artifacts that are difficult to eliminate by a simple threshold, as shown in **figure S2**. Consequently, the use of such a filter is only recommended on data with very little noise and/or with sufficient contrast.

The order in which filters are applied always remains the same. We apply the "Mean" filter to gain signal-to-noise (SNR) by averaging very close original images (< 20 nm between two DPs). The "Subtract Background" filter must be applied before any registration or filter to demarcate the spots from the large background. Finally, the "Bandpass" filter is applied last to enhance the diffraction spots depending on their size. These filters were explored in this work initially to directly improve pattern-matching by filtering only, then were studied as a potential springboard or first step to facilitate the registration of reflections.

Noise Study



Figure S4 Profile of a DP with (a) no filter (b) mean filter over 9 DPs (c) substracted backgroud with a radius of 25 px (d) Bandpass filter with range of 2 to 25 px. (e) Reconstruction using registration of subpixel-accurate positions, radius, and intensity of reflections (f)Plot of corresponding intensity profiles.

By applying these filters, we try to remove the noise and the background contribution due to scattering effects, with a limited alteration of the relative intensity between the spots. The objective is to eventually avoid noise overfitting with the simulated DPs during the cross-correlation calculation. By plotting the profile of the same DP at different filtering levels as shown in **Figure**, we observe a clear decrease in the height under the curve by using the "Subtract background". Then the "Bandpass" filter reduces the remaining background by

keeping only the spots filtered by size. In parallel, at each level of filtering, the histogram of the image evolves, and we observe larger populations of low gray levels by filtering with the "Mean", which initially stretches the histogram while preserving the signals close in intensity,



Figure S5 Evolution of example images of amorphous carbon, crystalline grain and membrane only areas through filtering and reconstruction. Two main points can be observed: (1) the not yet released features for amorphous ring detection in the reconstruct

then with the "rolling ball subtract background " which crushes the background towards the darkest levels of the current image. Finally, the "Bandpass" filter increases the values on the spot positions and brings the gray level of the other pixels to 0, which results in a gradient of gray levels in the immediate environment of the spots and very strong dark populations. When the bandpass filter is used, a final threshold is applied to cut off the lowest gray levels and consequently assign the value 0 to these pixels. Filtering by bandpass filter before registration was considered and then discarded because it induces consequent artefacts and requires the use of a threshold that is difficult to quantify, as shown in **figure S5**.

Since the errors are squared before they are averaged, the RMSE gives a relatively high weight to large errors. This means the RMSE should be more useful when large errors are particularly undesirable. MAE and SNR are not used in this work, as PSNR is more adapted than SNR to measure the variation of power of intensity changes, and MAE is less and less used because of its lack of normalization and representativity of general changes compared to other metrics.

SNR =
$$10 \cdot log_{10} \left[\frac{\sum_{0}^{n_x - 1} \sum_{0}^{n_y - 1} [r(x, y)]^2}{\sum_{0}^{n_x - 1} \sum_{0}^{n_y - 1} [r(x, y) - t(x, y)]^2} \right]$$
 (9)

$$PSNR = 10 \cdot log_{10} \left[\frac{max(r(x, y))^2}{\frac{1}{n_x n_y} \cdot \sum_{0}^{n_x - 1} \sum_{0}^{n_y - 1} [r(x, y) - t(x, y)]^2} \right]$$
(10)

RMSE =
$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_x n_y} \cdot \sum_{0}^{n_x - 1} \sum_{0}^{n_y - 1} [r(x, y) - t(x, y)]^2}$$
 (11)

MAE =
$$\frac{1}{n_x n_y} \cdot \sum_{0}^{n_x - 1} \sum_{0}^{n_y - 1} [r(x, y) - t(x, y)]$$
 (12)

$$SSIM(x,y) = l(x,y) \cdot c(x,y) \cdot s(x,y) = \frac{(2\mu_x\mu_y + c_1)(2\sigma_x\sigma_y + c_2)(c\sigma_{xy} + c_3)}{(\mu_x^2 + \mu_y^2 + c_1)(\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 + c_2)(\sigma_x\sigma_y + c_3)}$$
(13)

Figure S6 Equations of Image quality metrics: (9) signal over noise ratio (SNR), (10) peak signal over noise ratio (PSNR), (11) root mean square error (RMSE), (12) mean average error (MAE) and (13) structural similarity index measure (SSIM).



Figure S7 (a) Image quality metrics filtering different image types : amorphous carbon, crystalline grain, and substract of the grid (i.e. thin carbon membrane). The metrics used are (b) Peak Signal-over-Noise (PSNR), (c) Structural similarity index measure (SSIM) and (d) Root-mean-square error (RMSE). The registered and reconstructed images as been set as reference for all metrics but SSIM. More details on the choice of the metrics can be found below Figure S2

The quality assessment of the images was measured according to different metrics allowing us to characterize the preservation of the structure of the image through the different filters, to detect the possible appearance of artefacts or even to quantify the reduction in noise. As shown on **fig.S7**, we have chosen to observe these behaviors on 3 types of content: the crystal diffraction images characterized by the presence of diffraction spots, the diffusion rings due to the presence of an amorphous phase, and finally the result of the passing beam only through the thin carbon membrane of the grid support.

The structural similarity index measure (SSIM) is applied by sliding stack on each dataset to indicate the structural similarity intrinsic to each method of filtering by type of object observed. As shown on **figure S7b**, we notice that the fact of averaging naturally increases

this metric, which continues to improve slightly with the subtraction of the background which also subtracts noise. The reconstruction from the averaged and filtered data shows a significant increase in SSIM, as the majority of the image then contains -more than 95% of - black pixels and reflections relatively aligned in the axis of the stack.

However, the SSIM drops slightly when filtering by bandpass filter. Indeed, this reduction is due to the formation of artefacts (**Figure S5**) which is more visible around the direct spot when it is very bright. More precisely, when we mainly observe the interaction of the beam with the membrane because only a few contributions are coming from the amorphous phase or a crystalline phase, there is more probability that the bandpass induces artifacts on the large saturated direct spot. The formation of these artifacts is technically due to the saturation of the histogram towards very high gray values which leaves very few gray levels for the threshold post-bandpass filter to be effective.

For the peak signal-over-noise-ratio PSNR and root-mean-square-error RMSE calculations, the reconstructed image was taken as the reference signal, and not the original image. We show in **Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.** the improvement in the pattern-matching results which justifies that the reconstructed diffraction signal serves as a reference here.. Thus, the quality of the signal is evaluated for each filtering step by focusing mainly on the reflections of the diffraction images. However, it is important to note that the reconstructed images optimize the diffraction signal in the form of spots, but not for the signal in the form of rings formed by the amorphous carbons present.

PSNR is normalized to signal dynamics and represents how close a processed image is to its original, and RMSE measures deviations, called errors, and grows noticeably and disproportionately with them.^{48,49} The RMSE is therefore a metric that makes it possible to better visualize the differences. As shown in **Figure S7** (a) Image quality metrics filtering different image types : amorphous carbon, crystalline grain, and substract of the grid (i.e. thin carbon membrane). The metrics used are (b) Peak Signal-over-Noise (PSNR), (c) Structural similarity index measure (SSIM) and (d) Root-mean-square error (RMSE). The registered and reconstructed images as been set as reference for all metrics but SSIM. More details on the choice of the metrics can be found below Figure S2

c-d, the operation of summing neighboring diffraction patterns significantly improves the diffracted signal-over-noise (SNR). Then subtraction of the background component has a more pronounced effect on the improvement of the diffraction pattern, thanks to the effect of the almost complete separation of the diffraction and diffusion components on the intensities of the reflections.

Note that this processing also radically reduces the standard deviation of the errors, which means that the diffraction images are more normalized among themselves as well, as can also be seen through the SSIM. Finally, the bandpass filter deteriorates the diffraction signal,

because of the effects of saturation of the image which generates artefacts and also modifies the intensities of the diffraction peaks in an irreversible manner.

After applying the sum of the shots and subtracting the background, the distribution of the PSNR and the RMSE remain a little extended for the images corresponding to the grains compared to those of the membrane and the carbon. Indeed, as there are many more spots in the diffraction signal of the images taken on the grains, one can attribute the remaining variations in decreasing order to the variation of intensity, radius, and position of the spots. With the registration method employed here, the intensity is slightly modified, because it is taken as the average of the spot after applying a Gaussian filter to the image. However, the errors on the position and the radius of the spots are relatively small, as shown in **figure 4d**. Thus, the three metrics used here designate the consecutive operations of averaging over several neighboring images and of image background subtraction as the best preparation for the registration of diffraction patterns among the options evaluated in this work.

script:C:\eDiff_Reco	nstruction.ijm	×
Choice_macro	○ Registration ○ Reconstruction	
select files or folders	C:\scan_1 C:\scan_2_(0-200,0-200)	Add files Add folder content Remove selected Clear list
	OK Annuler	

Macro Interface in ImageJ

Figure S8 Interface of eDiff_Reconstruction ImageJ (Fiji) script : choosing working mode and folders containing the 4D-STEM datasets as image sequence.

The **Figure S8** shows the interface window displayed when the ImageJ macro eDiff_Reconstruction.ijm is run. It gives the opportunity to choose several dataset folders containing the 4D-STEM data as image sequences. Images should be sorted first by line of scan from top to down and then by column of scan from left to right (names like lineyyyy-columnxxxx.bmp work well). The user can choose between registration and/or registration. It is recommended for ACOM use to use both options together. The reconstructions with different parameters. The registration alone will be used for other in-development diffraction pattern analysis on the compressed data.

		Scan
scan_1		
		Size of Scan
Stack size (200*200= Size is correct (may	40000, total in fol be inversed)	der : 40000)
х	200	
Y	200	
		Prepararation
Binning to 512*512	(Recommended))
Align Stack XmYm Adaptative V2		Divergence max 0.100
🔽 Mean scan (3x3)		
🔽 Substract Backgrou	nd	
Write images of preparation		Optional name : 🗌 🗖 Optional Auto rename
		Registration
Prominence	3	
Radius start	10	
nSpots max	150	
	,	
	004>	Reconstruction
Refine alignment (0	512 px	
Dedius central anot		
Radius central spot	2	
Dedius anot	4	
Radius spot	1	Note: $V15.1$: Intensities corrected when $CB = (0, 1)$

Figure S9 Interface displayed for each scan totreat with the option Registration+Reconstruction of eDiff_Reconstruction macro.

Figure S9 shows the input parameters for the registration and reconstruction proposed for each scan.

- Scan: Displays the title of the datasets extracted from the folder name.
- Size of Scan: 1) read the size of scan from the folder name and compare to 2) the total number of images in folder, a solution of size will be proposed if 1) doesn't correspond to 2).
- Preparation: Here are all the options to filter images before registration including a binning function to reduce to 512 px*512 px the size of images. This accelerates the process and the macro has been developed around this for format, so it's recommended to use it (reconstruction allows to write any final size of image). Align Stack aligns diffraction pattern images by translating the grey values (with interpolation on for subpixel accuracy) to place the center of mass of the direct spot on the center of the image. Mean scan(3x3) calculates the mean over 9 neighbor images in the dataset (limit conditions: 6 images on the edge of scan, 4 images in corner of scan). The size of the scan is conserved. Subtract background removes the mean over 50 px around each pixel of the image, it is very practical to separate the contribution of diffraction peaks on the intensity. There is an option to write the filtered images. If active, the user can choose the option to rename the image files with a custom name or with the only coordinates in scan with auto rename option.
- Registration : set the minimum prominence of a peak to be registered. Radius start
 must be smaller than the minimum distance between to spot but ideally slightly larger
 than the detected spot to register. It is used to refine the position, radius and intensity
 of reflections registered starting from the pixel where the peak is detected. nSpots max
 is maximum number of spot to register by diffraction pattern, it is used to limit the total
 number of reflections registered, which may be important especially if the prominence
 parameter is low. The extra spots ignored are the less prominent.
- Reconstruction: Refine alignment takes the registered position of the central spot (which is usually the most prominent so on top of reflection list for each scan position), and translate all the reflections position to put the central spot at exact center of image. The user can choose to force the radius value of central spots and of all reflections to a constant radius. This option exists because of a lack of accuracy in the radius determination of the reflections, this accuracy on radius decreasing when the intensity of reflections registered are weaker. The gaussian blur gives back a gaussian shape to the reflection (filter over 0 or 1 px recommended). The intensity of the original images will be retrieved on the reconstructed image with this option, using a calibration of intensity for each parameter used to correct the registered intensity. A virtual brightfield can be drawn with no additional cost by summing all the reflection intensities for each scan position.



Figure S10 The data reduction rate and the size ratio before/after compression according to the number of reflections per diffraction pattern. The dataset reconstructed in this work contains on average 10.5 reflections per pattern and has a compressed rate of 614.

Some ImageJ's plugins have been used and implemented In this work :

- Joachim Walter's FFT Filter plugin: http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/plugins/fft-filter.html
- SNR, PSNR, RMSE, MAE plugin to assess the quality of images written by Daniel Sage at the Biomedical Image Group, EPFL, Switzerland: <u>http://bigwww.epfl.ch/sage/soft/snr/</u>
- Find Maxima contributed by Michael Schmid: https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/docs/menus/process.html https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/developer/api/ij/ij/plugin/filter/MaximumFinder.html