DYNAMIC TIME-LAG REGRESSION: PREDICTING TIME LAGGED EFFECTS OF SOLAR ACTIVITY

Mandar Chandorkar, Connecterra B.V., Amsterdam, The Netherlands Enrico Camporeale, CIRES/NOAA, Boulder, CO <u>Bala Poduval, UNH, Durham, NH/SSI, Boulder, CO</u> Cyril Furtlehner, Michele Sebag, INRIA, LRI, Universite Paris-Sud, Paris, France

> AGU 10 December 2019 NG22A - Machine Learning in Space Weather II

From the Ph.D. Thesis - Mandar Chandorkar, CWI, Amsterdam

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 2



Dynamic Time-Lag Regression, DTLR, is a novel method for modeling the temporal dependency between two spatio-temporal phenomena where one is caused by the other with

a non-stationary time delay.

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 3



There exists significant discrepancy between the background solar wind observed near the Earth's orbit and that predicgted by the current space weather prediction model, WSA-Enlil and there has been ongoing efforts to improve the prediction accuracy.

We introduced DTLR as an attempt to improve the solar wind prediction in the context of space weather forecast.

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 4



To forecast solar wind speed at L1 from solar & heliospheric observations

a complex regression problem because

 badly conditioned input-output problem — large dimension of input signal (d = 512 x 512 x #channels -> scaled output solar wind speed) - dilution of the "cause" in the input signal due to bad SNR. stochastic non-constant time lag — range 1 to 5 days:

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 5

PROBLEM DEFINITION



Two time series:

- the cause series x(t) - the observed effect series y(t) to establish a connection between x(t) and y(t), we seek a mapping f(.) that maps x(t) to y(t) and

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 6

$[\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{t}) \in \boldsymbol{\chi} \subset \mathbb{R}^d]$ [a scalar] g(.) that determines the time delay between x(t) and y(t)



- Deterministic formulation of the problem $y(\phi(t)) = f[x(t)]$ $\phi(t) = t + g[x(t)]$
 - where, $f : \chi \to \mathbb{R}$; and $g : \chi \to \mathbb{R}^+$; $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d, d \gg 1$, input data containing the hidden cause y(t), scalar, the effect $\phi(t)$, the time-lag between cause and effect

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 7



the time lag, g[x(t)]

- is non-stationary since it depend on x(t)

- is unknown (not explicitly recorded in the training data)

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 8



- the cause and effect series sampled at constant rates, $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{t}} \mathcal{E} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathsf{t}} \ (t \in \mathbb{N})$
- mapping 'g' maps xt onto finite set τ of possible timelags

 $\tau = \{\Delta t_{min} \dots \Delta t_{max}\}$



AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 9



Baysian combination of experts: $P[\mathbf{y}_t | \mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{x}] = \sum \hat{\mathbf{p}}(\tau_1, ..., \tau_n) \mathbb{N}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}), \sigma(\tau))$ $\{\tau_i \in \{0,1\}, i \in \mathcal{T}\}$

where,

 $\sigma(\tau): \text{the diagonal matrix of variance parameters of each time-lag} \ i \in \mathcal{T}$ $\hat{p}(\tau_1, ..., \tau_n | \mathbf{x})$: the joint probability measure of time-lagged effects caused by \mathbf{x} .

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 10



AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 11

DTLR solution is obtained as a probability distribution conditioned on cause x, mixture of Gaussians centered on the predictors $\hat{y}(x)$, where the mixture weights are defined from $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x})$



simplifying assumptions: — the stochastic time lag is modeled as binary latent variables: – $\tau_i = 1$ indicates if x_t drives y_{t+i} – every cause has a single effect: $\sum_{i \in T} \tau_i = 1$

- the variance of predictor \hat{y}_i does not depend on x:

 $\sigma_i(\tau)^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{1}$ $1 + \alpha \tau_i$

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 12

here, $\alpha_{ij} \ge 0$ default variance: σ^2

BALA PODUVAL

9-13 DECEMBER 2019



Model parameters:

• The predictors, $\hat{y}(x) = \{\hat{y}_i(x), i \in \mathcal{T}\}$ The probability weights, • $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) = {\hat{p}_i(\mathbf{x}), i \in \mathcal{T}}$

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 13

 Learning Creterion: The loss function is the Log Likelihood of the data (x, y) - $\mathcal{L}[\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}|\hat{\mathbf{y}},\hat{\mathbf{p}},\sigma,\alpha]$ Learning strategy: $\hat{y} \, \boldsymbol{\hat{\varepsilon}} \, \hat{p}$ are modeled using coupled neural nets σ & α are optimized in an outer loop based on saddle point equations

 $\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \hat{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})}, \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \hat{p}(\mathbf{x})}, \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \sigma}, \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \alpha}\right) = 0$

BALA PODUVAL

9-13 DECEMBER 2019



Implemetation

Initialization of α and σ $it \leftarrow 0$; while it < max do while epoch do $\mid \theta \leftarrow Optimize(\mathcal{L}(\theta, \alpha, \sigma^2));$ end $\sigma^2 \leftarrow \sigma^2 |T| - C_1[\mathbf{q}]$.

$$\sigma^{2} \longleftarrow \sigma_{0}^{2} \frac{|T| - 1}{|T| - 1};$$

$$\alpha \longleftarrow \frac{|T|}{|T| - 1} \frac{1 - C_{1}[\mathbf{q}]}{C_{1}[\mathbf{q}]};$$

end

Result: Model parameters $\theta = (\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\mathbf{p}})$, hyper-parameters α, σ^2

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 14



Predicted time-lag index :

$$\hat{I}(x) = \operatorname*{argmax}_{i} (\hat{p}_{i}(x))$$



Input data at to:

 $x(t) = (log(FTE); B_{cp}; V_{27}; SSN; F_{10.7})$ Here, FTE: the magnetic flux tube expansion factor, computed using the Current Sheet Source Surface (CSSS) model, B_{cp}: the radial magnetic field at 2.5 Rsun v27: the 27-day prior solar wind speed SSN: the Sunspot number F_{10.7}: the Solar Radio Flux at 10.7 cm AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 15



The FTEs were computed using the GONG synoptic maps and the CSSS model.

Output data y(t): solar wind speed (to+2days; to+5days) with time-lag discretization, |T| = 12.

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 16

Speed FTE >750 < 4.5 650 - 750 4.5 - 8 8 - 10 550 - 650 450 - 550 10 - 20 < 450 > 20

Wang & Sheeley empirical relationship between solar wind speed and FTE (1990;1993;1995) BALA PODUVAL 9-13 DECEMBER 2019



DTLR Performance

Mean Absolute Error Root Mean Square Error Pearson Correlation Coeft.

Note: 9-fold is the cross validation adopted in this work.

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 17

9-fold baseline 66.45 56.35 84.53 74.20 0.6 0.41



BALA PODUVAL

9-13 DECEMBER 2019



Comparison with the state of the art.

Reiss et al (ApJ Suppl. 2019)

Model

WS DCHB WSA Ensemble Me Ensemble Me Ensemble Me Persistence (4 Persistence (2

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 18

	M.A.E kn	n/sR.M.S
	74.09	85.27
	83.83	103.43
	68.54	82.62
edian (WS)	71.52	83.36
edian (DCHB)	78.27	100.04
edian (WSA)	62.24	74.86
4 days)	130.48	161.99
27 days)	66.54	78.86
LR	54.41	64.18





AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 19



BALA PODUVAL

9-13 DECEMBER 2019





CONCLUDING REMARKS

- DTLR : motivated by space weather forecasting but is more general. - Our Bayesian approach is based on a minimal model : possible refinements planned.
- with autoencoder.
- More experiments needed, to extend and select the relevant input information

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 20

- The neural net architecture is also minimal : should combine and pre-train



AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION FALL MEETING 21

Thank you!

