# NG2NET

### Outsourcing astrophysics data analysis to the real experts

Joe Bayley - University of Glasgow Chris Messenger - University of Glasgow Michael Williams - University of Glasgow

G2Net meeting - 29th September 2022





### Outline

- Motivation
- Kaggle and our challenge
  - Kaggle, the challenge itself, the process, and the results
- Summary •



### Motivation

- The number of papers on ML applications to GW data has grown rapidly in recent years (see Cuoco, et al Mach. Learn.: Sci. Technol (2020) for a review)
- Most problems and ML tools have been attempted • but there is still lots of room for improvement
- Some of the most recent and exciting work has been on rapid parameter estimation
- CBC searches were one of the early classification • problems looked at
- However, there is still no serious CBC ML search pipeline
- Plus, we're mostly self-trained in ML so not "experts"

### Gabbard et al, Nature (2021)







# Kaggle - what is it?

=	kaggle	Q Search	
+	Create		
Ø	Home	Competitions	
Φ	Competitions	Grow your data science skills by competing competitions. Find help in the documentation	g in our excitir i <mark>on</mark> or learn at
<b></b>	Datasets	Community Competitions.	
<>	Code	Host a Competition	
	Discussions	O Secret competitions	
$\bigcirc$	Courses	Search competitions	
$\sim$	More	All competitions Featured Research	Getting Star
		다 Get Started New to Kaggle?	
		These competitions are perfect for newcomers.	k
			Titanic - Mac from Disaste
			Start here! Predic
			14143 Teams
			Knowledge









### **G2Net Gravitational Wave Detection** Find gravitational wave signals from binary black hole collisions



∡

European Gravitational Observatory - EGO 1,219 teams 6 months ago

### The challenge

What did we ask people to do?



https://www.g2net.eu





# Data description (for the competitors)

In this competition you are provided with a training set of time series data containing simulated gravitational wave measurements from a network of 3 gravitational wave interferometers (LIGO Hanford, LIGO Livingston, and Virgo). Each time series contains either detector noise or detector noise plus a simulated gravitational wave signal. The task is to identify when a signal is present in the data (target=1).

The parameters that determine the exact form of a binary black hole waveform are the masses, sky location, distance, black hole spins, binary orientation angle, gravitational wave polarisation, time of arrival, and phase at coalescence (merger). These parameters (15 in total) have been randomised according to astrophysically motivated prior distributions and used to generate the simulated signals present in the data, but are not provided as part of the competition data.

Each data sample (npy file) contains 3 time series (1 for each detector) and each spans 2 sec and is sampled at 2,048 Hz.

The integrated signal-to noise ratio (SNR) is classically the most informative measure of how detectable a signal is and a typical level of detectability is when this integrated SNR exceeds ~8. This shouldn't confused with the instantaneous SNR - the factor by which the signal rises above the noise - and in nearly all cases the (unlike the first gravitational wave detection GW150914) these signals are not visible by eye in the time series.







### Data description (hidden from competitors)

- Detector noise was generated using the expected O4 Advanced interferometer
   Power Spectral Densities.
- Signal parameters were sampled from standard astrophysical distributions.
- However, the SNR distribution was tuned by limiting the redshift to z=0.5.
- This gave us the ability to set the difficulty of the challenge.
- Reverse engineering of the problem is a concern - Kagglers are sneaky and smart, so great care had to be taken



### Data practicalities

- Training data consisted of 500K items (~55GB)
- Testing data consisted of 220K items (~25GB)
- Defining a metric how do we decide who wins?
  - Standard practice in GW astronomy is to define a sensible False Positive Rate and try to maximise the True Positive Rate
  - Closest metric available within Kaggle was the Area Under the Curve (AUC)
  - Leaves the potential for analyses with best sensitivity at very low FPR to lose.



### Who's involved





### Novice

You've joined the community.

Register!



### Contributor

You've completed your profile, engaged with the community, and fully explored Kaggle's platform.

- Run 1 notebook or script
- Make 1 competition submission
- Make 1 comment
- 🗹 Give 1 upvote



### Expert

You've completed a significant body of work on Kaggle in one or more categories of expertise. Once you've reached the expert tier for a category, you will be entered into the site wide Kaggle Ranking for that category.

Competitions	Datasets	Notebooks	Discussions
🗆 🥥 2 bronze medals	🗆 🥥 3 bronze medals	🗆 🥥 5 bronze medals	🗆 🥔 50 bronz



### Master

You've demonstrated excellence in one or more categories of expertise on Kaggle to reach this prestigious tier. Masters in the Competitions category are eligible for exclusive Master-Only competitions.





### Grandmaster

You've consistently demonstrated outstanding performance in one or more categories of expertise on Kaggle to reach this pinnacle tier. You're the best of the best. Competitions Notebooks Datasets Discussions



ze medals

### The timeline

- July 2020: First contact with Kaggle •
  - Meetings held every ~month
- **October 2020:** Initial trial dataset generated and sent to Kaggle •
- January 2021: Started drafting the documentation
- Early 2021: Found out about Google prize money
- April 2021: Decided on the competition metric
- 28th April 2021: Contract signed
- **30th June 2021**: The competition launched
  - The competition was live for 3 months
- 30th September 2021: Competition ended

	April						May							June						
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
			1	2	3	4						1	2		1	2	3	4	5	6
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30	28	29	30				
							31													
							-													

	July												
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat							
			1.00	RT 64 Address	3	4							
5	6	7		9	10	1							
12	13	14	12	ALC: NO AND		18							
19	20	21	22	23	24	25							
26	27	28	29	30	31								

October

un	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat 1	Sun	Mor
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	6	7
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	13	14
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	20	21
23	24	25	26	27	28	29	27	28
30	31							

	September												
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat							
		1	2	3	4	5							
6	7	8	9	10	11	12							
13	14	15	16	17	18	19							
20	21	22	23	24	25	26							
27	28	29	30										

0١	/em	be	r		I						
ue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	1				
3	4	5	6	7							
0	11	12	13	14	6	7					
17	18	19	20	21	13	14					
4	25	26	27	28	20	21					
					27	28					

December														
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat								
		1	2	3	4	5								
6	7	8	9	10	11	12								
13	14	15	16	17	18	19								
20	21	22	23	24	25	26								
27	28	29	30	31										

	January												
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Su						
					1	2							
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	7						
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	14						
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	2						
24	25	26	27	28	29	30	20						
31													

27 28 29 30

February													
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri								
	1	2	3	4	5								
7	8	9	10	11	12								
14	15	16	17	18	19								
21	22	23	24	25	26								
28													

22 23

29 30

		March													
Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat								
6		1	2	3	4	5	6								
13	7	8	9	10	11	12	13								
20	14	15	16	17	18	19	20								
27	21	22	23	24	25	26	27								
	28	29	30	31											

	April						May									June			
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	
				1	2	3							1			1	2	3	
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	6	7	8	9	10	
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	13	14	15	16	17	
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	20	21	22	23	24	
25	26	27	28	29	30		23	24	25	26	27	28	29	27	28	29	30		
							30	31											

July						August						September								
un	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
				1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	and a state	23	24	25
25	26	27	28	29	30	31	29	30	31					26	27	2	29	30		
																100			<u> </u>	

N

Fri Sat

4 5 11 12

18 19

25 26



# During the challenge

- Interest in the challenge grew quickly ended • with ~1200 teams
- This was exemplified by the number of messages on the challenge forum
- Fortunately, most messages were between • competitors (it's a quite friendly and helpful environment)
- Occasionally, Michael or myself would get asked something and we would answer carefully
- This was relatively low effort
- After the challenge we are still working on the complete meta-analysis and hope to publish SOON

Pinned topics



g2net Competition Survey

ChristopherZerafa · Last comment 18d ago by dbsgudqo





Yesterday's Notebook Sharing Bug and Impact to G2Net inversion · Last comment 6mo ago by RDizzl3



Welcome to the G2Net Gravitational Wave detection challenge Chris Messenger · Last comment 5mo ago by ChristopherZerafa



Looking for a Team Megathread

Maggie · Last comment 6mo ago by Ashis108



All other topics



**Top 1 solution: Deep Learning part** Selim Seferbekov · Last comment 2mo ago by Selim Seferbekov

lafoss · Last comment 5mo ago by ChristopherZerafa



**3rd place solution** 

4th Place Solution Brief Summary : Magic of 1D CNN Mr\_KnowNothing · Last comment 4mo ago by wyn2168



# 1st place (AUC=0.885388)

- Selim Seferbekov is a Computer Vision Engineer at Mapbox, Minsk, Belarus - joined Kaggle 6 years ago
  - Enormous experience in competitive Machine Learning, very basic understanding in Digital Signal Processing (DSP).
  - Attracted by the unusual competition topic
- Denis Kanonic is an Engineering Manager at Goldmine, studying for PhD in **Computer Science** 
  - Profound experience with DSP in radio communications, significant reverse-engineering experience, some degree of familiarity with Gravitational Waves detection.
  - Attracted by the DSP-related competition.
- Both spent 2-4h daily for 1.5 month.
- Won \$6000 for 1st place

Competit Grandma	ions ster	****					
Current Ra 17 of 180,20	nk 0	High	iest Rank 10				
<b>(</b> 11	3		1				
G2Net Gra	<b>avitati.</b> ns ago		<b>1</b> st of 1219				
Deepfake • 2 years Top 1%	Detec. ago		<b>1</b> <sup>st</sup> of 2265				
2018 Data <ul> <li>✓ 4 years</li> <li>Top 1%</li> </ul>	a Scien ago	•••	<b>1</b> <sup>st</sup> of 3634				
Competit Master	tions		<b>ද</b> හි				
<b>Current Ra</b> <b>144</b> of 180,20	nk 0	High	nest Rank <b>74</b>				
1	2		1				
G2Net Gr	<b>avitati.</b> hs ago		<b>1</b> st of 1219				

Human Protein.

**RSNA Pneumoni...** 

Top 2%

Top 4%

**40**<sup>τη</sup>

of 2160

 $52^{\text{nd}}$ 

of 1499





### Results - ROC curves



### 100th place had AUC = 0.877268



### Summary

- There is a vast wealth of untapped knowle scientific impact
- This is a 2-way situation where the Kaggle astrophysics behind our problems
- We are very hopeful for our next chall the talk from Rodrigo)

· There is a vast wealth of untapped knowledge and skill that we can harness to enhance our

• This is a 2-way situation where the Kaggle community genuinely enjoys learning about the

We are very hopeful for our next challenge - the results could be very exciting (see



### Extra Slides

### Results - Efficiency



### Gabbard et al, PRL (2018)



### Results - Efficiency



Gabbard et al, PRL (2018)

# 1 st place interesting findings

- The most important trick used was custom Conv1D model with multiple large kernels
- overfitting
- called SNR wall)
- reversed probability.
- Model execution time •
  - pre-training takes ~2 days (fine tuning takes ~2 hours) ٠
  - 20 mins to analyse all 220K testing data (

The element that made them stand out from others was that they identified that 1D CNNs performed better than 2D CNNS and that they generated synthetic dataset for pre-training which helped to avoid severe

They found that around 30% of positive sample cannot be identified by any model due to theoretical limit (so

When training on hard negative/hard positive samples, the model generalizes to predict signals/noise with

## 1st place model

- Able to generate unlimited amounts of training data (avoid overfitting) - reverse engineered the training data using our own GW tools!
- Pre-train on "home-made" data which allowed access to hidden parameters
- Needed to use learnable frontend to transform 1D data into more suitable time-frequency or time-feature 2D domain
- Required a separate frontend for each channel to eliminate the need of data whitening
- Needed to use lean encoder to limit overfitting
- pre-training takes ~2 days (fine tuning takes ~2 hours)
- 20 mins to analyse all 220K testing data (300 times faster than real time)





## 2nd place (0.88299)

- Hiroshi Yoshihara Machine learning • engineer at Aillis Inc in Tokyo, Japan
- M.Sc. in health economics / epidemiology and Doctoral candidate in public health Professional background:
- Participated in many computer vision competitions.
- In total, spent more than 200 hours on it. •
- Won \$5000 for 2nd place •
- Model summary: Front end generation of • 2D features to a standard backend (MANY models)

Compet Master	itions	र्द्धः				
Current R 122 of 180,19	ank 99	Highest Rank <b>66</b>				
3	3	2				
G2Net G ⊘ · 6 mon Top 1%	<b>ravitati</b> ths ago	<b>2</b> nd of 1219				
Prostate	cANce s ago	<b>6</b> <sup>th</sup> of 1010				
RANZCR <pre>     · a year     Top 1% </pre>	CLiP - ago	<b> 7<sup>th</sup></b> of 1547				



#	Frontend	Backend	Input size	cv	Public LB	Private LB	Comment
1	сwт	efficientnet-b2	256 x 512	0.8779	0.8797	0.8782	
2	сwт	efficientnet-b2	128 x 1024	0.87841	0.8801	0.8787	
3	сwт	densenet201	256 x 512	0.87762	0.8796	0.8782	
4	сwт	xcit-tiny-p16	384 x 768	0.87794	0.8800	0.8782	
5	сwт	efficientnet-b7	128 x 1024	0.87957	0.8811	0.8800	
6	сwт	efficientnet-b4	256 x 1024	0.87942	0.8812	0.8797	
7	сwт	efficientnet-b2	128 x 1024	0.87875	0.8802	0.8789	difference CWT params
8	WaveNet	efficientnet-b2	128 x 1024	0.87846	0.8809	0.8794	
9	WaveNet	efficientnet-b6	128 x 1024	0.87982	0.8823	0.8807	
10	WaveNet	densenet201	128 x 1024	0.87831	0.8818	0.8804	
							4
#	Frontend	Backend	Input size	cv	Public LB	Private LB	Comment
11	CNN	efficientnet-b6	128 x 1024	0.87982	0.8823	0.8808	
12	WaveNet	effnetv2-m	128 x 1024	0.87861	0.8831	0.8815	
13	CNN	effnetv2-m	128 x 1024	0.87847	0.8817	0.8799	
14	WaveNet	effnetv2-l	128 x 1024	0.87901	0.8829	0.8811	
15	WaveNet	efficientnet-b6	128 x 1024	0.8797	0.8817	0.8805	Channel-wise
16	WaveNet	efficientnet-b3	256 x 1024	0.87948	0.8820	0.8803	
17	WaveNet	resnet200d	128 x 1024	0.87791	0.881	0.8797	
18	ResNet1d-18	3		0.87663	0.8804	0.8785	
19	WaveNet		an Te	0.87698	0.8796	0.8784	
	New and the	124 126	5	-	(12022223)	1	

#	Frontend	Backend	Input size	cv	Public LB	Private LB	Comment
11	CNN	efficientnet-b6	128 x 1024	0.87982	0.8823	0.8808	
12	WaveNet	effnetv2-m	128 x 1024	0.87861	0.8831	0.8815	
13	CNN	effnetv2-m	128 x 1024	0.87847	0.8817	0.8799	
14	WaveNet	effnetv2-l	128 x 1024	0.87901	0.8829	0.8811	
15	WaveNet	efficientnet-b6	128 x 1024	0.8797	0.8817	0.8805	Channel-wise
16	WaveNet	efficientnet-b3	256 x 1024	0.87948	0.8820	0.8803	
17	WaveNet	resnet200d	128 x 1024	0.87791	0.881	0.8797	
18	ResNet1d-18	3	-	0.87663	0.8804	0.8785	
19	WaveNet		5. 	0.87698	0.8796	0.8784	
20	DenseNet1d	-121	5 	0.86826	0.8723	0.8703	



# 2nd place model (actually lots of models)

- Neural network architecture played the most important role for improving the performance.
- In addition to a conventional spectrogram frontend + 2d-CNN, several trainable 1d-CNN based frontends (wavegram), and Complex Morlet wavelet transform, Wavenet, and a multi-scale CNN was used as a frontend before a 2d-CNN backend were attempted.
- For models with frontend--backend architectures, the depth and size of backend was correlated with model performance.
- After strong denoising by applying bandpass filter, 1d-CNN with no 2d-CNN backends also performed well. One-dimensional versions of ResNet and DenseNet were used.
- Simplified WaveNet without gated activation was also used because it converged much faster than it with gated attention.
- Improvement was found by using pseudo labels for the test dataset
- In order to increase diversity of prediction, 20 models we Ridge regression.



### Trainable frontend: WaveNet wavegram

# 2nd place interesting findings

- Things that worked
  - •
- Things that did not work
  - hard example mining loss [7], SSL using mean teacher framework.
- Setup and execution time
  - Surprisingly, training / inference time on both types of machine was almost the same.
  - For a 1d-CNN model, it took only 1000 to 2000 seconds/epoch to train, which is much faster.
  - SSL / no TTA).

Bandpass filter, adding gaussian noise, flipping waveform, test time augmentation, complex morlet wavelet transform, 1d-CNN as frontend (feature extractor), 1d-CNN, deeper backbone, semi-supervised learning (pseudo label), label smoothing during SSL.

Signal whitening, many types of augmentation (swapping channel, discrete wavelet transform denoising, shifting time, masking frequency bands, and etc.), melspectrogram (and many other SFTF based spectrograms), complex convolution, focal loss [6], online

• I used a local workstation with a NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 (24GB) and multiple cloud instances with a NVIDIA Tesla A100 (40GB).

• In general, it took 2000 to 6000 seconds/epoch to train a frontend-backend model depending on its backbone architecture (no SSL).

• Inference time was around 500 to 1500 seconds for a frontend-backend model, and 200 to 500 seconds for a 1d-CNN model (no



# 3rd place (0.88299)

- Anjum Sayed: Masters in Physics, Data Scientist, 12 years in the energy industry as a petrophysicist, Experience in the previous BirdClef competition was helpful in G2Net
- Maxim Shugaev: PhD in Applied Physics, Research Scientist in Computer Vision at Intelligent Automation, Inc., Kaggle Grandmaster (20+ competitions)
- Isamu Yamashita: Masters in Computer Science, Data Scientist in Canon. Inc., many years in the printer camera industry as a software engineer
- Ruiqi (Richard) Xing: PhD in Theoretical physics, Quant Researcher in Financial Industry, Prior machine learning and CNN knowledge helped in G2Net
- Ziyue (Vincent) Wang: Masters in Financial Engineering, Algorithmic Quant Researcher at BNPP
- Won \$4000 for 3rd place
- Model summary: Whitening to Q-Transform to 2D pre-trained CNN backend

Competi Master	tions	द्धि					and the second s			Compet Grandm	itions aster
Current Ra 63 of 180,19	nk Hig 9	hest Rank 57					•	-		Current R 150 of 180,1	ank ) 99
4	<b>(</b> 10	0					E			5	12
G2Net Gr • 6 mont Top 1%	<b>avitati</b> hs ago	<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b> of 1219					and the second s			G2Net G • 6 mor Top 1%	<b>ravitat</b> i iths ago
Commonl . 8 mont Top 1%	L <b>it Rea</b> hs ago	<b>4</b> <sup>th</sup> of 3633								HuBMAF • a year Top 1%	<b>- Hacl</b> ago
RSNA Intr .2 years Top 1%	r <b>acrani</b> ago	<b>5</b> <sup>th</sup> of 1345	A							OSIC Pu • a year Top 1%	<b>lmonar</b> ago
Competi Contribu	tions tor	¢	My,			$\left( \right)$				Compe Master	itions
	Unranked			4		-	<b>5</b> 17	6	Z	Current R 81 of 180,1	ank 99
<b>@</b> 1	0	0				Y			Ρ	6	6
G2Net Gr • 6 mont Fop 1%	<b>avitati</b> hs ago	<b>3</b> rd of 1219						ろ		ASHRAE • 2 year Top 1%	- Grea 's ago
Optiver R 3 months a Top 69%	<b>ealize</b> igo	<b>2,656<sup>th</sup></b> of 3852	Competition Master	ns	ঞ্জ			7-11-2		G2Net G • 6 mor Top 1%	<b>ravitati</b> iths ago
DonorsCh 4 years ago Top 26%	100se 0	<b>149</b> <sup>th</sup> of 580	Current Rank 355 of 180,199	Hight 3	est Rank 34	1		200		Indoor L	ocation ago
			2	1	2		i at	is-			
			G2Net Gravi	<b>tati</b> ago	<b>3</b> <sup>rd</sup> of 1219		ett.		Contraction of the local division of the loc		
			TensorFlow • 2 months a Top 1%	<b>- H</b> ago	<b>11<sup>th</sup></b> of 2025						
			Jane Street	Mar ago	84 <sup>th</sup>						

of 4245

Top 2%

