

Finanziato dall'Unione europea







PINNGraPE

Physics-Informed Neural Network for Gravitationalwave Parameter Estimation

ET Symposium 2025

May 28th, 2025

<u>Matteo Scialpi</u>, Francesco Di Clemente, Leigh Smith, and Michał Bejger

Ferrara and Trieste University, Italy - INFN

Funded by the European Union-Next Generation EU, Mission 4 Component 1 CUP J53D23001550006 with the PRIN Project No. 202275HT58







Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare











Introduction

- PINNGraPE is a ML algorithm which performs PE on CBC burst unmodeled signals.
- Based on Physics Informed Neural Networks.
- It is developed for LVK, but the technique could be exploited in ET.









Introduction: cWB

- cWB is an unmodeled pipeline used by LVK collaboration [1].
- **Unmodeled**: based on pure coherence between energy pixels in the frequency domain.
- No theoretical background needed to detect sources:
 - Pro: search for new signals.
 - Con: when detecting CBCs, the PE on the source, i.e.
 the chirp mass estimation, is only given by a fit on the likelihood plot.







[1]

Let's fix it!









Introduction: PINNs

- Physics-Informed Neural Networks are a ML technique developed to **exploit, discover or solve differential equations** as physical laws behind the data [2, 3].
- The base of the physical information is the **loss function**: the physics is implented inside the loss itself in form of PDE and auxiliary physics relations.







f [Hz]



Main goal for PINNGraPE

To infer the two BH masses m_1 and m_2 from a dataset of simulated burst CBCs signals.

Dataset: 10⁴ simulated signals. For every signal:

- 7 spectrogram-like images
- Stored values for target:
 - {m₁, m₂, M_c, M_{tot}, η , {df/dt}_{k, Newt}, {df/dt}_{k, 1.5PN_corr}, f_k},
- 1.5PN formalism [4]:

$$\begin{split} \varepsilon &= \frac{GM_{\odot}}{c^3} \left(\frac{M_{\rm tot}}{M_{\odot}}\right) \pi f \\ \frac{df}{dt} &= \frac{96}{5} \pi^{8/3} \left(\frac{GM_{\odot}}{c^3} \frac{M_{\rm tot}}{M_{\odot}} \eta^{3/5}\right)^{5/3} f^{11/3} \left[1 - \left(\frac{743}{336} + \frac{11}{4}\eta\right) \varepsilon^{2/3} + 4\pi\varepsilon\right] \end{split}$$











Architecture











Loss function

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{Newt} + \mathcal{L}_{1.5PN} + \mathcal{L}_{phys} = \frac{\beta_1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^{B} \left(\frac{d\hat{f}_i}{dt} - \frac{df_i}{dt} \right)_{Newt}^2 + \frac{\beta_2}{B} \sum_{i=1}^{B} \left(\frac{d\hat{f}_i}{dt} - \frac{df_i}{dt} \right)_{1.5PN-Newt}^2 + \mathcal{L}_{phys}$$
$$\mathcal{L}_{phys} = \frac{\beta_3}{B} \sum_{i=1}^{B} \left(\hat{M}_{tot, i} \, \hat{\eta}_i^{3/5} - \hat{M}_i \right)^2 + \frac{\beta_4}{B} \sum_{i=1}^{B} \left(\hat{M}_i \, \hat{\eta}_i^{-3/5} - \hat{M}_{tot, i} \right)^2 + \frac{\beta_5}{B} \sum_{i=1}^{B} \left(\left(\frac{\hat{M}_i}{\hat{M}_{tot, i}} \right)^{3/5} - \hat{\eta}_i \right)^2 + \frac{\beta_4}{B} \sum_{i=1}^{B} \left(\hat{M}_i \, \hat{\eta}_i^{-3/5} - \hat{M}_{tot, i} \right)^2 + \frac{\beta_5}{B} \sum_{i=1}^{B} \left(\left(\frac{\hat{M}_i}{\hat{M}_{tot, i}} \right)^{3/5} - \hat{\eta}_i \right)^2 + \frac{\beta_5}{B} \sum_{i=1}^{B} \left(\frac{\hat{M}_i}{\hat{M}_{tot, i}} \right)^{3/5} - \hat{\eta}_i \right)^2$$

• Main terms: df/dt ones.

Newtonian one depends only on M_c , while the correction one depends on M_{tot} and η .

- Physical loss terms exploit physical redundancy between M_c, M_{tot} and η.
 Physical redundancy explained in detail in Di Clemente et al. [5] and in a new paper in the writing stage.
- Notice: no direct output vs target term.









Loss function











Loss function







 Mc_p

Mc_p – Mc_t

– Mc_t) / Mc_t







Results







Finanziato dall'Unione europea







Results





28/05/25 - ET Symposium 2025

PINNGraPE - M. Scialpi









Results



Results

Results – test with GW150914 like masses

What about ET?

The same technique could be exploited in ET:

- it offers a PE technique for CBC detected with unmodeled pipelines;
- it is suitable for **new kind of signals**:
 - if we know the physics behind the system, we can optimize for different parameters and add different loss terms;
 - if we know the physics behind the system only partialy, PINNs are also able to approximate the unknown physics.

Conclusions and future steps

• Main goal reached:

 m_1 and m_2 are inferred within an error < 5%.

- PINNs really represents a promising approach for acheaving fast PE for unmodeled singals.
- Next steps:
 - Almost ready to implement on cWB.
 - Study on the error estimate on a new incoming signal.
 - Increase the parameters to estimate: add further PN terms.

Thank you for your attention!

[1] Drago, M., Klimenko, S., Lazzaro, C., Milotti, E., Mitselmakher, G., Necula, V., O'Brian, B., Prodi, G. A., Salemi, F., Szczepanczyk, M., Tiwari, S., Tiwari, V., V, G., Vedovato, G., and Yakushin, I. 2021). coherent waveburst, a pipeline for unmodeled gravitational-wave data analysis. SoftwareX, 14:100678.

[2] Raissi, M., Perdikaris, P., and Karniadakis, G. (2019). Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. Journal of Computational Physics, 378:686–707.

[3] Nascimento, R. G., Fricke, K., and Viana, F. A. (2020). A tutorial on solving ordinary differential equations using python and hybrid physics-informed neural network. Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence, 96:103996.

[4] Cutler, C. and Flanagan, E. E. (1994). Gravitational waves from merging compact binaries: How accurately can one extract the binary's parameters from the inspiral waveform? Physical Review D, 49(6):2658–2697.

[5] F. Di Clemente, M. Scialpi, and M. Bejger, "Explainable autoencoder for neutron star dense matter parameter estimation", 2025.

Backup slides

28/05/25 - ET Symposium 2025

RNN version

- Final loss value: 2.385 * 10^(-2).
- AdamW optimizer
- Total time: -1h on CPU (4000 epochs).

1.5PN formalism [4]

$$\begin{split} M_{\rm tot} &= m_1 + m_2 \\ \eta &= \frac{m_1 m_2}{(m_1 + m_2)^2} = \frac{m_1 m_2}{M_{\rm tot}^2} \\ \mathscr{M} &= \frac{(m_1 m_2)^{3/5}}{(m_1 + m_2)^{1/5}} = M_{\rm tot} \eta^{3/5} \\ \varepsilon &= \frac{G M_{\odot}}{c^3} \left(\frac{M_{\rm tot}}{M_{\odot}}\right) \pi f \\ \frac{df}{dt} &= \frac{96}{5} \pi^{8/3} \left(\frac{G M_{\odot}}{c^3} \frac{M_{\rm tot}}{M_{\odot}} \eta^{3/5}\right)^{5/3} f^{11/3} \left[1 - \left(\frac{743}{336} + \frac{11}{4} \eta\right) \varepsilon^{2/3} + 4\pi\varepsilon\right] \end{split}$$

Architecture

PINNs theory

$$u_t + \mathcal{N}[u; \lambda] = 0, \ x \in \Omega, \ t \in [0, T],$$
$$f := u_t + \mathcal{N}[u],$$

$$MSE = MSE_u + MSE_f$$
,

where

$$MSE_{u} = \frac{1}{N_{u}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{u}} |u(t_{u}^{i}, x_{u}^{i}) - u^{i}|^{2},$$

and

$$MSE_f = \frac{1}{N_f} \sum_{i=1}^{N_f} |f(t_f^i, x_f^i)|^2.$$

Task: find an approximation for u (= solve the differential equation) and optimize λ .

Data: (uⁱ, tⁱ,xⁱ).

How: approximate u with a NN and minimize the loss.

Why this should work? Since u is a NN, f is a PINN: they share the same parameters.

PINNs theory

