Using Graph Neural Networks, for Cosmic-Ray Composition **Analysis at IceCube Observatory**

Paras Koundal

EXAM Yuya Makino, IceCube/NSF

 H_{max}

/ParasKoundal **paraskoundal.com Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany**

the school as a direct on the com-

Talk Outline

- Introduction
	- CRays at IceCube
	- Previous Composition Analysis at IceCube
- New Composition Parameters
	- Muon-Spread Dependent Parameters
	- Muon Number Dependent Parameter
	- Muon Energy-Deposit Dependent Parameters
- Graph Neural Networks
	- Message Passing in GNNs
	- Improving Previous Architecture

5

维

 \sum ₃ ----------------------
PC: IceCube/NSF

[Previous Work](https://journals.aps.org/prd/pdf/10.1103/PhysRevD.100.082002)

5

Cosmic ray spectrum and composition from PeV to EeV using
3 years of data from IceTop and IceCube

M. G. Aartsen et al. (IceCube Collaboration) Phys. Rev. D 100, 082002 - Published 23 October 2019

4

Scope for Improvement

- Focus only on per-event based composition analysis
- Invent newer composition-sensitive parameters
	- Focus on in-ice deposit (primarily muon-deposit)
- Use and Improve SOTA Deep Learning Methods for composition-analysis
	- Use full in-ice footprint for composition analysis

New Composition Parameters

Impact Weighted Charge

- Help understand shower attenuation in-ice and a dynamic parameter

=

 \sum Charge $_i$ * ri

 $\sum r_i$

- Possibly help in understanding photon propagation in-ice
	- Ongoing work
- Good Separation Between Primaries

a-20 percentile

 $+500$

New Composition Parameters

Muons are the most promising candidates for cosmic-ray composition analysis

Ratio-Parameter

维

Total Stochastic Energy

- Uses In-Ice info.
- Captures local stochastic-deposits in-ice, primarily by muons.
- Good separation between primaries

Slope-Parameter

- Uses In-Ice info.
- Captures the rate of in-ice charge deposit.
- Good separation between primaries

Using In-Ice Signal Footprint

Credits: M. Huennefeld [\(arXiv:2101.11589\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.11589v2)

Learning on Graphs

 $G = (V, E)$ Defined by set of nodes (V) and set of edges (E) between the nodes

- Neighborhood and Connectivity & permutational invariance of Node Labelling

Undirected : Facebook Friends ...; Directed : Citation Graph ...; Bidirectional : Twitter Follows

methods at the IceCube Neutrino Observatory

GNNs at IceCube (for CR Analysis)

Previous Results @ ICRC,2021

PROCEEDINGS

ICRC 2021

The IceCube Collaboration

and IceCube

 P_o

(a complete list of authors can be found at the end of the proceedings) E-mail: paras.koundal@kit.edu, matthias.plum@icecube.wisc.edu, julian.saffer@kit.edu

The IceCube Neutrino Observatory is a multi-component detector at the South Pole which detects high-energy particles emerging from astrophysical events. These particles provide us with insights into the fundamental properties and behaviour of their sources. Besides its principal usage and merits in neutrino astronomy, using IceCube in conjunction with its surface array, IceTop, also makes it a unique three-dimensional cosmic-ray detector. This distinctive feature helps facilitate detailed cosmic-ray analysis in the transition region from galactic to extragalactic sources. We will present the progress made on multiple fronts to establish a framework for mass-estimation of primary cosmic rays. The first technique relies on a likelihood-based analysis of the surface signal distribution and improves upon the standard reconstruction technique. The second uses advanced methods in graph neural networks to use the full in-ice shower footprint, in addition to global shower-footprint features from IceTop. A comparison between the two methods for composition analysis as well as a possible extension of the analysis techniques for sub-PeV cosmic-ray airshowers will also be discussed.

Study of Mass Composition of Cosmic Rays with IceTop

Corresponding authors: Paras Koundal^{1*}, Matthias Plum², Julian Saffer³ ¹ Institute for Astroparticle Physics, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany ² Department of Physics, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, 53201, USA ³ Institute of Experimental Particle Physics, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany

* Presenter

1

Issues Resolved with Previous Work

Minor Issues Resolved

- Adding More Mass-Dependent Features
- Correcting Feature normalizations
- **Inherently introduced simplification for training – Using PyTorch**
	- Batch Size (subset of training data) $= 1$ graph
		- For Better Generalization: BS (not too big, not too small)

Major Update

- Global Features also included in graph message-passing framework
	- Global attributes are same features shared over all nodes
- **Small Dataset**
	- CR-MC Simulations are limited.
		- Simulations are costly.
	- **Working Solution for increasing dataset size:** Randomly drop (.1% % & .2%) in-ice DOMs to increase data 5-fold
		- **Speculation -** Our in-ice track and energy reconstructions are resilient to these changes : Will be tested in future
		- **Food for Thought –** Change introducing hadronic-interaction model dependence.

- **Graph architecture was over-simplified**

- Number of nodes were made equal
	- Now: Flexibility of choice.
- Message aggregate and update in graph was over-simplistic \rightarrow Generalized to implement any architecture
	- Now: k-nn connection (can choose between based on feature-vector or spatial coordinates)
	- For global-aggregation: Flattened-mean was used
		- **Now:** Implement any SOTA global-aggregation

Major Update

[Date of Publication:](https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9460814) 18 June 2021 - New Graph Message-Passing framework - Adapted from the work "**Hierarchical Multi-View Graph Pooling with** Hierarchical Multi-View Graph Pooling with **Structure Learning**" **Structure Learning** Improvement in Graph pooling (or downsampling) to learn hierarchical representations Zhen Zhang, Jiajun Bu*, Member, IEEE, Martin Ester, Senior Member, IEEE, Jianfeng Zhang, Zhao Li*, Chengwei Yao, Huifen Dai, Zhi Yu, Can Wang, Member, IEEE - Attention mechanism utilized to generate robust node ranks. Preserve the underlying graph topological information, using a structure learning mechanism. Adapted from DOI: [Date of Publication:](https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.02907) 22 Feb 2017 [10.1109/TKDE.2021.3090664](https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2021.3090664) SEMI-SUPERVISED CLASSIFICATION WITH **GRAPH CONVOLUTIONAL NETWORKS Thomas N. Kipf Max Welling University of Amsterdam University of Amsterdam** Canadian Institute for Advanced Research (CIFAR) T.N.Kipf@uva.nl **tructure** M.Welling@uva.nl Learning *3**MVPool Concatenation** $\overline{\mathbf{1}}$ Layer 1 » » » » » » ConCat (Global(MaxPool, 2 » » » » » » SumPool)) 3 Regressed Value Layer 2 $\left(\mathbf{4} \right)$ ConCat (Global(MaxPool, 3 Layers SumPool)) Signal to Graph Features Layer 3 Global ConCat (Global(MaxPool, SumPool)) FC Sum (ConCat 1, ConCat 2, ConCat 3) **1** 66

Results

- Target Variable: 1+ln(A)
- Major Improvements for all Primary Types
	- Maximum at True value
	- Shift towards lighter elements for H and He
	- Shift towards heavier for O and Fe
- Loss:
	- Adaptive Learning rate
	- Very Gradual decrease in error

 \sum_{17}

Prediction Error : Binned over Energy

Transfer Your Learning

传

Bottom Image: Borrowed from kdnuggets.com

Transfer Learning @ IceCube

Transfer Learning @ IceCube

- The validation loss of the finetuned transferredlearned model is already lower than the training loss of the previous model. Hopefully, improvement if future.
	- Caution: Do, I see signs of overfitting

0.79

 $m^{0.78}$

 \circ

 II 0.7°

 $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ $\ddot{}$ 0.76

Loss 0.7

Train Loss Validation Loss

Transfer Learning - Train Loss **Transfer Learning - Validation Loss**

IceCube Preliminary

Graph Level Prediction

GNNs adapt the learning structure of MLPs as well as CNNs. The aggregate and update step of GNNs is similar to convolution layers of CNN. To make a graph-level prediction, we need to find a permutation-invariant graph-level aggregation method.

Issues & Status of Current GNNs

- Oversmoothing: CNNs excel by their ability to use deeper architectures to improve accuracy. However, GNNs face with loss(or accuracy) saturation once the number of layers increase.
- Currently, the number of standard-datasets and correspondingly methods are limited in GNN.
- In most of the standard datasets, node number variation is small (not true for this analysis).
- To capture structural info, for smooth-graphs with big node number variation, clearly global max/mean pooling will not be very useful. Same for sort-pooling.
- Sum-pooling is size-dependent. However, not well suited for inverse problems.
- Attention Based Methods: Newer methods. Not very much explored.
- The input-from GNN message-passing can't be huge: Curse of dimensionality.

FC

 $\square\text{...}$

 $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$

Conclusion and Outlook

- New cosmic-ray composition analysis seem promising.
- Overall Improvement in Cosmic-Ray Composition using Graph Neural Network
	- Improvement over full-energy range
- Future: PointNet++, Removing learning from graphs ([arXiv:1905.04579](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.04579))