ExoGAN: Retrieving Exoplanetary Atmospheres Using Deep Convolutional Generative Adversarial Networks

TIZIANO ZINGALES^{1, 2} AND INGO P. WALDMANN¹

¹University College London
 Gower St, Bloomsbury, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom
 ²INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Palermo
 Piazza del Parlamento 1, 90134 Palermo, Italy

(Received April 20, 2024; Revised -; Accepted -)

Submitted to ApJ

ABSTRACT

Atmospheric retrievals on exoplanets usually involve computationally intensive Bayesian sampling methods. Large parameter spaces and increasingly complex atmospheric models create a computational bottleneck forcing a trade-off between statistical sampling accuracy and model complexity. This is especially true for upcoming JWST and ARIEL observations. We introduce ExoGAN, the Exoplanet Generative Adversarial Network, a new deep learning algorithm able to recognise molecular features, atmospheric trace-gas abundances and planetary parameters using unsupervised learning. Once trained, ExoGAN is widely applicable to a large number of instruments and planetary types. The ExoGAN retrievals constitute a significant speed improvement over traditional retrievals and can be used either as a final atmospheric analysis or provide prior constraints to a subsequent retrievals.

Keywords: Exoplanets — atmospheres — atmospheric retrieval — artificial intelligence — deep learning — GAN

1. INTRODUCTION

The modelling of exoplanetary atmospheric spectroscopy through so called atmospheric retrieval algorithms has become accepted standard in the interpretation of transmission and emission spectroscopic measurements (e.g. Kreidberg et al. 2018; Tsiaras et al. 2018; Bruno et al. 2018; Mansfield et al. 2018; Spake et al. 2018; Sheppard et al. 2017; Barstow et al. 2017; Rocchetto et al. 2016). These retrieval algorithms are designed to solving the often ill-defined inverse problem of determining atmospheric parameters (such as trace gas abundances for example) from the measured spectra and their corresponding measurement uncertainties (e.g. Irwin et al. 2008; Madhusudhan & Seager 2009; Line et al. 2013; Benneke & Seager 2013; Lavie et al. 2017; Gandhi & Madhusudhan 2018; Cubillos et al. 2016). The associated atmospheric forward model to be

fitted varies in complexity from retrieval to retrieval but most times encompasses a high dimensional likelihood space to be sampled. In the era of JWST (Gardner et al. 2006) and ARIEL (Tinetti et al. 2016) observations, said model complexity will have to increase significantly. To date, the most commonly adopted statistical sampling methods are Nested Sampling (Skilling 2004; Feroz & Hobson 2008; Feroz et al. 2009) and Markov Chain Monte Carlo (e.g. Gregory 2011). These approaches typically require of the order of 10^5 - 10^6 forward model realisations until convergence. This creates a precarious bottleneck: In order to achieve convergence within reasonable time frames (hours to days), we require the atmospheric forward model to be fast and consequently overly simplistic. The inclusion of disequilibrium chemistry, self-consistent cloud models and the move from 1 D to 2-3 D radiative transfer, are largely precluded by this constraint. In this paper, we present the first deep learning architecture for exoplanet atmospheric retrievals and discuss a path towards solving the computational bottleneck using atmospheric retrievals assisted by deep-learning.

Corresponding author: Tiziano Zingales tiziano.zingales.15@ucl.ac.uk

Artificial Intelligence has been used extensively to understand and describe complex structures and behaviour in a wide variety of dataset across a plethora of research fields.

In recent years, the field of exoplanets has seen a number of pioneering deep-learning papers on planet detection (Pearson et al. 2018; Shallue & Vanderburg 2018), exoplanet transit prediction (Kipping & Lam 2017) and atmospheric spectral identification Waldmann (2016). In Waldmann (2016) we applied a deep-belief neural network (DBN) to recognize the atmospheric features on an exoplanetary emission spectrum. This approach provided a qualitative understanding of the atmospheric trace gases likely to be present in a planetary emission spectrum, to then be included in our atmospheric retrieval framework TauREx (Waldmann et al. 2015b,a). In this paper, we introduce a generative adversarial network (GAN, Goodfellow et al. 2014) to predict the maximum likelihood (ML) of the full retrieval solution given the observed spectrum. As shown in the following sections, this can be used as a stand-alone solution to a retrieval or used to constrain the prior parameter ranges for a more classical atmospheric retrieval later.

We design our algorithm following four guiding principles:

- Once trained, the deep or machine-learning algorithm should be applicable to the widest possible range of planet types.
- Once trained, the algorithm should be applicable to a wide range of instruments.
- The algorithm should be robust in the presence of unknown 'un-trained' features and be able to generalise to parameter regimes outside its formal training set.
- The design of the algorithm and data format should be modular and easily modifiable and expandable.

In the following sections we will present the Exoplanet Generative Adversarial Network (ExoGAN) algorithm and demonstrate it on a variety of retrieval scenarios. Upon acceptance of this manuscript, we will provide the ExoGAN algorithm freely to the community.

2. METHOD

In the following sections we will introduce GANs and deep convolutional generative adversarial networks (DC-GANs), followed by a discussion how we adopt DCGANs for exoplanetary retrievals.

2.1. Generative Adversarial Networks

Generative Adversarial Networks first introduced by Goodfellow et al. (2014) belongs to the class of unsupervised deep generative neural networks (Goodfellow et al. 2016). Deep generative models are able to learn the arbitrarily complex probability distribution of a data set, p_{data} , and are able to generate new data sets drawn from p_{data} . Similarly, they can also be used to fill in missing information in an incomplete data set, so called inpainting. In this work, we will use the data inpainting properties of the GAN to perform retrievals of the atmospheric forward model parameters.

The most common analogy for a GAN architecture is that of a counterfeit operation. The neural network is given a training data set, \mathbf{x} , in our case combinations of atmospheric spectra with their associated forward model parameters. We refer to the training set as the 'real' data with the probability distribution p_{data} . Now two deep neural networks are pitted against each other in a minmax game. One network, the generator network (G), will try to create a 'fake' data set (p_q) , indistinguishable from the 'real' data. In a second step, a second neural network, the discriminator (D), will try to correctly classify 'fake' from 'real' data. The training phase of the GAN is completed when a Nash equilibrium is reached and the discriminator cannot identify real from fake any longer. At this stage the generator network will have learned a good representation of the data probability distribution and $p_g \simeq p_{data}$. Figure 1 shows a schematic of our GAN implementation. Unlike for variational inference methods, such as variational autoencoders (VAE; Kingma & Welling 2013; Jimenez Rezende et al. 2014), the functional form of the data likelihood does not need to be specified but is learned by the Generator. Such implicit latent variable models or likelihood-free networks allow the learning of arbitrarily complex probability distributions in an unsupervised manner, whilst assuming minimal prior assumptions on the data distribution.

GANs have been applied to multiple problems, such as semi-supervised learning, stabilizing sequence learning methods for speech and language, and 3D modelling (Denton et al. 2015; Radford et al. 2015; Salimans et al. 2016; Lamb et al. 2016; Wu et al. 2016). Notable examples of GANs applied in an astrophysical context are given by Rodriguez et al. (2018); Stark et al. (2018); Schawinski et al. (2017), who used GANs trained on existing N-body simulations to efficiently generate new, physically realistic realizations of the cosmic web, learn Point Spread Function from data or de-noise groundbased observations of galaxies. In the field of exoplanets, the use of GANs or similar deep architectures has not yet been explored. In this work we base ExoGANon a Deep Convolutional Generative Adversarial Network (DCGAN, Radford et al. 2015).

DCGANs are an evolution from the classical GAN by replacing the multilayer perceptrons (MLPs; Rumelhart et al. 1986; Bengio 2009) in the Generator and Discriminator networks with all convolutional layers. This makes DCGAN significantly more robust to discrete-mode and manifold model collapse (Metz et al. 2016; Arjovsky & Bottou 2017) and are found to be stable in most training scenarios (Radford et al. 2015). In addition, we note that convolutional networks are ideally suited to capturing the highly correlated signals of broad, rotovibrational spectral bands in NIR and IR wavelengths.

2.2. Adversarial Training

As described in the previous section, both Generator and Discriminator networks are pitted against one another during training. The goal of the training phase is to reach a Nash Equilibrium, i.e. when neither player can improve by unilaterally changing one's strategy. Hence, in the state of convergence, we have $p_g = p_{data}$ and $D(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}$. Figure 1 shows a schematic of the Exo-GAN setup.

In order to return the generator distribution p_g over the data \mathbf{x} we start from a prior distribution of Gaussian distributed latent variables $p(\mathbf{z})$ and define $G(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_G)$ as the mapping from latent variable space to generated data. Here $\boldsymbol{\theta}_G$ are the hyperparameters of the Generator network (see table 6).

Let $D(\mathbf{x})$ be the probability that \mathbf{x} came from the data rather than p_g . In the training phase we need D to maximise the probability of assigning the correct label to both training examples and samples from G. At the same time we want G to minimize the probability $\log(1 - D(G(\mathbf{z})))$. We can now define the cross-entropy cost-function of the Discriminator as:

$$J^{(D)} = -\left[\log D(\mathbf{x}) + \log\left(1 - D\left(G(\mathbf{z})\right)\right)\right]$$
(1)

During training, we employ batch training, with cost function of a batch of n data samples being

$$J^{(D)} = -\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log D(x_i) + \right.$$
(2)

$$+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log(1-D(G(z_i)))\}$$
 (3)

which can be written as the expectation values over the data and generated samples:

$$J^{(D)} = -\{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{data}}[\log D(\mathbf{x})] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim p_z}[\log (1 - D(G(\mathbf{z})))]\}.$$
(4)

Since the discriminator wants to minimize the cost function and the generator wants to maximise it, we can summarise the training as a zero-sum game where the cost function for the generator is given by: $J^{(G)} =$ $-J^{(D)}$. Hence, to capture the entire game, we only need to specify the loss-function of the Discriminator since it encompasses both $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(D)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(G)}$ hyperparameters. We then optimise the value function $V(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(D)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(G)}) =$ $-J^{(D)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(D)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(G)})$,

$$\min_{G} \max_{D} V(D,G) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{data}}[\log D(\mathbf{x})]$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim p_{z}}[\log (1 - D(G(\mathbf{z})))].$$
(5)

As stated earlier, equation 5 constitutes a minmax game since it involves minimising over G in an outer loop and maximising over D in an inner loop.

2.3. Application to exoplanet spectra

Here we explain the data format of the input and training data. In figure 2 we show an example a transmission spectrum of a cloud-free hot-Jupiter with water as the only trace-gas at $3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ volume mixing ratio at a constant resolution of $\frac{\Delta \lambda}{\lambda} = 100$. We train ExoGAN on a wavelength range of $0.3 \mu \text{m} - 50 \mu \text{m}$. For the purposes of this paper, we restrict our sampling resolution to be R = 100 throughout. This however does not preclude training with higher resolution data in the future.

2.3.1. Normalisation

For the neural network to learn efficiently, we must normalise the data to lie between zero and unity. We have experimented with various normalisation schemes. The most obvious scheme is a 'global' normalisation, where we normalise the full training set by its global maximum and minimum values. This approach proved problematic as spectral signatures for planets with low trace-gas abundances and high planetary masses would be too weak/flat to be recognisable by the neural network for reasonable training times. We have therefore opted to normalise each training spectrum to maximally amplify the spectral features. Assuming that the most common broad-band absorber is water in an exoplanetary atmosphere, we divide the spectrum along its major water bands in the IR, see dashed red lines in Fig 2. Note this does not mean that water-free atmospheres cannot be detected. Additionally, we divide the spectrum by the pass-bands of the JWST/NIRISS, NIRCam



Figure 1. The ExoGAN scheme. The Generator produces data sets sampling from a latent variable space z. The Discriminator compares the generated data set with data drawn from the training set (top left). The network has converged when the Discriminator cannot differentiate Real spectra from Generated Spectra any longer.



Figure 2. Spectral binning used in this work. The black line is a simulated spectrum of the hot-Jupiter HD 189733b. The red vertical line are represent the bin edges of prominent water bands. The blue and orange areas are the Hubble/WFC3 and JWST band-passes considered in this paper, respectively.

and MIRI instruments and the Hubble/WFC3 instrument passband. This gives us 14 spectral bands in total. We now normalise each spectral band between 0 and 1 and record the minimum and maximum normalisation factors for each. This normalisation scheme ensures a maximum amplification of the spectral features whilst retaining reversibility.

2.3.2. The Atmospheric Spectrum and Parameters Array (ASPA)

In order to store all aspects of an atmospheric transmission spectrum, we define the Atmospheric Spectrum and Parameters Array (ASPA). This is a 2D array encoding the 1D normalised spectral bands, each band's minimum and maximum normalisation factors and the associated forward model parameter values. We parametrise each training spectrum with 7 forward model parameters, ϕ , namely: H₂O, CO₂, CH₄ and CO volume mixing ratios, the mass of the planet M_p , the radius R_p and its isothermal temperature T_p at the terminator. Figure 3 shows a false-colour ASPA. For the purposes of this paper, the ASPA is a 33×33 pixel array, with the main part (section 1) encoding the spectral information. Sections 2 - 5 encode the normalisation factors and 6 - 12 the atmospheric parameters. By design, the planet's water abundance takes a significantly large range area of the ASPA, reflecting the relative importance of water in forming the spectral continuum. This said, the ASPA format is adaptable to other configurations in the future.

2.4. The training

In order to train ExoGAN on a wide range of possible exoplanetary atmospheres, we generated a very comprehensive training set of atmospheric forward models using the TauREx retrieval code (Waldmann et al. 2015a,b). We sampled each of the 7 previously mentioned forward model parameters (H₂O, CO₂, CH₄ and CO abundances, the mass of the planet M_p , the radius R_p and the temperature T_p) 10 times within the parameter ranges denoted in table 1. This yields 10⁷ forward models, which are split into 90% training set and 10% test set. The test set is used to validate the accuracy of the network on previously unseen data. As discussed later on, we find this training set to be overcomplete and only require a smaller subset of the full training set for convergence.

During the training, we perform two training iterations of the discriminator to every training step of the generator. We used a NVIDIA TESLA V100 GPU with batch sizes of 64 training ASPAs. We required ~ 9 hours per epoch on the V100 GPU and comparatively about 3 days on 20 CPU cores in parallel. The convergences of



Figure 3. The Atmospheric Spectra and Parameters Array (ASPA). Each area is dedicated to a particular atmospheric characteristic: Area 1 is the spectrum between 1μ m and 50μ m at resolution 100 normalised between 0 and 1 in each spectral bin. Areas 2 to 5 give information about the normalisation factors used in the different section of the spectrum, clear and dark area give, respectively, information about the maximum values and the minimum values. In areas 6 to 8 we encode the atmospheric trace-gas volume mixing ratios of CO₂, CO and CH₄ respectively. Areas 9 to 11 are, respectively M_p , R_p and T_p . Area 12 gives information on the H₂O trace-gas volume mixing ratio.

the loss functions during the training phase are shown in figure 4. The full model setup can be found in the appendix (table 7). We tested three different sizes of our latent variable space \mathbf{z} , with $z_{dim} = 50$, 100 and 200. We found $z_{dim} = 50$, to yield significantly noisier reconstructions at the end of one epoch of training, whereas no discernible differences between $z_{dim} = 100$ and $z_{dim} = 200$ could be observed. We hence settled on $z_{dim} = 100$. We have adopted a training batch size of 64 ASPAs and found no significant effect of larger training batch sizes on network convergence.

2.5. Data reconstruction

Once we have trained ExoGAN, we can now define our 'retrieval' model. As alluded to above, we use the inpainting properties of a GAN to complete the missing data, in this case the forward model parameters, in our ASPA. In other words, we convert our observed spectrum into the ASPA format and keep unknown values (parameters and missing wavelength ranges) masked. Given the information available, the ExoGAN will then attempt to fill in the missing information to complete the full ASPA. Here we follow the semantic inpainting algorithm by Yeh et al. (2016).

Training set parameters				
Variable	lower bound upper bound			
H_2O	10^{-8}	10^{-1}		
CO_2	10^{-8}	10^{-1}		
CO	10^{-8}	10^{-1}		
CH_4	10^{-8}	10^{-1}		
M_p	$0.8 M_J$	$2.0 M_J$		
R_p	$0.8 R_J$	$1.5 R_J$		
T_p	1000 K	2000 K		

Table 1. Parameters boundary condition used to generate the training set. Each parameter has been divided into 10 parts and used to model 10^7 different spectra.



Figure 4. Discriminator (green) and Generator (red) crossentropies as function of the iteration steps.

We can define our reconstructed data, \mathbf{x}_{recon} , from the incomplete observed data, \mathbf{y} , using

$$\mathbf{x}_{recon} = M \odot \mathbf{y} + (1 - M) \odot G(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \tag{6}$$

where M is a binary mask set to zero for missing values in \mathbf{y} , i.e. forward model parameter values and, possibly, missing wavelength ranges. Here, \odot constitutes the Hadamard product and $G(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ is the GAN generated data. We note that after the ExoGAN has been trained, \mathbf{z} represents an encoding manifold of p_{data} and we denote the closest match of $(M \odot G(\mathbf{z}))$ to $(M \odot \mathbf{y})$ with $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \subseteq \mathbf{z}$. The aim is now to obtain $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ that accurately completes \mathbf{x}_{recon} .

Let us define the following optimisation

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \arg\min_{z} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}).$$
 (7)

where \mathcal{L} is a loss function of \mathbf{z} that finds its minimum when $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ is reached. Following Yeh et al. (2016), we define

the loss function to be comprised of two parts, contextual loss and perceptual loss

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{cont}(\mathbf{z}) + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{perc}(\mathbf{z}). \tag{8}$$

The contextual loss, $\mathcal{L}_{cont}(\mathbf{z})$ is the difference between the observed data and the generated data. Here we follow the definition by Amos (2016):

$$\mathcal{L}_{cont}(\mathbf{z}) = \parallel M \odot G(\mathbf{z}) - M \odot y \parallel_1.$$
(9)

Empirically, Yeh et al. (2016) find the l_1 norm to yield slightly better results, though the l_2 norm can equally be used. Whereas the conceptual loss compares the generated data with the observed data directly, the perceptual loss, $\mathcal{L}_{perc}(\mathbf{z})$, uses the discriminator network to verify the validity of the generated data given the training set.

$$\mathcal{L}_{perc}(\mathbf{z}) = \log\left(1 - D(G(\mathbf{z}))\right) \tag{10}$$

To solve equation 7 we use the ADAM optimiser (Kingma & Ba 2014) with a learning rate of 0.1. We investigated the ratio of perceptual loss (Eq 10) to contextual loss (Eq 9) and found $\lambda = 0.1$ to be optimal but note that $\lambda > 0.1$ gives too much emphasis to the perceptual loss term and yielded less reliable results.

In figures 5 & 6 we show the three phases associated to a prediction: Left, the ground truth; Middle: the masked spectrum/parameters; Right: the reconstructed ASPA. Figure 7 shows a water-dominated atmosphere of a test-set hot-Jupiter (black) and the ExoGAN reconstructed spectrum based on the Hubble/WFC3 bandpass only (red). We find a very good agreement between reconstructed and ground-truth spectra.

3. ATMOSPHERIC PARAMETER RETRIEVAL

In order to retrieve the atmospheric forward model parameters, we assume the observational uncertainties on the spectrum to be Gaussian distributed. We then generate 1000 noisy instances of the observed spectrum, $x_i(\lambda)$, by sampling from a normal distribution with mean of $x(\lambda)$ and standard deviation σ_{λ} . From these noisy spectrum instances, we generate 1000 corresponding ASPAs with missing information (may they be parameters, spectral ranges or both) masked. We now let ExoGAN predict and inpaint these ASPAs. Finally, we collect all parameter predictions and calculate the mean and standard deviation of the resulting distribution.

4. ACCURACY TESTS

We defined the accuracy of the retrieved parameter, A, as the function of the ground-truth parameter value, ϕ ,



Figure 5. Left: input spectrum together with the parameters pixels. Centre: masked ASPA leaving Hubble/WFC3 wavelengths only. Right: ExoGAN completed ASPA given the middle ASPA.



Figure 6. Same as figure 5 but only masking the atmospheric forward model parameters.



Figure 7. Spectral reconstruction of ExoGANof a water dominated Hubble/WFC3 spectrum. Black: the ground-truth spectrum; Red: the ExoGAN reconstructed spectrum across all wavelengths giving as input only the Hubble/WFC3 band-pass.

Training set parameters					
Variable	$A(0 \sigma_{\phi})$	$A(1 \sigma_{\phi})$	$A(2\sigma_{\phi})$		
СО	64.4%	74.9%	80.8%		
$\rm CO_2$	93.7%	96.4%	97.3%		
H_2O	86.3%	92.9%	94.8%		
CH_4	80.3%	88.4%	91.9%		
\mathbf{R}_p	99.8%	99.8%	99.8%		
M_p	88.8%	90.5%	91.6%		
T_p	89.4%	91.9%	93.1%		

Table 2. ExoGAN prediction accuracies associated to each parameters for the training set. The $A(0 \sigma_{\phi})$ column represent the absolute accuracy of the prediction without taking into account the error bar of the retrieval. The 2^{nd} and 3^{rd} columns are taking into account the 1σ and 2σ retrieved errors following equation 11.

Test set parameters					
Variable	$A(0 \sigma_{\phi})$	$A(1 \sigma_{\phi})$	$A(2\sigma_{\phi})$		
CO	62.8%	72.6%	78.2%		
$\rm CO_2$	94.2%	96.6%	97.4%		
H_2O	89.6%	92.8%	93.9%		
CH_4	80.3%	88.2%	91.6%		
\mathbf{R}_p	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
M_p	88.0%	89.7%	90.8%		
T_p	90.4%	92.2%	93.2%		

Table 3. Same as table 2 but for the test set.

the retrieved value, ϕ_{recon} , and its corresponding error σ_{ϕ} ,

$$A(\phi, \sigma_{\phi}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i}^{N} \frac{(\phi_{i, recon} - \phi_{i})^{2}}{\phi_{i}^{2} + \sigma_{\phi_{i}}^{2}}$$
(11)

where N is the number of reconstructed ASPA instances.

We compute the reconstruction accuracies for 1000 randomly selected planets for each, the test and training sets. The accuracies are summarised in tables 2 & 3 for 0σ (an exact match), 1σ and 2σ confidence intervals. Figure 8 shows an example of the parameter distributions retrieved for a test-case planet.

4.1. Comparison with a classical retrieval model

In this section we compare the ExoGAN results with a 'classical' retrieval result obtained with the TauREx retrieval code. For this comparison and tests in subsequent sections, we used as example the hot-Jupiter HD 189733b with planetary/orbital parameters taken from Torres et al. (2008); Butler et al. (2006) and atmospheric chemistry based on Venot et al. (2012), see table 4.

Test planet parameters			
Parameter	Value		
R_*	$0.752R_{\odot}$		
R_p	$1.151 R_{J}$		
M_p	$1.150 M_J$		
T_p	$1117\mathrm{K}$		
H_2O	$3 \cdot 10^{-4}$		
CO	$4 \cdot 10^{-4}$		
$\rm CO_2$	$2 \cdot 10^{-7}$		
CH_4	$5 \cdot 10^{-6}$		

Table 4. Test-case atmospheric and planetary parameters used based on HD 189733b. The molecular abundances are given in volume mixing ratios.

We now retrieve the forward model parameters for both TauREx and ExoGAN for spectra across the Hubble/WFC3 only band and a large $(0.3 - 15 \,\mu\text{m})$ wavelength band. Here the Hubble/WFC3 spectrum was taken from Tsiaras et al. (2018) and interpolated to the ExoGAN resolution using a quadratic interpolation (figure 9). The large wavelength range spectrum is synthetic, based on table 4.

In figure 10 we compare both sets of results. The Hubble/WFC3 and large wavelength retrievals are shown with square and circular markers respectively. In both cases, the ExoGAN predictions are consistent with the TauREx retrievals within the error bars. We note that in the case of CO in the Hubble/WFC3 data, neither TauREx nor ExoGAN feature detections as expected.

Comparisons of run-time are remarkable. Using the TauREx Retrieval code with 7 free parameters a standard nested-sampling analysis takes ~ 10 hours on 24 CPU cores using absorption cross-sections at a resolution of R = 15,000 and spanning a large (0.3 - 15 μ m) wavelength range. The trained ExoGAN requires ~ 2 minutes for the same analysis. This constitutes a speed up of ~ 300 times and is independent of the number of free parameters.

5. ROBUSTNESS TESTS

In order to test the limits of ExoGAN we simulate three conditions previously encountered by the network. We use the same example planet as in the previous section (table 4) and simulate the following three scenarios unseen by ExoGAN during training phase:

- the presence of clouds;
- the addition of a trace gas unknown to the network;
- atmospheric temperatures outside the training range.



Figure 8. ExoGAN parameter distribution of the default test planet. Blue vertical line: Mean predicted value; green vertical line: ground truth value; vertical dotted lines: 1σ bounds estimated by ExoGAN.

Robustness results						
Variablo	clouds		unkwnown gases		T offscale	
variable	Input	ExoGAN	Input	ExoGAN	Input	ExoGAN
$\log(CO)$	-3.4	$-4.1^{3.1}_{2.5}$	< -8	$-5.7^{1.8}_{1.4}$	-3.4	$-3.1^{0.4}_{3.8}$
$\log(CO_2)$	-6.7	$-6.0^{2.3}_{1.7}$	< -8	$-5.5^{3.9}_{1.8}$	-6.7	$-5.6^{4.4}_{0.2}$
$\log(H_2O)$	-3.5	$-3.6^{1.1}_{3.0}$	-3.5	$-3.3^{0.7}_{3.5}$	-3.5	$-2.9^{0.2}_{4.1}$
$\log(CH_4)$	-5.3	$-6.7^{1.6}_{1.1}$	< -8	$-5.5^{2.0}_{1.9}$	-5.3	$-5.1^{2.1}_{1.1}$
$R_p (R_J)$	1.15	$1.18_{0.01}^{0.01}$	1.15	$1.14_{0.01}^{0.01}$	1.15	$1.16_{0.01}^{0.02}$
$M_p (M_J)$	1.15	$1.23_{0.42}^{0.59}$	1.15	$1.39_{0.49}^{0.43}$	1.15	$1.60_{0.7}^{0.2}$
T_p (K)	1117	1681_{208}^{153}	1117	1689^{179}_{506}	2500	$1744_{6.4}^{157}$

Table 5. Summary of all the robustness test results. For each value we show the input value used for the spectrum and the predicted result from ExoGAN. For the unknown gases test we used ammonia with a volume mixing ratio of 10^{-4} .

Each test is discussed below and the ExoGAN predicted abundances versus the ground-truth are summarised in table 5. Furthermore we test the ExoGAN's robustness against varying signal-to-noise (S/N) levels of the observed spectrum.

5.1. Presence of clouds

Here we test the response of ExoGAN to the presence of clouds in the atmospheric spectrum. We simulate a grey cloud deck at 10 mbar pressure (figure 11) and let ExoGAN reconstruct the atmospheric parameters, see figure 12. The lack of information due to the clouds presence results in a wider distribution of parameters. However, ExoGAN is still able to retrieve all trace-gas abundances within 1σ confidence. We find that temperature estimates can be overestimated. This is likely a consequence of the normalisation procedure used in the presence of clouds.

5.2. Presence of molecules outside of the training set

In this test we simulate the impact of unknown features on the retrievability of known trace gases. We here consider a spectrum containing water at the default test value and NH₃ with a mixing ratio of 10^{-4} . Though Venot et al. (2012) estimated an NH₃ mixing ratio of 10^{-6} , we use an unrealistically high value as worst-case scenario. By removing all other trained tracegases but water, we also test for spurious detections in



Figure 9. Real HD 189733b observation with the Hubble WFC3 camera (Tsiaras et al. 2018). The black points are the observed data and the green line is the interpolated spectrum to the ExoGAN resolution.



Figure 10. Comparison between the ExoGAN predictions (red points) and TauREx (black points). For the molecules we show the value -log(mixing-ratio). The squared points show the results for a real spectrum of HD 189733b using Hubble/WFC3. The round points are the results for a synthetic model of HD 189733b between 0.3 - 15 μ m. The results from the two retrievals are in both cases consistent with each others within the error bars.

non-existing trace-gases. Figure 13 shows the ExoGAN parameter distributions. We find the network to recognise the absence of trace-gases and does not detect 'false positives', whilst still recovering the exact mixing ratio of H_2O .

5.3. Parameters outside the training range

In the third robustness test we simulated a default planetary atmosphere but an effective temperature of 2500 K, 500 K above the temperature training range. In this test, as shown in figure 14, all parameters converge toward the real solution within 1σ , except for the planetary temperature. Here, the network does not retrieve

the correct temperature but assigns a large error bar suggesting that the temperature value is unconstrained if the input value is not contained in the domain range of ExoGAN.

5.4. Impact of spectral signal-to-noise

We test ExoGAN for varying levels of observational noise. Here we take the default planet (table 4) and add noise at steps of 10ppm in the range [0, 100] ppm. In figure 15 we show examples of spectra at σ_{λ} : 20, 50, 60 and 100 ppm noise level.

For each noise level, we calculated the accuracy of the prediction following equation 11, but setting $A(\sigma_{\phi} = 0)$, figure 16. We note that figure 16 only shows the difference between the predicted value and an exact match and prediction accuracies increase when retrieval error bars are taken into account. Here we want to demonstrate the relative degradation of the prediction accuracy as function of σ_{λ} .

As intuitively expected, we can see that the more noisy the spectra the less accurate the model. The Radius of the planet can be easily recognised by the ExoGAN in the entire error range tested. The most difficult parameter to recognise are the CO abundance and the mass of the planet.

6. DISCUSSION & FUTURE WORK

In the previous sections we have explored the use of DCGANs to retrieve atmospheric parameters from observations. As explained in the previous sections, GANs are latent variable models where the 'observed' data, **x**, is drawn from a conditional probability distribution, $\mathbf{x} \simeq p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^G}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$. As opposed to variational autoencoders (VAEs), the GAN is a likelihood-free method and the marginal likelihood, $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$, does not need to be computed during training. This has obvious advantages over pure VAEs when the data likelihood is unknown but does not allow inference over the data. In future work we will explore VAE-GAN hybrid models (e.g. Rosca et al. 2017; Dosovitskiy & Brox 2016; Ulyanov et al. 2017; Makhzani et al. 2015), and Bayesian GAN (Saatchi & Wilson 2017) which guard against model collapse, further aid convergence and in cases allow for inference.

In this work, we used 10^7 forward models over seven atmospheric forward model parameters. We find that this training set is significantly over-complete and the ExoGAN training can be completed successfully with ~ 50 % of the existing training set. Optimising training in future iterations will allow for the inclusion of more complex atmospheric forward models.

One of the main difficulties for training neural networks with transmission spectra is the normalisation of



Figure 11. Simulated spectra of the default test planet HD 189733b without clouds (left) and with grey clouds at 10 mbar cloud top pressure. (right).



Figure 12. Same as figure 8 but for the clouds robustness test for the default test planet, section 5.1.

the spectra in R_p/R_* . A consistent normalisation across a large range of possible atmospheres is required during the training process, but difficult to achieve in reality given strongly varying atmospheric scale heights and trace-gas abundances. In this work we adopted a normalisation based on instrument pass-bands as well as water bands. Though in practice this approach works for most scenarios, it can introduce biases when highaltitude clouds are present. In these cases, we find that the normalisation procedure stretches the observed spectrum too much, leading the network to identify higher atmospheric temperatures than it otherwise would. In future work we plan to mitigate this effect by including

grey clouds in the training set as well as further refining the normalisation scheme. We note that for emission spectroscopy a consistent normalisation is more readily achieved if the planetary and stellar equilibrium temperatures are assumed to be known (Waldmann 2016).

ExoGAN has been trained on a large set of simulated forward models. By including ExoGAN as integral part in the TauREx retrieval framework, we will be able to use forward models created during a classical retrieval run (of the order of $10^5 - 10^6$ models per retrieval) to perform online learning and continuously improve the accuracy of ExoGAN over time.



Figure 13. Same as figure 8 but for the ExoGAN analysis for a spectrum with only water and NH₃, section 5.2.



Figure 14. Same as figure 8 but for the ExoGAN analysis for a planetary temperature at 2500 K, 500 K outside the training range, see section 5.3.



Figure 15. Four examples of spectra used to calculate the accuracy of the ExoGAN. The green line represents the input spectrum and the blue part is the area representing the error bars, σ_{λ} in which we varied the input signal to simulate a noisy spectrum. In the **top left** we seen the 20ppm error bars, in the **top right** the 50ppm, in the **bottom left** the 60 ppm and the **bottom right** the 100ppm one.



Figure 16. Accuracy as a function of spectral error bars, σ_{λ} . As discussed in the text, we note that this figure does not take into account the retrieval error bar, i.e. $A(\sigma_{\phi} = 0)$ following equation 11.

7. CONCLUSION

In the era of JWST and ARIEL observations, next generation atmospheric retrieval algorithms must reflect the higher information content of the observation with an increase in atmospheric model complexity. Complex models are computationally heavy, creating potential bottlenecks given current state-of-the-art sampling schemes. Artificial intelligence approaches will provide essential tools to mitigate the increase in computational burden whilst maintaining retrieval accuracies.

In this work we introduced the first deep learning approach to solve the inverse retrieval of exoplanetary atmospheres. We trained deep convolutional generative adversarial network on a large library of atmospheric forward models and their associated model parameters. The training set spans a large range of atmospheric chemistries and planet types. Once trained, the ExoGAN algorithm achieves comparable performances to more traditional statistical sampling based retrievals and the ExoGAN results can be used to constrain the prior ranges of subsequent retrievals (to significantly cut computation times) or be used as stand alone results. We found ExoGAN to be upto 300 times faster than a classical retrieval for large spectral ranges. ExoGAN is designed to be universally applicable to a wide range of instruments and wavelength ranges without additional training.

ExoGAN and the training data set will be made openaccess at final publication of the paper. The retrieval code TauREx is open-access at https://github.com/ orgs/ucl-exoplanets/teams/taurex_public.

The authors thank the UCL Exoplanet team for insightful discussions. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 758892, ExoAI) and under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ ERC grant agreement numbers 617119 (ExoLights). The authors further acknowledge funding from Microsoft Azure for Research and the STFC grants ST/K502406/1 and ST/P000282/1. TZ also acknowledges the contribution from INAF trough the "Progetti Premiali" funding scheme of the Italian Ministry of Education, University, and Research

REFERENCES

Amos, B. 2016, Image Completion with Deep Learning in TensorFlow,

http://bamos.github.io/2016/08/09/deep-completion, accessed: 12/05/2018

- Arjovsky, M., & Bottou, L. 2017, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1701.04862
- Barstow, J. K., Aigrain, S., Irwin, P. G. J., & Sing, D. K. 2017, ApJ, 834, 50
- Bengio, Y. 2009, Learning Deep Architectures for AI, Vol. 2 (Now Publishers Inc)
- Benneke, B., & Seager, S. 2013, APJ, 778, 153
- Bruno, G., Lewis, N. K., Stevenson, K. B., et al. 2018, AJ, 155, 55

- Butler, R. P., Wright, J. T., Marcy, G. W., et al. 2006, ApJ, 646, 505
- Cubillos, P., Blecic, J., Harrington, J., et al. 2016, BART:Bayesian Atmospheric Radiative Transfer fitting code,Astrophysics Source Code Library, ascl:1608.004
- Denton, E., Chintala, S., Szlam, A., & Fergus, R. 2015, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1506.05751
- Dosovitskiy, A., & Brox, T. 2016, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29, ed. D. D. Lee,M. Sugiyama, U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon, & R. Garnett (Curran Associates, Inc.), 658–666
- Feroz, F., Gair, J. R., Hobson, M. P., & Porter, E. K. 2009, Classical and Quantum Gravity, 26, 215003

- Feroz, F., & Hobson, M. P. 2008, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 384, 449
- Gandhi, S., & Madhusudhan, N. 2018, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 474, 271
- Gardner, J. P., Mather, J. C., Clampin, M., et al. 2006, Space Science Reviews, 123, 485
- Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. 2016, Deep Learning (MIT Press), http://www.deeplearningbook.org
- Goodfellow, I. J., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., et al. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1406.2661
- Gregory, P. C. 2011, MNRAS, 410, 94
- Irwin, P. G. J., Teanby, N. A., De Kok, R., et al. 2008, Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy & Radiative Transfer, 109, 1136
- Jimenez Rezende, D., Mohamed, S., & Wierstra, D. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1401.4082
- Kingma, D. P., & Ba, J. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1412.6980
- Kingma, D. P., & Welling, M. 2013, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1312.6114
- Kipping, D. M., & Lam, C. 2017, MNRAS, 465, 3495
- Kreidberg, L., Line, M. R., Parmentier, V., et al. 2018, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1805.00029
- Lamb, A., Dumoulin, V., & Courville, A. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1602.03220
- Lavie, B., Mendonça, J. M., Mordasini, C., et al. 2017, AJ, 154, 91
- Line, M. R., Wolf, A. S., Zhang, X., et al. 2013, The Astrophysical Journal, 775, 137
- Madhusudhan, N., & Seager, S. 2009, The Astrophysical Journal, 707, 24
- Makhzani, A., Shlens, J., Jaitly, N., Goodfellow, I., & Frey, B. 2015, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1511.05644
- Mansfield, M., Bean, J. L., Line, M. R., et al. 2018, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1805.00424
- Metz, L., Poole, B., Pfau, D., & Sohl-Dickstein, J. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1611.02163
- Pearson, K. A., Palafox, L., & Griffith, C. A. 2018, MNRAS, 474, 478
- Radford, A., Metz, L., & Chintala, S. 2015, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1511.06434
- Rocchetto, M., Waldmann, I. P., Venot, O., Lagage, P. O., & Tinetti, G. 2016, ApJ, 833, 120

- Rodriguez, A. C., Kacprzak, T., Lucchi, A., et al. 2018, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1801.09070
- Rosca, M., Lakshminarayanan, B., Warde-Farley, D., & Mohamed, S. 2017, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1706.04987
- Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E., & Williams, R. J. 1986 (Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press), 318–362
- Saatchi, Y., & Wilson, A. G. 2017, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1705.09558
- Salimans, T., Goodfellow, I., Zaremba, W., et al. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1606.03498
- Schawinski, K., Zhang, C., Zhang, H., Fowler, L., & Santhanam, G. K. 2017, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters, 467, L110
- Shallue, C. J., & Vanderburg, A. 2018, AJ, 155, 94
- Sheppard, K. B., Mandell, A. M., Tamburo, P., et al. 2017, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 850, L32
- Skilling, J. 2004, Bayesian Inference and Maximum Entropy Methods in Science and Engineering: 24th International Workshop on Bayesian Inference and Maximum Entropy Methods in Science and Engineering held 25-30 July, 735, 395
- Spake, J. J., Sing, D. K., Evans, T. M., et al. 2018, Nature, 557, 68
- Stark, D., Launet, B., Schawinski, K., et al. 2018, MNRAS, 477, 2513
- Tinetti, G., Drossart, P., Eccleston, P., et al. 2016, in Space Telescopes and Instrumentation 2016: Optical, Infrared, and Millimeter Wave, Vol. 9904, 99041X
- Torres, G., Winn, J. N., & Holman, M. J. 2008, ApJ, 677, 1324
- Tsiaras, A., Waldmann, I. P., Zingales, T., et al. 2018, AJ, 155, 156
- Ulyanov, D., Vedaldi, A., & Lempitsky, V. 2017, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1704.02304
- Venot, O., Hébrard, E., Agúndez, M., et al. 2012, A&A, 546, A43
- Waldmann, I. P. 2016, ApJ, 820, 107
- Waldmann, I. P., Rocchetto, M., Tinetti, G., et al. 2015a, ApJ, 813, 13
- Waldmann, I. P., Tinetti, G., Rocchetto, M., et al. 2015b, ApJ, 802, 107
- Wu, Y., Schuster, M., Chen, Z., et al. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1609.08144
- Yeh, R. A., Chen, C., Yian Lim, T., et al. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1607.07539

ZINGALES & WALDMANN

APPENDIX

A. ExoGAN ARCHITECTURE AND PARAMETERS

ExoGAN is made of two neural networks, the generator and the discriminator, whose parameters are shown in Tab 6.

Layer	Operation	Output	Dimension		
Discrim	ninator $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(D)})$				
X			$m\cdot 33\cdot 33\cdot 1$		
h_0	conv	leaky relu - batch norm	$m\cdot 17\cdot 17\cdot 64$		
h_1	conv	leaky relu - batch norm	$m\cdot 9\cdot 9\cdot 128$		
h_2	conv	leaky relu - batch norm	$m \cdot 5 \cdot 5 \cdot 256$		
h_3	conv	leaky relu - batch norm	$m\cdot 3\cdot 3\cdot 512$		
h_4	linear	sigmoid	$m \cdot 1$		
Generator $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(G)})$					
\mathbf{z}			$m \cdot 100$		
h_0	linear	relu - batch norm	$m\cdot 3\cdot 3\cdot 512$		
h_1	deconv	relu - batch norm	$m \cdot 5 \cdot 5 \cdot 256$		
h_2	deconv	relu - batch norm	$m\cdot 9\cdot 9\cdot 128$		
h_3	deconv	relu - batch norm	$m\cdot 17\cdot 17\cdot 64$		
h_4	deconv	sigmoid	$m\cdot 33\cdot 33\cdot 1$		

Table 6. Architecture of ExoGAN listing the hyperparameters $\theta^{(D)}$ and $\theta^{(G)}$. We used 5 layer deep networks for both Generator and Discriminators. m is the batch size fixed to 64 during training.

Hyper-parameter	Stage		Description
	Training	Prediction	Description
batch size	64	1024	Number of spectral samples used at each train- ing/prediction iteration for both networks
Z	100	100	Generator gaussian prior distribution
Learning rate	$2 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1 \cdot 10^{-1}$	Learning rate for the Adam optimizer
β_1	0.5	0.9	Exponential decay rate for the first moment esti- mates in the Adam optimizer.
β_2	-	0.999	Exponential decay rate for the second moment es- timates in the Adam optimizer.
λ	-	0.1	Hyper-parameter that controls the importance of the contextual loss compared to the perceptual loss

 Table 7. Hyperparameters used in ExoGAN.