Machine Learning in Analyzing **Atmospheric Gravity Waves**

Anastasia Brown Utah State University Physics Department and Center for Atmospheric and Space Sciences

Kenneth 7ia

Utah State University Physics Department and Center for Atmospheric and Space Sciences **P.-Dominique Pautet**

Utah State University Physics Department and Center for Atmospheric and Space Sciences

Yucheng Zhao Utah State University Physics Department and Center for Atmospheric and Space Sciences

Max Haehnel Utah State University Physics Department and Center for Atmospheric and Space Sciences

Michel J. Taylor

Utah State University Physics Department and Center for Atmospheric and Space Sciences

tahState

Universitv

cknowledgments: This research pr



Objective: Improve Halley LightGBM Model to

better identify images of clear skies.

- The ANtarctic Gravity Wave Instrument Network (ANGWIN) is an international collaboration aimed at investigating the upper atmosphere dynamics over a continent-size region, using a network of all-sky imagers (Fig. 1).
- ANGWIN network began collecting All-Sky-Imager (ASI) data in 2012 (Table, 1). The ASI data is then sifted through to find windows of "clean" data (no clouds, aurora, or moonlight, Fig.2).
- · Once found the "clean" image windows are processed and power spectrum graphs are made to identify wave activity (Fig. 3 and 4).
- In the middle of winter, each station collecting ASI data can easily produce well over 8,000 images a night.
- To streamline the sorting process, a machine learning algorithm is used to identify "clean" (marked as 0) images from "obscured" (marked as 1) images (Zia 2022).
 - Based on a machine learning algorithm that quickly sort through large Themis Aurora data sets reporting 96% accuracy (Clausen et al., 2018).
 - The algorithm we used: Light Gradient Boosted Machine (LightGBM)

Already, ASI data from 2 ANGWIN stations are sorted using LightGBM models. However, the model created to sort the third station, Halley, needs improvement:

The machine claims an accuracy of 99.2% but when validated, 62.3% of the "clean" windows identified were misidentified.



Fig. 2: Obstructions to the sky, such as clouds, aurora, bright moon, and fog will yield faulty power spectrum graphs.

- Methods (Fig.6)
- · Use current LightGBM model to identify "clean" windows.
- Validate the findings of the current model and identify strengths as well as areas that could be improved.
- Add frames depicting sky conditions the current model can not identify well to the training set to strengthen the next model.
- Evaluate training set and remove frames that confuse the computer.
- · Increase the size of the training set and experiment with the ratio of clear and obscured images
- Generated the next model with the new and improved training set.
- Compare each model's ability to correctly label data from Halley, July 2012 (Fig. 4 and 5)

Model

data, the model is done. Else, if the

output is labeled as "obscured" and

added to the training set to produce

models mislabel data, the faulty

a new model.

Repeat until the machine learning algorithm effectively reduces the number of days that need to be processed.



Fig 3: Airalow images are processed to remove noise and the fish eye affect of the lenses.



2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023



Table. 1: LightGBM is highly accurate and lightweight enough to use on a regular laptop (Ke et al., 2017). As a result, LightGBM models have been developed for four stations: Davis, McMurdo, Halley, and Rothera. Both the Davis and McMurdo models are fully functional and used to sort all sky data. The training set for the Halley model is under revision, and the Rothera model will be tested soon.

Results and Conclusion

- Use of machine learning in ASI cleaning removes the bottle neck created by the large data set.
- · A more accurate model results a lower cost of analysis and a faster turnout. After much fine tuning, the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th iteration of the LightGBM Halley Model all preformed better than the 1st.

The 4th iteration surpassed the others in avoiding obscured windows while still correctly clear skies (Fig. 7).



Guolin Ke, Qi Meng, Thomas Finley, Taifang Wang, Wei Chen, Weidong Ma, Qiwei Ye, Tie-Yan Liu. (2017) "LightGBM: A Highly Efficient Gradient Boosting Decision Tree", NeurIPS Proceedings. Zia, Kenneth I., "Investigating Atmospheric Gravity Waves Using 3-I



Fig. 4 Power spectrums from windows shown in figure 4. For comparison see a) Halley Model 1, Jul 2-13 5:35 - 10:04 UT, b) Halley Model 2, Jul 2-13 0:55 - 3:34 UT. c) Halley Model 3, Jul12-13 20:35 – 23:36 UT. d) Halley Model 4, Jul12-13 18:08 - 1:42



Fig. 5: The models' ability to find clean windows was compared by grading each model's capacity to find clean windows in July. Those points were then tallied to estimate the net number of "clear" hours each model identified.



the number of "clean" windows identified by each model to the number of clean windows each model correctly identified shows the validated accuracy of each model. Comparina the number of days that the , models claimed to have "clean" windows to the number of days that truly had clean windows displays the amount of time and resources each model saves