

## Aberystwyth University

### *Reliability of AI-generated magnetograms from only EUV images*

Liu, Jiajia; Wang, Yimin; Huang, Xin; Korsós, Marianna B.; Jiang, Ye; Wang, Yuming; Erdélyi, Robert

*Published in:*  
Nature Astronomy

*DOI:*  
[10.1038/s41550-021-01310-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-021-01310-6)

*Publication date:*  
2021

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Liu, J., Wang, Y., Huang, X., Korsós, M. B., Jiang, Y., Wang, Y., & Erdélyi, R. (2021). Reliability of AI-generated magnetograms from only EUV images. *Nature Astronomy*, 5(2), 108-110. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41550-021-01310-6>

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Aberystwyth Research Portal (the Institutional Repository) are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Aberystwyth Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Aberystwyth Research Portal

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

tel: +44 1970 62 2400  
email: [is@aber.ac.uk](mailto:is@aber.ac.uk)

# Reliability of AI-generated magnetograms from only EUV images

Jiajia Liu<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Yimin Wang<sup>1,3,\*</sup>, Xin Huang<sup>4</sup>, Marianna Korsos<sup>5</sup>, Ye Jiang<sup>6</sup>, Yuming Wang<sup>7</sup>, Robert Erdélyi<sup>1,8,9,+</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Solar Physics and Space Plasma Research Centre (SP2RC), School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S3 7RH, UK*

<sup>2</sup>*Astrophysics Research Centre, School of Mathematics and Physics, Queen’s University, Belfast, BT7 1NN*

<sup>3</sup>*School of Electrical Engineering, University of Jinan, Jinan 250022, China*

<sup>4</sup>*Key Laboratory of Solar Activity, National Astronomical Observatories of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China*

<sup>5</sup>*Department of Physics, Aberystwyth University, Penglais, Aberystwyth SY23 3BZ, UK*

<sup>6</sup>*Department of Computer Science, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield S1 4DP, UK*

<sup>7</sup>*CAS Key Laboratory of Geospace Environment, Department of Geophysics and Planetary Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

<sup>8</sup>*Department of Astronomy, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Pázmány P. sétány 1/A, H-1117, Hungary*

<sup>9</sup>*Gyula Bay Zoltán Solar Observatory (GSO), Hungarian Solar Physics Foundation (HSPF), Petőfi tér 3., Gyula, H-5700, Hungary*

\* *These authors contribute equally to this Matters Arising*

+ *Corresponding Author, email: robertus@sheffield.ac.uk*

Kim et al. 2019 [ref.<sup>1</sup>] (KPL19) proposed an artificial intelligence (AI) model to predict the photospheric magnetograms of the Sun using EUV observations as the only inputs, and concluded that “the model is reliable if the farside active regions conform to Hale’s law, as long as the slight overestimation of their total flux and a possible slight difference in their tilt angle are considered”. **In this Matters Arising, we present a detailed sensitivity study of the AI algorithm by KPL19.** Despite identifying issues in the inappropriate data preparation process and the possibility of data leakage in KPL19, we also found the physics basis of this idea is problematic. We detail our concerns and analysis below, as well as in the Supplementary Material.

Recently, a number of novel machine learning (ML) and/or AI techniques have been introduced to and used for a variety of purposes in the area of solar physics and space weather forecasting<sup>2</sup>. Using direct images or extracted features from photospheric magnetic field only or combined with solar EUV observations, a number of efforts have been made to predict the occurrence and/or onset time of solar flares employing statistical and/or ML methods<sup>3–9</sup>. In addition, employing algorithms including the support vector machines and convolutional neural networks, the mean absolute error in predicting the arrival time of Corona Mass Ejections (CMEs) has been remarkably reduced to as low as  $\sim 6$  hours<sup>10,11</sup>, yielding further kudos to using ML/AI in space

38 weather forecasting.

39 In order to study solar activity and predict space weather, KPL19 employed an AI tech-  
40 nique - conditional generative adversal networks (cGANs) - to predict the solar photospheric mag-  
41 netograms. They fed cGANs with full-disk EUV and photospheric magnetic field observations  
42 from the Atmospheric Imaging Assembly<sup>12</sup> (AIA) 304 Å passband and Helioseismic and Mag-  
43 netic Imager<sup>13</sup> (HMI) onboard the Solar Dynamics Observatory (SDO). A model was then built  
44 with the SDO/AIA 304 Å images as the input to generate simultaneous SDO/HMI photospheric  
45 magnetograms. KPL19 then evaluated the model and found promising correlation coefficients  
46 (CCs) between the total unsigned magnetic flux (TUMF) of the generated and observed magne-  
47 tograms. KPL19 claimed a conclusion that using their method, the photospheric magnetograms  
48 could be well forecasted to greatly improve our current knowledge of the farside active regions.  
49 However, there are several vital practical, as well as theoretical, issues in KPL19, detailed as below  
50 that to some extent mitigate the success of KPL19.

51 While pre-processing the SDO/HMI photospheric LOS magnetograms (Supplementary Data  
52 and Method) , KPL19 set the upper and lower saturation limits of the magnetic field strength as  
53  $\pm 100$  G. However, these limits are found to be problematic, especially for active regions, con-  
54 sidering one of the main purposes of KPL19 was to predict the farside active regions of the Sun.  
55 The average absolute magnetic field (AMF) strength of all 3936 active regions detected from the  
56 original observations in the testing set of the data has been found to be  $208 \pm 54$  G. Only 0.77%  
57 of all the active regions reveal an average AMF strength less than 100 G, among which only three  
58 active regions has an average AMF strength less than 90 G.

59 The slopes of black dots in Supplementary Figures 1(a) and (b) suggest that the rescaled  
60 magnetograms with saturation limits of  $\pm 100$  G give on average 0.45 and 0.67 of the original  
61 TUMF and net magnetic flux (NMF). In addition, the degree of the scattering of the dots yields  
62 the R2 scores (Supplementary Eq. 1) of -0.07 and 0.77, respectively. The percentage of instances  
63 where the rescaled magnetograms yield the opposite signs of the NMF to the original observations  
64 is about 19.4%. The above evaluation suggests, again, that the generated magnetograms could  
65 still be significantly different from the original observations even if the model were perfect, if  
66 saturation limits of  $\pm 100$  G are used when preparing the dataset. For a comparison, blue dots and  
67 lines in Supplementary Figures 1(a) and (b) show the corresponding results for saturation limits  
68 of  $\pm 625$  G. We note that setting inappropriate large saturation limits might also be problematic as  
69 that could introduce too much noise that might then severely impact the ability of the generative  
70 models to capture the prior distribution. Thus we encourage researchers to evaluate carefully  
71 before choosing the saturation limits for normalization purposes. In addition, KPL19 have used  
72 observations in September and October in each year as the testing set and the rest as the training  
73 set, risking a possibility of a data leakage considering that the Sun rotates at a period of  $\sim 27.3$   
74 days (see Supplementary Potential Data Leakage).

75 Despite the above practical issues, we foresee the model to be not successful based on the  
76 theoretical fact that EUV observations of the chromosphere and corona do not provide any infor-  
77 mation about the photospheric magnetic field polarities. We trained the neural network to build an  
78 optimistic AI model using the code provided by KPL19, fed with the same dataset preprocessed  
79 with the same parameter settings (Supplementary Data and Method). Figures 1 shows a compari-  
80 son of the observations (panel b) and the generated magnetograms by the model we built (panel c,  
81 first run), which could be directly compared with the one generated from the model KPL19 built  
82 (Figure 1 therein). Overall, the AI models could successfully identify the active regions presented  
83 in the original observation. However, the shape of the active regions and the distribution of the  
84 positive and negative polarities are poorly reconstructed (see the two active regions enclosed in the  
85 green rectangle and blue square boxes in panels b to c). Further, we ran the same procedure twice  
86 and built two new models (best models built at 128 and 212 epochs for the second and third runs  
87 respectively). The generated magnetogram from one of these two models (the second run) is shown  
88 in Figure 1 (d). Significant differences can be seen between the generated active regions in panels  
89 (c) and (d), which should not happen to a robust and reliable model. **We shall note that though we**  
90 **have used the same architecture, hyper-parameters and training data in all our three mod-**  
91 **els, they are different models and are exactly the same as that in KPL19, because they all**  
92 **have different trained parameters due to factors including different weight initialisation, the**  
93 **stochastic character of the optimizer and specificities of the loss hypersurface, etc. All the**  
94 **further analysis shown below and in the Supplementary Material is based on the first model**  
95 **we built.** Detailed evaluations of the correlation between the generated (from the first run) and  
96 rescaled (with saturation limits of  $\pm 100$  G) magnetograms (see Supplementary Full-disk Param-  
97 eters) yield that the proposed AI model is only successful in reproducing the TUMF of the global  
98 magnetic field, but fails in reconstructing the relative relations between the positive and negative  
99 polarities, suggested by the low pixel-to-pixel cross correlation and the low correlation between  
100 the NMFs. Integrating the TUMF information and area of the farside active regions into dedicated  
101 models together with the frontside magnetograms could in some cases improve the performance in  
102 predicting the in-situ solar wind speed<sup>14</sup>.

103 We employ an automated detection system<sup>15,16</sup> to automatically extract active regions and  
104 their parameters from the rescaled and the generated full-disk magnetograms. Supplementary  
105 Figure 2 depicts a direct comparison between the active regions detected from the rescaled and  
106 generated magnetograms at 00 UT on 28 September 2011 as an example. One can clearly observe  
107 significant differences between the sizes, shapes and polarity inversion lines (PILs) of the active  
108 regions in the northern hemisphere, especially in the two big active regions with one close to the  
109 disk center and the other on the right. In addition, there are missed active regions in the northern  
110 hemisphere and one extra active region in the southern hemisphere of the generated magnetogram  
111 compared to the rescaled one.

112 Statistical analysis (Supplementary Active Region Parameters and Supplementary Figure 3)  
113 reveals that, on average, the model only reproduces less than half of the active regions in each of  
114 the observations. The centres of the detected active regions in the AI-generated magnetograms are

115 on average  $\sim 1.3^\circ$  away in heliographic coordinates from the real ones. Detailed evaluations on a  
116 number of key parameters of the detected active regions (Supplementary Active Region Parameters  
117 and Supplementary Figure 4) suggest that the AI model performs fairly well in predicting the  
118 areas of the active regions, but poorly in reproducing the NMF of the active regions, and the total  
119 number, the length and the average magnetic gradient across PILs. **To conclude, our sensitivity  
120 study suggests that the AI model proposed by KPL19 shall be rather far from providing  
121 scientifically reliable magnetograms.**

Figure 1: **Example of the observations and the AI-generated magnetograms.** The four panels are the SDO/AIA 304 Å observation (a), the SDO/HMI photospheric magnetogram (b), **the AI-generated magnetogram of the Sun by two of our independent verification processes with (c) for the first run and (d) for the second run, respectively, at 12 UT on September 5 2017.**

## 122 Data Availability

123 SDO/AIA and SDO/HMI data are publicly available from NASA’s SDO website (<https://sdo.gsfc.nasa.gov/data/>). Information of the dataset we have used is available at [https://github.com/yiminking/pix2pix\\_EUV2HMI\\_datasets](https://github.com/yiminking/pix2pix_EUV2HMI_datasets).

## 126 Code Availability

127 Codes for the AI models built in this paper are accessible from Kim et al. 2019 (<https://github.com/tykimos/SolarMagGAN>). Codes used for the active region detection are available upon requests.

## 130 References

- 132 1. Kim, T. *et al.* Solar farside magnetograms from deep learning analysis of STEREO/EUVI  
133 data. *Nat. Astron.* **3**, 397–400 (2019).
- 134 2. Camporeale, E. The Challenge of Machine Learning in Space Weather: Nowcasting and  
135 Forecasting. *Space Weather* **17**, 1166–1207 (2019).
- 136 3. Wang, H. N., Cui, Y. M., Li, R., Zhang, L. Y. & Han, H. Solar flare forecasting model  
137 supported with artificial neural network techniques. *Adv. in Space Res.* **42**, 1464–1468 (2008).
- 138 4. Bobra, M. G. & Couvidat, S. Solar Flare Prediction Using Sdo /Hmi Vector Magnetic Field  
139 Data With a Machine-Learning Algorithm. *Astrophys. J.* **798**, 135–145 (2015).
- 140 5. Korsós, M. B., Ludmány, A., Erdélyi, R. & Baranyi, T. On Flare Predictability Based on  
141 Sunspot Group Evolution. *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **802**, L21–L26 (2015).

- 142 6. Nishizuka, N. *et al.* Solar Flare Prediction Model with Three Machine-learning Algorithms  
143 using Ultraviolet Brightening and Vector Magnetograms. *Astrophys. J.* **835**, 156–165 (2017).
- 144 7. Liu, C., Deng, N., Wang, J. T. L. & Wang, H. Predicting Solar Flares Using SDO/HMI  
145 Vector Magnetic Data Products and the Random Forest Algorithm. *Astrophys. J.* **843**, 104–  
146 117 (2017).
- 147 8. Florios, K. *et al.* Forecasting solar flares using magnetogram-based predictors and machine  
148 learning. *Sol. Phys.* **293**, 28–69 (2018).
- 149 9. Huang, X. *et al.* Deep Learning Based Solar Flare Forecasting Model . I . Results for Line-of-  
150 sight Magnetograms. *Astrophys. J.* **856**, 7–17 (2018).
- 151 10. Liu, J., Ye, Y., Shen, C., Wang, Y. & Erdélyi, R. A New Tool for CME Arrival Time Prediction  
152 using Machine Learning Algorithms: CAT-PUMA. *Astrophys. J.* **855**, 109–118 (2018).
- 153 11. Wang, Y., Liu, J., Jiang, Y. & Erdélyi, R. CME Arrival Time Prediction Using Convolutional  
154 Neural Network. *Astrophys. J.* **881**, 15–24 (2019).
- 155 12. Lemen, J. R. *et al.* The Atmospheric Imaging Assembly (AIA) on the Solar Dynamics Obser-  
156 vatory (SDO). *Sol. Phys.* **275**, 17–40 (2012).
- 157 13. Scherrer, P. *et al.* The Helioseismic and Magnetic Imager (HMI) Investigation for the Solar  
158 Dynamics Observatory (SDO). *Sol. Phys.* **275**, 207–227 (2012).
- 159 14. Arge, C. N. *et al.* Modeling the corona and solar wind using ADAPT maps that include far-  
160 side observations. In Zank, G. P. *et al.* (eds.) *Solar Wind 13*, vol. 1539 of *American Inst. of*  
161 *Phys. Conf. Ser.*, 11–14 (2013).
- 162 15. Wang, Y. & Zhang, J. A Statistical Study of Solar Active Regions That Produce Extremely  
163 Fast Coronal Mass Ejections. *Astrphys. J.* **680**, 1516–1522 (2008).
- 164 16. Zhang, J., Wang, Y. & Liu, Y. Statistical Properties of Solar Active Regions Obtained from  
165 an Automatic Detection System and the Computational Biases. *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **723**, 1006–  
166 1018 (2010).

## 167 **Acknowledgements**

168 We acknowledge the use of the data from the Solar Dynamics Observatory (SDO). SDO is the first  
169 mission for the NASA’s Living With a Star (LWS) program. JL and RE are grateful to STFC (UK,  
170 grant number ST/M000826/1) and EU H2020 (SOLARNET grant nr 158538). JL also acknowl-  
171 edges the support from STFC under grant No. ST/P000304/1 and from the Leverhulme Trust via  
172 grant RPG-2019-371. RE also acknowledges the support from the Chinese Academy of Sciences  
173 President’s International Fellowship Initiative (PIFI, grant number 2019VMA0052) and The Royal

174 Society (grant nr IE161153). Yimin Wang thanks for the warm hospitality and support received as  
175 an MSRC Visiting Research Fellow while carrying out this research at the Solar Physics and Space  
176 Plasma Research Centre (SP2RC), School of Mathematics and Statistics (SoMaS), The University  
177 of Sheffield. MBK is grateful to the STFC under grant No ST/S000518/1.

### 178 **Author Contributions**

179 JL conducted the data preparation, result analysis and drafted the manuscript. Yimin Wang per-  
180 formed the machine learning approach with the help of YJ. RE, XH and JL recognised the core  
181 problems. RE led the overall research. All authors joined the discussion and participated in the  
182 interpretation of the results. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

### 183 **Competing Interests**

184 The authors declare no competing interests.

### 185 **Additional Information**

186 **Supplementary information** is linked to the online version of this Matters Arising at  
187 <https://www.nature.com/natastron/>.

188 **Reprints and permissions information** is available at [www.nature.com/reprints](http://www.nature.com/reprints).

189 **Correspondence and requests for materials** should be addressed to R.E.