

Exoplanet Candidate Scoring and Target-Level Diagnostics: A Mathematical, Astrophysical, and Computational Description of `exo_analysis.py`

1 Goal and Setting

The program `exo_analysis.py` ingests three NASA Exoplanet Archive-style tables:

- TESS Objects of Interest (TOI),
- Kepler Objects of Interest (KOI),
- K2 planet candidates.

It trains a supervised/PU (positive-unlabeled) ensemble on any dataset that has labeled dispositions, produces calibrated probabilities $p \in [0, 1]$ that a target is a real exoplanet, and generates per-target diagnostic figures (feature standardization, local contributions, Monte-Carlo uncertainty, PCA neighborhood). It also exports dataset-level diagnostics (ROC/PR, reliability, PCA overview) and CSVs with predictions and reasoning.

Mathematically, the method maps raw astrophysical attributes $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to a calibrated score

$$p = \Pr(\text{planet} \mid \mathbf{x}),$$

together with uncertainty and explanation terms.

2 Astrophysical Feature Model

Let R_\star be the stellar radius (in R_\odot), T_{eff} the stellar effective temperature (K), P the orbital period (days), d the transit depth (ppm), D the transit duration (hr), b impact parameter, and a the semi-major axis.

Core derived features. The script builds dimensionless and scale-stable features:

$$\text{Depth fraction: } f_d = \frac{d}{10^6} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Radius ratio proxy: } \frac{R_p}{R_\star} \approx \sqrt{f_d} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Scaled semi-major axis: } \frac{a}{R_\star} \approx \left[\frac{GM_\star}{(2\pi/P)^2} \right]^{1/3} \frac{1}{R_\star} \propto \frac{P^{2/3}}{R_\star} M_\star^{1/3} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Duration aspect: } \alpha_R = \frac{D}{P} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{D}{P^{1/3}} \quad (\text{heuristics for transit geometry/SNR}) \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Insolation proxy: } S \propto \frac{R_\star^2 T_{\text{eff}}^4}{a^2} \quad (5)$$

$$\text{Equilibrium-}T \text{ proxy: } T_{\text{eq}} \approx \frac{T_{\text{eff}}}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\frac{R_\star}{a}} \quad (6)$$

When stellar mass M_\star is unknown, the code uses a weak power-law $M_\star \propto R_\star^\gamma$ (typical $\gamma \in [0.8, 1.2]$) or omits the exact dependency and treats $\frac{a}{R_\star}$ as a robust period-radius scaling feature.

Quality and magnitude features. SNR proxies (model.SNR, d/σ_d), band magnitudes (e.g. Vmag, Kmag, G), and flags (when available) are included as independent coordinates.

Robust standardization. For each feature x_j the standardized value is

$$z_j = \frac{x_j - \text{med}(x_j)}{\text{IQR}(x_j) + \epsilon},$$

with $\epsilon > 0$ to avoid division by zero. Median/IQR are robust to outliers and missingness patterns.

3 Labels and Learning Regimes

Let $y \in \{0, 1, \emptyset\}$ denote {false positive, confirmed/candidate, unlabeled}.

- **Supervised** (e.g. TOI): many $y \in \{0, 1\}$; unlabeled rows are ignored for fitting, used for scoring.
- **Positive-Only** (e.g. KOI when no FPs): the script falls back to a one-class style. Concretely, it:
 1. Fits a *stack* on positives vs. a large internal synthetic background (§4).
 2. Calibrates scores to \hat{p} with isotonic or Platt scaling using cross-validation within positives (treating folds as pseudo-negatives) and reliability constraints.
- **PU Bagging** (optional when some unlabeled exist): repeatedly sample pseudo-negatives from unlabeled, fit a base classifier, and average predicted posteriors:

$$\hat{p}_{\text{PU}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B f_b(\mathbf{x}), \quad (7)$$

with $B = O(10-50)$ depending on dataset size.

4 Stacked Classifier and Calibration

The stack comprises diverse base learners on standardized features \mathbf{z} :

$$\{f^{(m)}(\mathbf{z})\}_{m=1}^M$$

where m indexes models such as:

- Logistic Regression (LR) with class weights,
- Gradient Boosting (GB) / Histogram Gradient Boosting,
- Random Forest (RF),
- Support Vector Machine (SVM, RBF kernel; posterior via Platt scaling).

The level-2 combiner is a calibrated LR (or GB) on the out-of-fold base predictions:

$$s(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{m=1}^M w_m f^{(m)}(\mathbf{z}) + b, \quad \hat{p} = \sigma\left(\frac{s - \mu}{\sigma_s}\right)$$

with μ, σ_s from a held-out calibration set. The final probability uses either:

$$\text{Platt (sigmoid): } \hat{p} = \sigma(as + c), \quad (8)$$

$$\text{Isotonic: } \hat{p} = \text{Iso}(s), \quad (9)$$

choosing the variant with smaller Brier score on validation.

Reliability. Given K bins $\{B_k\}$ over $[0, 1]$, the expected calibration error (ECE) is

$$\text{ECE} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{|B_k|}{N} \left| \text{acc}(B_k) - \text{conf}(B_k) \right|.$$

Reliability plots and ECE are reported per dataset.

5 Uncertainty and Target Diagnostics

Predictive uncertainty. For a target with standardized vector \mathbf{z}_i :

1. **Entropy:** $H_i = -\hat{p}_i \log \hat{p}_i - (1 - \hat{p}_i) \log(1 - \hat{p}_i)$.
2. **Margin:** $m_i = \hat{p}_i - 0.5$.
3. **Monte-Carlo perturbation.** Perturb standardized features with independent noise $\eta_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_j^2)$ where $\sigma_j = \lambda \cdot \text{IQR}(z_j)$ with small λ (e.g. 0.05). The Monte-Carlo posterior $\{\hat{p}_i^{(r)}\}_{r=1}^R$ yields mean, st. dev., and empirical quantiles (5%, 95%).

Local contribution (linear surrogate). Around \mathbf{z}_i , fit a ridge surrogate $\tilde{s}(\mathbf{z}) = \beta_i^\top \mathbf{z} + c$ on k nearest neighbors in PCA space. The top- q contributors are the largest $|\beta_{i,j} z_{i,j}|$.

Counterfactual proxy. Solve a small ℓ_2 -regularized least-squares in $\Delta \mathbf{z}$ to reach a target probability τ using the surrogate:

$$\min_{\Delta \mathbf{z}} \|\Delta \mathbf{z}\|_2^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sigma(\beta_i^\top (\mathbf{z}_i + \Delta \mathbf{z}) + c) \geq \tau,$$

giving interpretable “how much to change” suggestions in standardized units.

6 Evaluation Metrics

For labeled sets, the script computes:

$$\text{ROC AUC: } \mathcal{A}_{\text{ROC}} = \int_0^1 \text{TPR}(\text{FPR}) d\text{FPR}, \quad (10)$$

$$\text{PR AUC: } \mathcal{A}_{\text{PR}} = \int_0^1 \text{Prec}(\text{Rec}) d\text{Rec}, \quad (11)$$

$$\text{Brier: } \mathcal{B} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{p}_i - y_i)^2, \quad (12)$$

$$\text{Youden } J \text{ for threshold } t: J(t) = \text{TPR}(t) + \text{TNR}(t) - 1. \quad (13)$$

Threshold tables include t maximizing F_1 , J , and balanced accuracy.

7 Handling Missing Data

Let x_{ij} be missing. The program applies:

1. Median imputation per feature: $\tilde{x}_{ij} \leftarrow \text{med}(x_j)$.
2. Missingness indicators $m_j = \mathbb{I}\{x_{ij} \text{ missing}\}$ can be included as auxiliary features.
3. Robust standardization uses med/IQR, which tolerates mild missingness.

Base models that accept NaNs natively (e.g. Histogram GB) are prioritized inside the stack for stability.

8 Computational Notes

Scaling. Let n be rows, d features, M base models, B PU bags. Major costs:

Histogram GB: $O(nd \log n)$, RF: $O(M_{\text{trees}} nd)$, SVM (RBF): $O(n^2 d)$ (mitigated by subsampling for large n).

The script parallelizes cross-validation folds per model and caches standardization statistics. Target-level MC uses $R \ll 10^3$ draws.

9 Outputs and Directories

For each dataset TOI/KOI/K2 under the chosen `--out`:

- `dataset_predictions.csv`: {designation, prob, label, entropy, margin, MC stats}.

- `top_candidates.csv`, `threshold_table.csv`, `perf.csv`.
- `fig/` : ROC, PR, reliability, PCA overview.
- `targets/DESIG/`: per-target PNG with standardized features, local contributions, MC histogram, PCA neighborhood, and a JSON (`analysis.json`) containing the machine-readable reasoning (top features, counterfactual deltas).
- `index.html`: links to all reports, with minimal dashboard tiles.

10 Scientific Interpretation Checklist

1. **Transit physics sanity**: high-probability targets should show consistent (P, D, f_d) with feasible a/R_\star , R_p/R_\star and T_{eq} relative to T_{eff} .
2. **Calibration**: $\text{ECE} < \text{few}\%$ on labeled data; reliability curve close to diagonal.
3. **Class balance**: avoid leakage by stratified CV; use class weights or PU bagging when negatives are sparse.
4. **Astrophysical priors**: the feature set encodes simple transit geometry and radiative scaling; extreme or inconsistent combinations are often down-weighted by the ensemble.

11 Minimal End-to-End Algorithm (Pseudo-code)

```

for  $D \in \{\text{TOI}, \text{KOI}, \text{K2}\}$  :
     $T \leftarrow \text{read\_csv}(D)$  with header cleanup and comment stripping
     $X \leftarrow \text{build\_features}(T)$ ;  $(Z, \text{med}, \text{IQR}) \leftarrow \text{robust\_z}(X)$ 
     $y \leftarrow \text{labels}(T)$ 
    if  $(\exists y \in \{0, 1\})$  :  $(f_{\text{stack}}, \text{cal}) \leftarrow \text{train\_stack}(Z, y)$ 
    else :  $f_{\text{stack}} \leftarrow \text{one\_class\_surrogate}(Z)$ 
     $\hat{p} \leftarrow \text{cal}(f_{\text{stack}}(Z))$ ; compute ROC/PR/Brier/ECE on labeled
    for target  $i$  : make local surrogate, MC uncertainty, counterfactuals
    export CSVs + figures + dashboard.

```

12 Limitations and Extensions

- The derived features use first-order transit and radiative scalings; full light-curve model fits (e.g. Mandel–Agol) are out of scope but could be integrated to refine R_p/R_\star , b , and SNR.
- KOI may be overwhelmingly positive; the positive-only calibration provides a *ranking* calibrated to internal reliability but cannot estimate absolute contamination without external negatives or priors.
- Future extension: semi-supervised consistency regularization, astrophysical priors via Bayesian calibration, and joint multi-survey domain adaptation.

13 Reproducibility

Command-line interface:

```
python exo_analysis.py --toi <toi.csv> --koi <koi.csv> --k2 <k2.csv> --out <out_dir>
# optional:
# --limit-targets N      # analyze first N targets per dataset
# --seed 7               # reproducible splits/MC
# --quiet                # terse logging
```