Accelerating HI density predictions during the Epoch of Reionization using a GPR-based emulator on N-body simulations

Gaurav Pundir,^{*a*,1} Aseem Paranjape,^{*b*} and Tirthankar Roy Choudhury^{*c*}

^aDepartment of Physics,

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Pune,

Dr. Homi Bhabha Road, Pashan, Pune 411008, India

^bInter-University Centre for Astronomy & Astrophysics,

Post Bag 4, Ganeshkhind, Pune 411007, India

^cNational Centre for Radio Astrophysics, TIFR,

Post Bag 3, Ganeshkhind, Pune 411007, India

E-mail: gaurav.pundir@students.iiserpune.ac.in, aseem@iucaa.in, tirth@ncra.tifr.res.in

Abstract. Building fast and accurate ways to model the distribution of neutral hydrogen during the Epoch of Reionization (EoR) is essential for interpreting upcoming 21 cm observations. A key component of semi-numerical models of reionization is the collapse fraction field $f_{\rm coll}(\mathbf{x})$, which represents the fraction of mass within dark matter halos at each location. Using high-dynamic range N-body simulations to obtain this is computationally prohibitive and semi-analytical approaches, while being fast, end up compromising on accuracy. In this work, we bridge the gap by developing a machine learning model that can generate $f_{\rm coll}$ maps by sampling from the full distribution of $f_{\rm coll}$ conditioned on the dark matter density contrast δ . The conditional distribution functions and the input density field to the model are taken from low-dynamic range N-body simulations that are more efficient to run. We evaluate the performance of our ML model by comparing its predictions to a high-dynamic range N-body simulation. Using these $f_{\rm coll}$ maps, we compute the HI and HII maps through a semi-numerical code for reionization. We are able to recover the large-scale HI density field power spectra ($k \lesssim 1 \ h \, {\rm Mpc}^{-1}$) at the $\lesssim 10\%$ level, while the HII density field is reproduced with errors well below 10% across all scales. Compared to existing semi-analytical prescriptions, our approach offers significantly improved accuracy in generating the collapse fraction field, providing a robust and efficient alternative for modeling reionization.

¹Corresponding author.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Simulations	3
3	 Methodology 3.1 Binning 3.2 Training using Gaussian Process Regression 3.3 Sampling 	4 4 5 5
4	Results4.1Fiducial $4.1.1$ f_{coll} results $4.1.2$ SCRIPT Results4.2Variation	6 6 6 7 10
5	Discussion	13
6	Conclusion	17
A	Convergence of Results	21
В	Optimization of Binning	22

1 Introduction

The Epoch of Reionization (EoR) marks an important period in the history of the universe when the first luminous objects ionized the neutral hydrogen (HI) in the intergalactic medium (IGM). Studying this era is crucial for understanding many astrophysical processes, including the emergence of the first stars and galaxies and the growth of cosmic structure (for recent reviews, see [1, 2]). The observational signatures of EoR are extremely faint because of the large distances involved and are also buried under much stronger astrophysical foregrounds. One of the most promising probes is the 21 cm brightness temperature fluctuation, which is a tracer of the HI density fluctuations during EoR [3–5]. This has been targeted by radio interferometers such as GMRT¹, MWA², PAPER³, LOFAR⁴ and will also be observed by the upcoming HERA⁵ Phase-II and SKA⁶.

In standard models of the EoR that assume galaxies to be the dominant contributors of ionizing photons, reionization proceeds via the formation of 'ionized bubbles' containing ionized hydrogen (HII). By modeling the distribution of these ionized bubbles, we can get the distribution of neutral hydrogen, which in turn provides information regarding fluctuations

¹https://www.gmrt.ncra.tifr.res.in/

²https://www.mwatelescope.org/

³http://eor.berkeley.edu/

⁴http://www.lofar.org/

⁵https://reionization.org/

⁶https://www.skao.int/en

in the 21 cm signal. The most accurate way to achieve this is to run radiative transfer simulations that take into account the detailed physical interactions between matter and the photons emitted by the sources [6–15]. However, these simulations must have a sufficiently large volume to achieve statistical convergence on the bubble distribution at large scales [16, 17]. Simultaneously, they need to resolve the smallest mass halos capable of forming the first galaxies (typically down to ~ $10^8 h^{-1} M_{\odot}$) due to their significant contribution to the ionizing photon budget. This 'high-dynamic range' requirement adds significantly to their computational cost and makes them highly inefficient to explore the parameter space of EoR models.

One gets around this problem by resorting to the much faster but approximate seminumerical models of reionization. These aim to predict the 'ionization field' – describing the fraction of hydrogen ionized at each location – by using the excursion-set approach [18] and a simple photon counting argument to define the barrier [19], thus bypassing the complicated radiative transfer physics [20–25]. The input to these models is the 'collapse fraction field' denoted by $f_{\rm coll}(\mathbf{x})$, which is equal to the fraction of dark matter mass within halos in the grid cell at \mathbf{x} . This can be prescribed semi-analytically from the conditional Press-Schechter (hereafter conditional PS) halo mass function [18, 26], conditioned on the dark matter density contrast $\delta(\mathbf{x})$ for each cell. One can also use the conditional Sheth-Tormen (hereafter conditional ST) mass function, which is based on the more general ellipsoidal collapse model [27, 28].

However, these analytical mass functions do not capture the full complexity of halo formation, are not universal and are only an approximate match to N-body simulation results [29–33]. Therefore, as the first step, one should transition away from the conditional PS and ST mass functions and use N-body simulations to calculate the conditional mass function empirically. However, these approaches only assign the mean $f_{\rm coll}$ conditioned on the density value of each cell $\langle f_{\rm coll} | \delta \rangle$, whereas in reality, the $f_{\rm coll}$ value can stochastically fluctuate across different cells with the same density value. Ignoring this 'scatter' or 'stochasticity' in the collapse fraction (which is primarily due to a dependence of $f_{\rm coll}$ on environmental variables other than the grid-scale δ) can lead to inaccurate recovery of the small-scale features in the HI and HII maps. Hence, as the next step, one should use the conditional cumulative distribution function of $f_{\rm coll}$ conditioned on the density contrast, ${\rm CDF}(f_{\rm coll}|\delta)$ to sample the $f_{\rm coll}$ field.

In either case, it is still important for the N-body simulations to have a high-dynamic range. This makes them computationally very expensive and thus one must explore alternatives to enable fast predictions of collapse fraction and subsequently the HI density fields. Attempts to resolve this issue have involved running low-resolution, large-volume simulations and using a high-resolution, small-volume simulation to populate the otherwise unresolved halos. This has been implemented in [16, 34], although while not taking into account the scatter in the halo numbers for a given overdensity. Poisson fluctuations in the halo number count around the mean value predicted by the analytical conditional mass functions have been incorporated in certain studies [35–37], but this has the limitation of only being valid for large enough cell sizes [38, 39]. An alternative approach is to identify matching cells in the small-volume, high-resolution simulation and use halos from these cells to populate the low-resolution box [40]. However, this method requires simultaneous access to both the largevolume and small-volume simulations during the construction of the effective high-dynamicrange box.

In this work, we aim to fully incorporate the effects of stochasticity in the collapse

fraction values, by directly using the full $\text{CDF}(f_{\text{coll}}|\delta)$ obtained from an N-body simulation for sampling the f_{coll} field. We still use a hybrid scheme of combining information from computationally inexpensive low-dynamic range boxes to mimic a high-dynamic range one, but do so using a machine learning algorithm based on Gaussian Process Regression (GPR). For the sake of comparison, we define this to be the *stochastic* case and also define the *deterministic* case in which f_{coll} predictions are made by simply assigning the conditional means $\langle f_{\text{coll}}|\delta \rangle$. We use the f_{coll} fields from both the cases as inputs to a semi-numerical code for reionization to obtain the HI and HII maps, and compare the results with those obtained from the f_{coll} field of a high-dynamic range simulation (ground truth). While we obtain the results for both the cases, the main focus of the paper and the machine learning model is the stochastic case. Therefore, this work aims to establish an ML framework for efficiently modeling fields relevant to EoR by bypassing the need to run a high dynamic range N-body simulation, while improving upon the accuracy of semi-analytical prescriptions.

The details of the simulations used are presented in section 2, followed by the ML methodology in section 3. We show the power spectra results for the HI and HII density fields during EoR obtained using both cases and compare them with the high-dynamic range simulation results in section 4. Additionally, we also compare the performance of the conditional PS and ST mass functions in predicting the $f_{\rm coll}$, HI and HII fields with the ML method. We discuss some features of our ML model in section 5 and conclude by summarizing the work and addressing the future directions in section 6. The appendices provide additional checks on some of the parameter choices made while building the ML model.

2 Simulations

Here, we describe the various N-body simulation boxes that are used for training, sampling, and benchmarking the ML model. All of these were run using the GADGET-2⁷ code [41], assuming a flat Λ CDM cosmology with $H_0 = 67.8 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$, $\Omega_m = 0.308$, $\Omega_b = 0.04$, $\sigma_8 = 0.829$, $n_s = 0.961$. On the simulation snapshots at the redshifts of interest, we compute the dark matter overdensity field $\delta(\mathbf{x})$ over a default grid size of $\Delta x = 0.5 h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, using a cloud-in-cell mass-assignment scheme. We then run the Friends-of-Friends (FoF) [42] halo finder on these snapshots (excluding the LB box) to get the discrete halo field. The collapse fraction field $f_{\text{coll}}(\mathbf{x})$ is defined as

$$f_{\rm coll}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sum_h m_h(\mathbf{x})}{M_{\rm tot}(\mathbf{x})},\tag{2.1}$$

where the summation runs over the mass of all the halos $m_h(\mathbf{x})$ contained in the cell at \mathbf{x} , and $M_{\text{tot}}(\mathbf{x})$ is the total dark matter mass in the same cell. This field is then computed over the same grid as the density field $\delta(\mathbf{x})$. For the default case, we use 10 as the minimum number of particles for identifying a halo, which corresponds to a minimum halo mass of $4.08 \times 10^8 \ h^{-1}M_{\odot}$ for both the SB and RB as defined below, since they have the same particle mass resolution.

• Small Boxes (SB): These have a volume of $V = 40 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc and contain $N = 512^3$ particles. 7 realizations of these are run with different seeds, and for each, the overdensity and collapse fraction fields are computed. These pairs of (δ, f_{coll}) found for each cell are then combined over all cells and over all 7 realizations to get a list of $80^3 \times 7 = 3584000$

⁷https://wwwmpa.mpa-garching.mpg.de/gadget/

 $(\delta, f_{\rm coll})$ pairs, from which the training data is constructed (refer subsection 3.1). Each realization of these simulations took ~ 210 CPU hours to run, consuming a maximum RAM of around 20 GB.

- Reference Box (RB): This box has a volume of $V = 80 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc and number of particles $N = 1024^3$. With both the volume and the number of particles 8 times greater than the SBs, it has the same particle mass resolution $(M_{p, \min})$ as them (since $M_{p, \min} \propto \frac{V}{N}$), and consequently the same minimum halo mass as well. This box is our 'ground truth' the goal of our emulator will be to recover the statistics of this high dynamic range box. This simulation took ~ 2900 CPU hours to run, consuming a maximum RAM of 160 GB.
- Large Box (LB): This box has a volume of $V = 80 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc and number of particles $N = 512^3$. Therefore, it has a coarser particle resolution than the SBs, but the same volume as the RB. This box is used solely to provide the density values to be input into the emulator and make the $f_{\rm coll}$ predictions to be compared with the ground truth RB, and hence we do not run a halo finder on it. This simulation took ~ 220 CPU hours to run, consuming a maximum RAM of around 20 GB. Note that the combination of SB and LB requires significantly lesser RAM (20 GB) as compared to running the RB (160 GB).

3 Methodology

From the SB simulation boxes outlined in section 2, we obtain the $(\delta, f_{\text{coll}})$ pairs for each cell. We can then bin the δ values from the SBs, and collect the f_{coll} values falling in each bin to either (a) compute their conditional mean $\langle f_{\text{coll}} | \delta \rangle$ or (b) construct the conditional cumulative distribution function $\text{CDF}(f_{\text{coll}} | \delta)$. Using (a) and (b) to make the f_{coll} predictions precisely corresponds to the deterministic and stochastic cases as defined at the end of section 1, respectively. The GPR training as described in the next subsections is required only for the stochastic case.

3.1 Binning

The goal is to use the emulated CDF to directly sample an f_{coll} value, if a new δ value is given as the input. This amounts to the assumption that the spatial distribution of collapse fractions is primarily dictated by the local overdensity, and the cumulative effect of other environmental factors is modeled by random sampling from the conditional CDFs.

The binning of the overdensity values is made trickier by their highly skewed distribution since extremely low and high values are quite rare. If a uniform binning scheme is adopted, to accurately capture the variation of the conditional CDF between two intermediate δ values, the bin width must be made sufficiently small. This causes too few $f_{\rm coll}$ values to be found in higher δ bins, leading to a very noisy CDF. Thus, to strike a balance between noise and systematic error, we adopt a variable binning scheme, where the bin width is set to a reference value at $\delta = 0$, and it increases along either direction. The bins are defined in $\log(1 + \delta)$, and usually have a reference value of around 0.03 dex at $\delta = 0$. The other parameter that we must decide in the training data is the number of bins in $f_{\rm coll}$ used to make the CDFs for a fixed δ bin. This, along with the δ bin widths at the two extremes are optimized for each case that we present separately. The optimal extreme bin widths are around ~ 0.05 dex and ~ 0.2 dex, while the optimal number of $f_{\rm coll}$ bins is either 500 or 900, depending on the case. We refer the reader to Appendix B, where we study the effect of using a fixed binning scheme (optimized for the default z = 7 case) directly on the other cases.

3.2 Training using Gaussian Process Regression

We employ the Gaussian Process Regression (GPR) technique to construct our interpolator function. This is a non-parametric method that approximates the collection of the target function values \mathbf{y} as a *Gaussian Process* over the inputs \mathbf{x} , specified by a mean function, $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ and a covariance function, $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ (for more details on GPR, the reader may refer to [43]). The mean function is usually taken to be $\mathbf{0}$ in the prior after appropriate normalization of the data. In our case, we use the anisotropic Matérn kernel with $\nu = 2.5$ as the covariance function. Training the GPR model then entails learning the values of the *hyperparameters* associated with the Matérn kernel.

This optimization is carried out using an anisotropic simulated annealing (ASA) procedure, following [44]. This method has been used and validated in other studies of reionization [45, 46] and we briefly outline the details for completeness. Firstly, the data is divided into two parts - one for training and another for validation. Once the training data is specified, the ASA procedure involves evaluating the log marginal likelihood using algorithm 2.1 of [43] over a region with sparsely distributed values in hyperparameter space, which is then iteratively refined to zoom-in on the region of hyper-likelihood maximum (or equivalently, the cost function minimum).

The hyperparameter vector **h** that minimizes the cost function is then used to make predictions on the validation data, again following algorithm 2.1 of [43] as implemented in Scikit-Learn⁸. A convergence criterion is defined by requiring the magnitude of the 1st and 99th percentiles of $\hat{\alpha} - \alpha$ to be less than a threshold set by the user, called **cv_thresh** (here $\hat{\alpha}$ is the predicted value of the function and α is the true value at the same input). If the convergence criterion is not satisfied, the entire process repeats with a training data larger in size by 10%, and this cycle continues until the maximum number of iterations or $\geq 80\%$ of the full data is used for training. **cv_thresh** is usually taken to be around 0.015 in our case.

Once the training is complete, we have a properly trained interpolator function at our disposal, that can be used to sample the values of the function $\hat{\alpha}$ at any desired input. We use the GPR training to emulate the $\text{CDF}(f_{\text{coll}}|\delta)$ as obtained in the previous subsection, viewed as a function of f_{coll} and δ , thereby setting α = the CDF value. For most cases, the training ends within ~ 10 minutes on 4 CPU cores and uses around 10-15% of the full data for training.

3.3 Sampling

Our idea is to be able to recover the $f_{\rm coll}$ field of RB by a combination of information from SB and LB. We have used SB for obtaining the conditional means and the conditional CDFs to train the GPR, and we now use the δ values from the LB as the corresponding input to make the $f_{\rm coll}$ predictions.

For a given input δ_0 from the LB, we return (a) the conditional mean $\langle f_{\text{coll}} | \delta_m \rangle$ for the stochastic case and (b) an f_{coll} value randomly drawn from the emulated $\widehat{\text{CDF}}(f_{\text{coll}} | \delta_m)$ for the deterministic case, where δ_m is the middle value of the bin that contains δ_0 . We can see that the latter method naturally accounts for scatter in the f_{coll} predictions for a fixed δ while

⁸https://scikit-learn.org/

the former does not. This sampling is done on a cell-by-cell basis, to produce a prediction of f_{coll} for each cell based on its δ value in LB.

In certain cases of δ , such as the rightmost curve shown in Figure 1a, the predicted CDF is non-monotonic. Such features arise only in very high δ that are also very rare. For the purpose of sampling in such cases, we return the smallest value of $f_{\rm coll}$ for which the predicted CDF becomes equal to the random number uniformly sampled between 0 and 1.

4 Results

In this section, we benchmark the various $f_{\rm coll}$ predictions against the ground truth taken from the RB. Our primary interest lies in modeling the neutral hydrogen density field during the Epoch of Reionization (EoR), and we obtain this from the collapse fraction field by using Seminumerical Code for ReIonization with PhoTon-conservation (SCRIPT)⁹ [25]. The section is divided into two parts - Fiducial, where we discuss the $f_{\rm coll}$ and SCRIPT results corresponding to the fiducial choice of parameters and Variation, where we compare the SCRIPT results for the semi-analytical methods and extend them to variations in the parameters.

4.1 Fiducial

4.1.1 f_{coll} results



Figure 1: (a) Comparison between the true CDF from the training data and the interpolator's prediction, shown at 10 different Δ values. The relative error occasionally blows up due to the small values of the CDFs, (b) Comparison of the joint distribution of $f_{\rm coll}$ and Δ . The 10, 40, 70 and 95 percentile contours are shown and the blue region demarcates the $f_{\rm coll}$ less than the first bin edge defined during the $f_{\rm coll}$ binning. The conditional means calculated in the deterministic case for each delta bin are also shown using black horizontal lines.

We consider our fiducial case to have redshift z = 7, grid size $\Delta x = 0.5 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc , and minimum halo mass $M_{h,\min} = 4.08 \times 10^8 \ h^{-1} M_{\odot}$ (corresponding to 10 particles per halo for the SB and RB). Henceforth, we shall use the notation $\Delta \equiv 1 + \delta$. We first look at the results of GPR training, by comparing the emulated and training CDFs as a function of f_{coll}

⁹https://bitbucket.org/rctirthankar/script

conditioned on 10 different Δ values, as shown in Figure 1a. It can be seen that both the training and prediction CDF become noisy at very high Δ , due to a smaller number of f_{coll} values.

The recovery of the joint distribution of non-zero $f_{\rm coll}$ values and their corresponding Δ is shown in Figure 1b. While the contours are very similar between truth and prediction at intermediate to high $f_{\rm coll}$ and Δ , the very low $f_{\rm coll}$ values are not recovered as well. We understand this to be a limitation of the way we set up the training data for the GPR, where the smallest value of the training CDF that is fed into the GPR is $CDF(f_{coll} = 0.002)$. The region below $f_{\rm coll} = 0.002$ is shaded in blue. The interpolator ends up overestimating the CDF at $f_{\rm coll}$ below this threshold and that leads to an oversampling of $f_{\rm coll} = 0$ values, and consequently an undersampling of very low $f_{\rm coll} \lesssim 10^{-3}$. Attempting to fix this problem by incorporating $\text{CDF}(f_{\text{coll}} = 0)$ during the training does not provide any significant improvement over our current choice for the joint distribution or the rest of our results. In Figure 1b, we have also shown the $\langle f_{\rm coll} | \delta \rangle$ values for various δ bins using short horizontal black lines. The variable length of the horizontal line reflects the variable bin widths in δ . We distinguish between the collapse fraction $f_{\rm coll}$ computed from equation 2.1 (constrained to be between 0 and 1) and the mass-averaged collapse fraction $f_{\text{coll}}^M(\mathbf{x}) \equiv f_{\text{coll}}(\mathbf{x})(1 + \delta(\mathbf{x}))$, where as usual, for the predicted (true) f_{coll}^M the δ is taken to be from the LB (RB). We use the following expressions to compute the auto power spectrum of a field $g(\mathbf{x})$, denoted by $P_q(k)$, and its cross power spectrum with another field $h(\mathbf{x})$, denoted by $P_{qh}(k)$:

$$\frac{\langle g(\mathbf{k})g^*(\mathbf{k}')\rangle}{\bar{g}^2} = (2\pi)^3 P_g(k)\delta_D(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'), \qquad (4.1)$$

$$\frac{\langle g(\mathbf{k})h^*(\mathbf{k}')\rangle}{\bar{g}\bar{h}} = (2\pi)^3 P_{gh}(k)\delta_D(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'), \qquad (4.2)$$

where $g(\mathbf{k})$ and \bar{g} are, respectively, the Fourier conjugate and mean of $g(\mathbf{x})$, an asterisk denotes complex conjugation and the angular brackets represent an average over Fourier space such that $|\mathbf{k}| = k$.

We compute the auto and cross power spectra by setting $g = f_{\text{coll}}^M$ and $h = \Delta$ respectively in the above, for both the deterministic and stochastic cases, and compare them with the truth in Figure 2. The agreement between the auto power spectra is within 5% for $k \leq 2$ $h \,\text{Mpc}^{-1}$, and at the smallest scales stays within 10% for the stochastic case whereas for the deterministic case it worsens to slightly below -10%. The cross-power spectrum is recovered better as expected, with sub-2% errors for most of the k range and only becoming $\sim 5\%$ at the smallest scales. We can see that the level of agreement is very similar between the stochastic and deterministic cases.

If we take a closer look at Figure 2a, the error in the large-scale power is mostly constant for $k \leq 0.7 \ h \,\mathrm{Mpc^{-1}}$. Moreover, this error arises predominantly due to the error in the mean of $f_{\rm coll}^M$ between the truth and predictions. This implies a good agreement (< 1%) at largescales between the un-normalized power spectra, computed by dropping the \bar{g}^2 in the auto power as defined in equation 4.1. We address this issue in section 5.

4.1.2 SCRIPT Results

As mentioned earlier, we use SCRIPT to model the HI and HII fields relevant to EoR. The code requires $f_{\text{coll}}(\mathbf{x})$ at the desired redshift as the primary input to produce an ionization (HII) fraction field $x_{\text{HII}}(\mathbf{x})$, which can then be used to get an HI fraction field, $x_{\text{HII}}(\mathbf{x}) = 1 - x_{\text{HII}}(\mathbf{x})$.



Figure 2: Comparison of (a) f_{coll}^M - f_{coll}^M auto and (b) f_{coll}^M - Δ cross power spectra, between truth and predictions using the deterministic and stochastic cases.

Upon mass-averaging these, we get the HII and HI density fields upto normalization:

$$x_{\rm HI}^M(\mathbf{x}) = x_{\rm HI}(\mathbf{x})(1+\delta(\mathbf{x})) \propto \rho_{\rm HI}(\mathbf{x}); \qquad (4.3)$$

$$x_{\rm HII}^M(\mathbf{x}) = x_{\rm HII}(\mathbf{x})(1+\delta(\mathbf{x})) \propto \rho_{\rm HII}(\mathbf{x}).$$
(4.4)

We use the stochastic, deterministic and true collapse fraction fields as the input to SCRIPT and generate the HI and HII maps. Along with the $f_{\rm coll}$ field, we also need to provide the reionization efficiency parameter ζ to generate the maps, and we calibrate this for all the three cases separately such that the global ionization fraction, $Q_{\rm HII}^M \equiv \langle x_{\rm HII}^M(\mathbf{x}) \rangle$ is 0.5 (this is our fiducial setting). A comparison of the HI density field $x_{\rm HI}^M(\mathbf{x})$, at a slice through $z = 50 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc is then shown in Figure 3. We also compute statistics such as the auto and cross (with Δ) power spectra of the HII and HI density fields, computed as given in equation 4.1. The comparison between the deterministic, stochastic and true cases for the fiducial $Q_{\rm HII}^M = 0.5$ can be seen in Figure 4.

For the HI auto power spectrum, it is clear that the error in the recovery of large-scale power ($k \leq 1 \ h \,\mathrm{Mpc^{-1}}$) is similar between the deterministic and stochastic cases, with both being around 10% in magnitude. Interestingly, at the smallest scales, the deterministic case underestimates the power with a large error of around 35 - 40% whereas the stochastic case has a better agreement of around 20 - 25%. For the HII auto power, the recovery is more consistent between the two cases, being well within 10% for the entire k range. This highlights the crucial role played by stochasticity in correctly predicting specifically the HI map during reionization, and we discuss this further in section 5.



Figure 3: The neutral HI density field at $Q_{\text{HII}}^M = 0.5$ in the ground truth *(top panel)*, as recovered by our ML interpolator (stochastic, *middle panel*), and as recovered using the conditional means (deterministic, *bottom panel*) at a slice through $z = 50 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc. The black regions are the ionized bubbles. We elaborate on the zoomed-in regions in section 5.



Figure 4: HI-HI (*left*), HII-HII (*right*) power spectra for truth and predictions using the stochastic and deterministic cases ($Q_{\text{HII}}^M = 0.5$)

4.2 Variation

The conditional PS [18, 26] and ST [27, 28] mass functions can only be used to get the $f_{\rm coll}$ field at a resolution of $\Delta x \geq 1 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc, and any finer resolution causes the $f_{\rm coll}$ values to turn out negative. This is because tidal effects become important at such small scales and hence using the spherical collapse model to obtain the mapping between the non-linear and linear density fields is inaccurate (refer to equation A6 of [25]). This leads to the derivative terms in equation A4 of [25] becoming negative, ultimately leading to a negative $f_{\rm coll}$.

Therefore, in order to enable a full comparison, we need to run the stochastic and deterministic methods at a resolution of $\Delta x = 1 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc, which is different from the fiducial. Keeping the other parameters $(Q_{\text{HII}}^M, z, M_{h,\min})$ fixed, we vary Δx to $1 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc and rerun our model. To get the conditional PS and ST results, we use the density field from the LB as the input. The resulting f_{coll}^M power spectra comparison is shown in Figure 5.

We can clearly observe that both the methods that use the simulations to generate $f_{\rm coll}$ values (stochastic and deterministic) perform better in recovering the power than the semianalytical prescriptions, except at very small scales. Proceeding to the HI and HII density fields and computing their power spectra, we compare the results in Figure 6. At least for the HI density field, the power at the largest and the smallest scales has a significantly greater error as compared to the stochastic case. This improved recovery of the HI power adds to the pre-existing advantage of our method of being able to generate maps at resolutions finer than $\Delta x = 1 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc.

We now settle on the stochastic case and investigate the robustness of the method, in particular the SCRIPT results, against a variation of the involved parameters. Hereafter, the 'Predicted' label on the plots refers to the stochastic case. We start by changing the global ionization fraction $Q_{\rm HII}^M$ to 0.25 and 0.75 from the fiducial 0.5, keeping everything else the same. Figure 7 shows the results for the auto and cross power spectra of the HI and HII density fields.

As seen before, the large-scale HI auto power is recovered at the ~ 10% level for the $Q_{\rm HII}^M = 0.5$ case, down to $k \sim 1.5 \ h \,{\rm Mpc}^{-1}$. The $Q_{\rm HII}^M = 0.75$ case is even better, with a 5%



Figure 5: Comparison of (a) f_{coll}^M - f_{coll}^M auto and (b) f_{coll}^M - Δ cross power spectra, between truth, stochastic, deterministic and the semi-analytical predictions



Figure 6: Comparison of HI-HI *(left)*, HII-HII *(right)* power spectra between truth, stochastic, deterministic and the semi-analytical predictions at $Q_{\text{HII}}^M = 0.5$

error over a similar k range. The HI cross power is also similar, with sub-5% errors initially that increase to around 10% by $k \sim 1.5 \ h \,\mathrm{Mpc^{-1}}$. The ionization field auto and cross are recovered much better, with at least a fidelity of $\sim 5\%$ down to $k \sim 2 \ h \,\mathrm{Mpc^{-1}}$, regardless of the Q_{HII}^{M} value. We see relatively larger errors in the $Q_{\mathrm{HII}}^{M} = 0.25$ case and at small scales $(k \gtrsim 2 \ h \,\mathrm{Mpc^{-1}})$ even for other ionized fraction, at least in the HI results. The relatively greater disagreement for $Q_{\mathrm{HII}}^{M} = 0.25$ at large-scales is related to the behaviour of the large-scale HI bias (defined below) in the truth at ionization fractions close to 0.25, and is described in section 5.

We then proceed to calculate the HI (HII) bias denoted by $b_{\rm HI}$ ($b_{\rm HII}$) and given by the

expressions

$$b_{\rm HI}^2(k) = \frac{P_{\rm HI}(k)}{P_m(k)}; \qquad b_{\rm HII}^2(k) = \frac{P_{\rm HII}(k)}{P_m(k)},$$
(4.5)

where $P_{\rm HI}(k)$ ($P_{\rm HII}(k)$) is the HI (HII) auto power spectrum and $P_m(k)$ is the matter power spectrum, both computed using equation 4.1. We compute the HI and HII bias only at three different low k values, and study their variation as a function of the global ionized fraction $Q_{\rm HII}^M$ in Figure 8. In the HII bias plot, we have also plotted the $f_{\rm coll}$ bias (which is independent of $Q_{\rm HII}^M$ by construction). One can observe the HII bias to be clearly approaching the $f_{\rm coll}$ bias, at sufficiently low $Q_{\rm HII}^M$ [25]. We can also see that for higher k, the deviation from the $f_{\rm coll}$ bias happens for a lower value of $Q_{\rm HII}^M$.



Figure 7: HI-HI (top left), HII-HII (top right), HI-(1 + δ) (bottom left), HII-(1 + δ) (bottom right) power spectra for truth and prediction (always stochastic hereafter), for different values of the global ionization fraction $Q_{\text{HII}}^M = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75$.

Next, we vary the redshift to two other values z = 5 and z = 9, and the effects on the HI and HII power spectra are captured in Figure 9. For the HI field, the agreement remains within around 10%, at least up to $k \sim 1 h \,\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$. The HII results are a lot better with the errors not exceeding 5% for almost the entire k range. The grid size is similarly varied from



Figure 8: Comparison between truth and prediction of (a) HI bias, (b) HII bias evaluated for three different low k values as a function of the ionized fraction. In the right panel, the three sets of gray horizontal lines represent the f_{coll} bias for each of the three k values.

the fiducial value of $\Delta x = 0.5 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc to two other values, $\Delta x = 0.25 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc and $\Delta x = 1 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc , with the results shown in Figure 10.

The $\Delta x = 0.25$ case suffers larger errors for the HI power spectra, but the other two cases have similar $\leq 10\%$ agreements at large scales below $k = 1 h \,\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$. However, achieving results corresponding to $\Delta x = 0.25 h^{-1}\mathrm{Mpc}$ is simply not possible using the conditional PS and ST prescriptions without resorting to ad hoc assumptions, such as setting negative $f_{\rm coll}$ values to zero. Our interpolator enables this and represents a significant improvement over the current state of the art. The HII results are again a lot more robust, always performing better than 10% across all k. Finally, the results upon varying $M_{h,\min}$ from $4.08 \times 10^8 h^{-1} M_{\odot}$ to $1.63 \times 10^9 h^{-1} M_{\odot}$ and $3.26 \times 10^9 h^{-1} M_{\odot}$ are shown in Figure 11. We see $\sim 12\%$ error at the largest scales in the HI results, that falls and stays within 10% till $k \sim 1 h \,\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$, and the HII power spectra remain within 7-8% for almost the entire k range.

5 Discussion

Our interpolator draws $f_{\rm coll}$ values for cells taking only their density information into account. This means that the correlation between sampled $f_{\rm coll}$ values across different cells is controlled purely by the correlation between the density values conditioning the CDFs from which these $f_{\rm coll}$ values are sampled. We expect other environmental factors to play a role in the true $f_{\rm coll}$ correlation as well, but these effects are randomized across all cells by our interpolator via picking a uniform random number between 0 and 1 for inverse CDF sampling. A comparison of the recovery of $f_{\rm coll}$ features by our interpolator at different scales, then, is a way of testing the sensitivity of halo formation on the cosmological environment at these scales.

As it turns out, conditioning the $f_{\rm coll}$ CDFs on the density field allows a reasonable recovery of the large-scale structure of the $f_{\rm coll}$ field and consequently, the HI density map. This can be confirmed visually from the full maps in the left part of Figure 3 and quantitatively through the power spectra at low k in Figure 2 for the $f_{\rm coll}$ field and Figure 4 for the HI and



Figure 9: HI-HI (*left panel*), HII-HII (*right panel*) power spectra for truth and prediction, for three different values of redshift at fixed ionization fraction $Q_{\text{HII}}^M = 0.5$.



Figure 10: HI-HI (*left panel*) and HII-HII (*right panel*) power spectra for truth and prediction, for three different values of grid size Δx at fixed ionization fraction $Q_{\text{HII}}^M = 0.5$. Each case has been plotted up to its Nyquist frequency.

HII density fields. Moreover, this large-scale recovery is very similar between the stochastic and deterministic cases, with the latter being marginally better. Therefore, the stochastic variations in the $f_{\rm coll}$ field for a fixed matter density δ , which are precisely due to the effect of other environment variables, do not affect the large-scale distribution of collapse fractions and hence the ionization bubbles within our tolerance.

As one would expect, these environmental factors become more important in dictating the small-scale power of the $f_{\rm coll}$ or HI density fields. This is clearly visible in the HI density maps in Figure 3 if we focus on small-scale features. The deterministic case completely ignores stochastic fluctuations in the $f_{\rm coll}$ field and ends up producing a relatively smooth HI density field outside the ionization bubbles. The true case accounts for the effect of stochasticity in the correct way, increasing fluctuations in the field but doing so in a way consistent with the



Figure 11: HI-HI (*left panel*) and HII-HII (*right panel*) power spectra for truth and prediction, for three different values of minimum halo mass $M_{h,\min}$ at fixed ionization fraction $Q_{\text{HII}}^M = 0.5$ and grid size $\Delta x = 0.5 \ h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$.

full information contained in the environment. The stochastic case achieves a middle ground by accounting for stochasticity in the 'wrong' manner (by randomizing the effect of factors other than the grid-scale density). This randomization procedure used in the sampling causes nearby $f_{\rm coll}$ values to be less correlated, randomly causing some unusually high or low $f_{\rm coll}$ values to get sampled. The high $f_{\rm coll}$ values then are able to cross the excursion-set barrier and the corresponding cells get flagged as ionized. This leads to a greater number of scattered and uncorrelated tiny ionized bubbles (as evident from the zoomed-in plots in Figure 3) that end up decreasing the small-scale HI power in the stochastic case as compared to truth (Figure 4). On the other hand, ignoring stochasticity turns out to be detrimental to the small-scale HI power of the deterministic case, leading to much larger errors. This shows that while our middle ground is far from the truth, it is still better at recovering the small-scale HI power than the deterministic case.

It is then also interesting to note the behaviour of the ionized field. Not only do the stochastic and deterministic cases recover the HII power spectra almost equally well (right panel of Figure 4), the errors are significantly lesser as compared to the HI power spectra (compare left and right panels of Figure 7). This can be understood if we look at the HII density map in Figure 12. The spurious tiny ionized bubbles are present here as well, but the difference is that the dominant contribution to power at all scales comes from the much stronger density field fluctuations present inside the ionized regions (note that these regions trace the density field since the ionized fraction $x_{\text{HII}}(\mathbf{x})$ there is identically 1). In the case of the HI density field, these regions were masked out and the power spectrum contained complementary information regarding the distribution of less prominent ionized bubbles. These tiny, spurious ionized bubbles are random fluctuations that contribute in tandem to decreasing the power at small scales, but average out when large scales are considered, thereby not contributing much to the large-scale power.

This is apparent from Figure 2a, where the large-scale power of the f_{coll}^M field has a constant offset at around 5%. If we plot the un-normalized predicted f_{coll}^M auto power spectrum (that is, without dividing by \bar{g}^2 in equation 4.1) then it matches the truth to within



Figure 12: The ionized HII density field at $Q_{\text{HII}}^M = 0.5$ in the ground truth *(left)*, as recovered by the stochastic *(middle)* and deterministic *(right)* case at a slice through $z = 50 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc. The black regions contain neutral hydrogen.

1%. Therefore, the observed ~ 5% at large scales is mostly due to the error in the global $f_{\rm coll}^M$ mean (squared) made by the interpolator. Since we do not accurately take into account the effect of the environment, the sampled $f_{\rm coll}$ values in nearby cells are incorrectly correlated with each other. This 'mistake' in the $f_{\rm coll}$ sampling, combined with the minor errors in the CDF emulation, implies that the global mass-averaged means of $f_{\rm coll}$ are not constrained to match between truth and prediction, which subsequently leads to the large-scale offset in the properly normalized $f_{\rm coll}^M$ auto power.

The relatively large deviation arising in the HI power at the large scales in Figure 7 can be understood in the following manner. For the HI (HII) field, we are actually plotting the power spectrum of $\Delta_{\text{HI}}(\mathbf{x})$ ($\Delta_{\text{HII}}(\mathbf{x})$) given by

$$\Delta_{\rm HI}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{x_{\rm HI}^M(\mathbf{x})}{1 - Q_{\rm HII}^M}; \qquad \Delta_{\rm HII}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{x_{\rm HII}^M(\mathbf{x})}{Q_{\rm HII}^M}, \qquad (5.1)$$

and these can be related in the following manner:

$$\Delta_{\rm HI}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{x_{\rm HI}^M(\mathbf{x})}{1 - Q_{\rm HII}^M} \tag{5.2}$$

$$=\frac{x_{\rm HI}(\mathbf{x})(1+\delta(\mathbf{x}))}{1-Q_{\rm HII}^M}$$
(5.3)

$$=\frac{1+\delta(\mathbf{x})-x_{\rm HII}^M(\mathbf{x})}{1-Q_{\rm HII}^M}$$
(5.4)

$$=\frac{1+\delta(\mathbf{x})-Q_{\rm HII}^M\Delta_{\rm HII}(\mathbf{x})}{1-Q_{\rm HII}^M}\,.$$
(5.5)

Following the discussion in Appendix B of [25], if we assume the bias to be scale-free at large scales during the early stages of reionization, we can relate the HI and HII bias as

$$b_{\rm HI} = \frac{1 - Q_{\rm HII}^M b_{\rm HII}}{1 - Q_{\rm HII}^M} \,. \tag{5.6}$$

Recall that the square of the bias is simply the power spectrum of the relevant field normalized by the matter power spectrum (equation 4.5), and since the matter power spectrum at large scales is identical between LB and RB, the power spectra error is directly proportional to the bias error. We can write this at fixed Q_{HII}^M as

$$\frac{(b_{\rm HI})_{\rm predicted}}{(b_{\rm HI})_{\rm true}} = \frac{1 - Q_{\rm HII}^M(b_{\rm HII})_{\rm predicted}}{1 - Q_{\rm HII}^M(b_{\rm HII})_{\rm true}}.$$
(5.7)

From Figure 8b, we can read off the value of $(b_{\rm HII}^2)_{\rm true}$ for the smallest k to be around 13.5. This implies $(b_{\rm HII})_{\rm true} \approx 3.7$ and so the denominator in the relative error expression above will blow up around $Q_{\rm HII}^M \approx 1/3.7 \approx 0.27$. Thus, the value of $Q_{\rm HII}^M = 0.25$ for which we plot the power spectra in Figure 7 is also expected to show a large error. The same calculation is confirmed from Figure 8a as well, where both the true and predicted HI biases become numerically very small, causing the errors to blow up.

6 Conclusion

The advent of more advanced radio interferometer experiments such as the SKA will provide more precise bounds on the 21 cm power spectra, and hence the HI density distribution from the Epoch of Reionization (EoR). This makes the forward modeling of HI maps during EoR crucial for testing our understanding of the epoch. Efficient methods to do this require the distribution of the fraction of mass in dark matter halos (collapse fraction field) to be input into excursion-set based semi-numerical models of reionization [20–25]. Obtaining the collapse fraction field using the semi-analytical formalism of the conditional Press-Schechter [18, 26] and conditional Sheth-Tormen [27, 28] mass functions, while efficient, is an approximation to more accurate results obtained from high-dynamic range N-body simulations [29–33]. The latter are extremely inefficient for parameter estimation due to their high computational cost.

While there have been attempts to make the prediction of the collapse fraction field more efficient by using hybrid approaches that combine information from low-dynamic range boxes [16, 34–37], they have not taken into account the full stochasticity in $f_{\rm coll}$ for a fixed dark matter density contrast δ , as predicted by N-body simulations. In this work, we build a machine learning model to accurately predict $f_{\rm coll}(\mathbf{x})$ using a hybrid approach while taking into account the full stochasticity. We use the conditional cumulative distribution functions $\text{CDF}(f_{\rm coll}|\delta)$ obtained from a set of 7 small-volume, high-resolution simulations (SB) to train the ML model using a methodology based on Gaussian Process Regression (GPR). The density input from a large-volume, low-resolution simulation (LB) is then used to randomly draw samples of $f_{\rm coll}$ values from the emulated CDFs for each cell. This constitutes our *stochastic* case, and we also obtain $f_{\rm coll}(\mathbf{x})$ corresponding to the *deterministic* case, which excludes stochasticity by simply using the conditional means $\langle f_{\rm coll}|\delta \rangle$ computed from the SB.

Upon comparing the auto power spectra of the mass-averaged $f_{\rm coll}(\mathbf{x})$ and its cross with $\Delta \equiv 1 + \delta$ for our fiducial choice of the parameters $z, \Delta x, M_{h,\min}$, we find similar levels of agreement between the stochastic and deterministic cases (Figure 2). We then compute the HI and HII density fields using the semi-numerical code for reionization SCRIPT. While the recovery is similar at large scales, the deterministic case performs much worse at smaller scales for the HI density field (Figure 4). We then increase the grid size to $\Delta x = 1 h^{-1}$ Mpc to enable a more complete comparison between the simulation-based deterministic and stochastic methods and the semi-analytical conditional mass functions. For the mass-weighted $f_{\rm coll}$, HI and HII power spectra, the simulation-based methods work better and the stochastic case is the best at recovering the small-scale HI power (Figures 5 and 6). Therefore, not only does the stochastic case provide a significant improvement in the accuracy of modeling the HI maps

as compared to the semi-analytical methods, unlike them, it is also capable of generating these maps at resolutions finer than $\Delta x = 1 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc. We further test the flexibility of the stochastic case against variations in all the involved parameters, including global ionized fraction, redshift, grid size and minimum halo mass. For almost all the cases, we are able to recover the HI large-scale power ($k \leq 1 \ h \,\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$) at the $\leq 10\%$ level, whereas for the HII density field the errors are well within 10% for the entire range of k values.

Using only the dark matter density contrast to condition the distribution of f_{coll} , we are able to recover large-scale structures well in the f_{coll} field and the subsequent HI maps. We demonstrate how stochasticity in the f_{coll} predictions can play a critical role in recovering the small-scale structure of the HI maps. However, our specific implementation of stochasticity does not take into account the full information contained in the cosmological environment, and this leads to some spurious small-scale structures in the HI maps. Therefore, further improvements to the ML framework can include finding a set of variables, that can better reflect the environment than δ alone, to condition the distribution of f_{coll} . As suggested by [40], the three eigenvalues of the tidal tensor evaluated at each location $\{\lambda_1(\mathbf{x}), \lambda_2(\mathbf{x}), \lambda_3(\mathbf{x})\}$ could be used for such a purpose, and this shall be explored in future work.

Another possible direction for the future entails increasing the dynamic range gap between SB/LB and RB. Currently, we are using SB simulations that are 8 times smaller in volume than the target RB. We can test the accuracy of the framework for a simulation that is 64 times smaller. One can also explore using our ML model to build a redshift evolution of reionization by sampling $f_{coll}(\mathbf{x})$ at appropriately spaced redshifts. In conclusion, the method presented in this work can prove to be an efficient yet accurate way to study models of reionization and also help constrain parameters from upcoming observations.

Acknowledgments

GP thanks Susmita Adhikari for valuable discussions. The research of AP is supported by the Associateship Scheme of ICTP, Trieste. We received support from the computing facilities at NCRA for running the GADGET-2 simulations. The resources provided by the PARAM Brahma facility at IISER Pune which is a part of the National Supercomputing Mission (NSM) of the Government of India are also gratefully acknowledged.

Data availability

The parameters and code of the GPR emulator for the various cases can be made available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

References

- N.Y. Gnedin and P. Madau, Modeling cosmic reionization, Living Reviews in Computational Astrophysics 8 (2022) 3.
- [2] T.R. Choudhury, A short introduction to reionization physics, General Relativity and Gravitation 54 (2022).
- [3] S.R. Furlanetto, S. Peng Oh and F.H. Briggs, Cosmology at low frequencies: The 21cm transition and the high-redshift universe, Physics Reports 433 (2006) 181.
- [4] J.R. Pritchard and A. Loeb, 21 cm cosmology in the 21st century, Reports on Progress in Physics 75 (2012) 086901.

- [5] A. Mesinger, ed., The Cosmic 21-cm Revolution, 2514-3433, IOP Publishing (2019), 10.1088/2514-3433/ab4a73.
- [6] N.Y. Gnedin, Cosmological reionization by stellar sources, The Astrophysical Journal 535 (2000) 530.
- B. Ciardi, A. Ferrara and S.D.M. White, Early reionization by the first galaxies, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 344 (2003) L7
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/344/1/L7/18652206/344-1-L7.pdf].
- [8] I.T. Iliev, G. Mellema, U.-L. Pen, H. Merz, P.R. Shapiro and M.A. Alvarez, Simulating cosmic reionization at large scales i. the geometry of reionization, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 369 (2006) 1625 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/369/4/1625/3799304/mnras0369-1625.pdf].
- [9] H. Trac and R. Cen, Radiative transfer simulations of cosmic reionization. i. methodology and initial results, The Astrophysical Journal 671 (2007) 1.
- M. Petkova and V. Springel, An implementation of radiative transfer in the cosmological simulation code gadget, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 396 (2009) 1383
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/396/3/1383/5796731/mnras0396-1383.pdf].
- [11] N.Y. Gnedin, Cosmic reionization on computers. i. design and calibration of simulations, The Astrophysical Journal 793 (2014) 29.
- [12] A.H. Pawlik, A. Rahmati, J. Schaye, M. Jeon and C. Dalla Vecchia, The aurora radiation-hydrodynamical simulations of reionization: calibration and first results, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 466 (2016) 960
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/466/1/960/10864970/stw2869.pdf].
- J. Rosdahl, H. Katz, J. Blaizot, T. Kimm, L. Michel-Dansac, T. Garel et al., The sphinx cosmological simulations of the first billion years: the impact of binary stars on reionization, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 479 (2018) 994
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/479/1/994/25129300/sty1655.pdf].
- [14] R. Kannan, E. Garaldi, A. Smith, R. Pakmor, V. Springel, M. Vogelsberger et al., Introducing the thesan project: radiation-magnetohydrodynamic simulations of the epoch of reionization, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 511 (2021) 4005
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/511/3/4005/42579816/stab3710.pdf].
- [15] J.S.W. Lewis, P. Ocvirk, J.G. Sorce, Y. Dubois, D. Aubert, L. Conaboy et al., The short ionizing photon mean free path at z = 6 in cosmic dawn iii, a new fully coupled radiation-hydrodynamical simulation of the epoch of reionization, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 516 (2022) 3389
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/516/3/3389/45882789/stac2383.pdf].
- I.T. Iliev, G. Mellema, K. Ahn, P.R. Shapiro, Y. Mao and U.-L. Pen, Simulating cosmic reionization: how large a volume is large enough?, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 439 (2014) 725
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/439/1/725/5599101/stt2497.pdf].
- [17] H.D. Kaur, N. Gillet and A. Mesinger, Minimum size of 21-cm simulations, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 495 (2020) 2354
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/495/2/2354/33323159/staa1323.pdf].
- [18] J.R. Bond, S. Cole, G. Efstathiou and N. Kaiser, Excursion Set Mass Functions for Hierarchical Gaussian Fluctuations, ApJ 379 (1991) 440.
- [19] S.R. Furlanetto, M. Zaldarriaga and L. Hernquist, The growth of HII regions during reionization, The Astrophysical Journal 613 (2004) 1.

- [20] A. Mesinger and S. Furlanetto, Efficient simulations of early structure formation and reionization, The Astrophysical Journal 669 (2007) 663.
- [21] O. Zahn, A. Lidz, M. McQuinn, S. Dutta, L. Hernquist, M. Zaldarriaga et al., Simulations and analytic calculations of bubble growth during hydrogen reionization, The Astrophysical Journal 654 (2007) 12.
- [22] T.R. Choudhury, M.G. Haehnelt and J. Regan, Inside-out or outside-in: the topology of reionization in the photon-starved regime suggested by lyα forest data, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 394 (2009) 960 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/394/2/960/3710519/mnras0394-0960.pdf].
- [23] A. Mesinger, S. Furlanetto and R. Cen, 21cmfast: a fast, seminumerical simulation of the high-redshift 21-cm signal, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 411 (2011) 955
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/411/2/955/4099991/mnras0411-0955.pdf].
- Y. Lin, S.P. Oh, S.R. Furlanetto and P.M. Sutter, The distribution of bubble sizes during reionization, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 461 (2016) 3361
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/461/3/3361/8112292/stw1542.pdf].
- T.R. Choudhury and A. Paranjape, Photon number conservation and the large-scale 21 cm power spectrum in seminumerical models of reionization, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 481 (2018) 3821
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/481/3/3821/25844366/sty2551.pdf].
- [26] W.H. Press and P. Schechter, Formation of Galaxies and Clusters of Galaxies by Self-Similar Gravitational Condensation, ApJ 187 (1974) 425.
- [27] R.K. Sheth and G. Tormen, Large-scale bias and the peak background split, MNRAS 308 (1999) 119 [astro-ph/9901122].
- [28] R.K. Sheth and G. Tormen, An excursion set model of hierarchical clustering: ellipsoidal collapse and the moving barrier, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 329 (2002) 61 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/329/1/61/3882215/329-1-61.pdf].
- [29] D.S. Reed, R. Bower, C.S. Frenk, A. Jenkins and T. Theuns, The halo mass function from the dark ages through the present day, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 374 (2006) 2

[https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/374/1/2/2835466/mnras0374-0002.pdf].

- [30] J. Tinker, A.V. Kravtsov, A. Klypin, K. Abazajian, M. Warren, G. Yepes et al., Toward a halo mass function for precision cosmology: The limits of universality, The Astrophysical Journal 688 (2008) 709.
- [31] J. Courtin, Y. Rasera, J.-M. Alimi, P.-S. Corasaniti, V. Boucher and A. Füzfa, Imprints of dark energy on cosmic structure formation - ii. non-universality of the halo mass function, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 410 (2011) 1911
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/410/3/1911/2864964/mnras0410-1911.pdf].
- [32] M. Crocce, P. Fosalba, F.J. Castander and E. Gaztañaga, Simulating the universe with mice: the abundance of massive clusters, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 403 (2010) 1353
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/403/3/1353/6170753/mnras0403-1353.pdf].
- [33] S. Bhattacharya, K. Heitmann, M. White, Z. Lukić, C. Wagner and S. Habib, Mass function predictions beyond λcdm , The Astrophysical Journal 732 (2011) 122.
- [34] K. Ahn, I.T. Iliev, P.R. Shapiro, G. Mellema, J. Koda and Y. Mao, Detecting the rise and fall of the first stars by their impact on cosmic reionization, The Astrophysical Journal Letters 756 (2012) L16.

- [35] M. McQuinn, A. Lidz, O. Zahn, S. Dutta, L. Hernquist and M. Zaldarriaga, The morphology of h ii regions during reionization, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 377 (2007) 1043
 - [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/377/3/1043/5678910/mnras0377-1043.pdf].
- [36] M.G. Santos, L. Ferramacho, M.B. Silva, A. Amblard and A. Cooray, Fast large volume simulations of the 21-cm signal from the reionization and pre-reionization epochs, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 406 (2010) 2421
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/406/4/2421/3339431/mnras0406-2421.pdf].
- [37] Doussot, Aristide and Semelin, Benoît, A bubble size distribution model for the epoch of reionization, A&A 667 (2022) A118.
- [38] R.K. Sheth and G. Lemson, Biasing and the distribution of dark matter haloes, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 304 (1999) 767
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/304/4/767/3558836/304-4-767.pdf].
- [39] R.K. Sheth and G. Lemson, The forest of merger history trees associated with the formation of dark matter haloes, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 305 (1999) 946
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/305/4/946/18635251/305-4-946.pdf].
- [40] A. Barsode and T.R. Choudhury, Efficient hybrid technique for generating sub-grid haloes in reionization simulations, 2407.10585.
- [41] V. Springel, The cosmological simulation code gadget-2, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 364 (2005) 1105
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/364/4/1105/18657201/364-4-1105.pdf].
- [42] M. Davis, G. Efstathiou, C.S. Frenk and S.D.M. White, The evolution of large-scale structure in a universe dominated by cold dark matter, ApJ 292 (1985) 371.
- [43] C.E. Rasmussen and C.K.I. Williams, Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning, The MIT Press (2006).
- [44] A. Paranjape, A simulated annealing approach to parameter inference with expensive likelihoods, arXiv e-prints (2022) arXiv:2205.07906 [2205.07906].
- [45] B. Maity, A. Paranjape and T.R. Choudhury, A fast method of reionization parameter space exploration using gpr trained script, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 526 (2023) 3920
 [https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/526/3/3920/52108319/stad2984.pdf].
- [46] T.R. Choudhury, A. Paranjape and B. Maity, A gpr-based emulator for semi-numerical reionization code script: parameter inference from 21 cm data, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics 2024 (2024) 027.

A Convergence of Results

We chose to combine 7 different realizations of SB boxes to get the (δ, f_{coll}) pairs, from which the training CDFs were constructed. Now, we vary this number to 1, 3, 5 and 10 and observe the effect on the results. The training converges successfully to $cv_thresh = 0.015$ for each of these variations and the predicted f_{coll}^M auto and cross power spectra are shown in Figure 13. In the lower panels, we show the error between the power spectra of each case with the truth obtained from RB, but the true power spectra itself is not shown in the upper panels. These results have been obtained for the fiducial z = 7 setting. While the variation is not much at large scales, one can clearly notice a trend at the smallest scales, with the error curves of 7 and 10 realizations combined being almost identical. However, the SCRIPT results are quite robust to these differences, and are similarly presented in Figure 14. This validates our choice of using 7 realizations to make the training, since any further increase in the number of realizations does not improve the results while any decrease causes the results to change, albeit only for the $f_{\rm coll}$ power.



Figure 13: Comparison of (a) f_{coll}^M - f_{coll}^M auto and (b) f_{coll}^M - Δ cross power spectra (upper panels) for different numbers of SB boxes combined for training, and the relative error of each with the true power spectra (lower panel). The default case that we work with is 7, shown in black.



Figure 14: HI-HI (left panel) and HII-HII (right panel) power spectra for different numbers of SB boxes combined for training, and the relative error of each with the true power spectra (lower panel), at fixed ionization fraction $Q_{\rm HII}^M = 0.5$. The default case that we work with is 7, shown in black.

B Optimization of Binning

As described in 3.1, we adopt a variable binning scheme to construct the training data, defined over $\log(1 + \delta)$. For the fiducial case, the bin widths for the first and last bins are 0.06 and

0.2 dex, respectively and a turning point occurs at $\delta = 0$, where it is the minimum at 0.03 dex. For each of the variation cases, we train the emulator with training data obtained from different choices of these three dex values, and finally settle on the interpolator that produces the best results for the HI and HII power spectra. This is our optimization procedure for the binning scheme.

If we just apply the binning scheme of our fiducial case on all the variations, the results worsen primarily for the redshift and the grid size variations. These are shown in Figures 15 and 16. Evidently, in Figure 15, the z = 5 case worsens significantly when compared to its best interpolator, shown in Figure 9. The z = 9 case in HI and the HII results shows a less significant degradation. For the gridsize variations, the $\Delta x = 1 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc case shows some noticeable degradation, which is less prominent for all other cases. In general, we see that most of the results are not extremely sensitive to the binning scheme. The minimum halo mass variation cases have identical δ values as the fiducial case, and so applying the fiducial binning scheme over them does not result in any significant degradation, and are thus not shown here.



Figure 15: HI-HI (left panel), HII-HII (right panel) power spectra for truth and prediction using the interpolator made from the function binning scheme. Three different values of redshift are shown at fixed ionization fraction $Q_{\text{HII}}^M = 0.5$.



Figure 16: HI-HI (left panel) and HII-HII (right panel) power spectra for truth and prediction using the interpolator made from the fiducial binning scheme. Three different values of grid size Δx are shown at fixed ionization fraction $Q_{\text{HII}}^M = 0.5$. Each case has been plotted up to its Nyquist frequency.