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0.1 Description of the Bayesian Optimization

The number of hidden layers and epochs for each topology to be determined by Bayesian Optimization. For epochs we select the values 1, 100, 500, 1000, 1500 and for hidden layer the values 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 30. The combinations of these values form the search space for the Bayesian Optimization. Figure 1 shows the hyper-surface resulting from the evaluation of the models. The red spots are where the models give the worst possible results and the blue
areas are where the combination of parameter gives the best possible results. Those blue areas point to our selected combinations of hidden-layers and epochs. The metric used was the Accuracy implemented by Keras.
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Figure 1: Accuracy vs (Hidden-Layers, Epochs) of our models for the Bayesian optimization. Using LDA-GS as descriptor and PBE0-CASIDA as target property. In red those combination where the models gives the worst results, in blue the best combination of hyper-parameters.

Table 1 shows the rest of hyper-parameter values selected to construct our models. The model where constructed using Keras with TensorFlow, the names coincides with those implemented in by the frameworks named before.

| Model  | Activation | Number of Neurons per Hidden-layer | Optimizer | Loss Function | Kernel size |
|--------|------------|------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|
| MLP-1D | eLU/ReLU(negative slope = 0.01) | 60 | Adams | MSE | - |
| MLP-2D | eLU/ReLU(negative slope = 0.01) | 25 | Adams | MSE | - |
| CNN-2D | eLU/ReLU | 60 (Filter) | Adams | MSE | 20 |
0.2 Reconstruction of the discrete absorption spectra.

As an example of multiple molecules discrete absorption spectra, Figure 2 shows 20 molecules for CNN-2D and MLP-2D models. In both cases the function $\log$ was used as a pre-processing method.
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Figure 2: Discrete absorption spectra reconstruction. The color scale shows the intensity of the transition measured by the $\Delta r$ metric. Each image shows a molecule, were the upper reconstruction is the prediction and the lower reconstruction is the reference. The descriptor used was extracted from LDA-GS and the target properties from PBE0-CASIDA.

For simplicity Figure 3 show the best, mean and worst spectra reconstruction.
Figure 3: Discrete and broadened excitation spectra for the best, mean and worst examples: (a) CNN-2D (b) MLP-2D. On the $X$ axis are the excites states $\omega$ and on the $Y$ axis the oscillator strengths $f_I$. Green curves represent reconstructed spectra from predictions, while the red ones represent the reference reconstructed spectra from PBE0-CASIDA calculations.