

#### UNIVERSITÄT HEIDELBERG ZUKUNFT **SEIT 1386**

# **Diffusion Models**

for LHC event generation

Anja Butter, Nathan Huetsch, Sofia Palacios Schweitzer, Tilman Plehn, Peter Sorrenson, Jonas Spinner arXiv: 2305.10475

#### ML4Jets, 07.11.2023

SPONSORED BY THE



Federal Ministry of Education and Research





#### UNIVERSITÄT HEIDELBERG ZUKUNFT **SEIT 1386**

# **Uncertainty-Aware Diffusion Models** SPONSORED BY THE

Anja Butter, Nathan Huetsch, Sofia Palacios Schweitzer, Tilman Plehn, Peter Sorrenson, Jonas Spinner arXiv: 2305.10475

#### ML4Jets, 07.11.2023

for LHC event generation



Federal Ministry of Education and Research



## Why Event Generation?

Vast amount of data collected by collider experiments

Standard Model is probed

Theoretical predictions (simulation) need to match experimental statistics





## Why ML Event Generation?



Figure from https://web.archive.org/web/20220706170326/https://lhc-commissioning.web.cern.ch/schedule/images/LHC-nominal-lumi-projection.png





## Why ML Event Generation?



Figure from https://web.archive.org/web/20220706170326/https://lhc-commissioning.web.cern.ch/schedule/images/LHC-nominal-lumi-projection.png





#### Raising Awareness for Uncertainties

Being precise = estimating uncertainties





#### Raising Awareness for Uncertainties

#### Being precise = estimating uncertainties

How can we account for network uncertainties?







Once training is done:  $W_1$ ,  $W_2$ ,  $W_3$  fixed (*"Network output is deterministic"*)





**Bayesianization:** We draw each entry from  $W_1, W_2, W_3$  from distribution  $q(\theta | \mu_{\phi}, \sigma_{\phi})$ 









$$\vec{z} = \mathbf{W}_{3}\vec{y}_{2}$$
Output
$$\left\{ \vec{z} \right\} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} \vec{z}_{i}$$

$$\sigma_{pred}^{2} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \langle \vec{z} \rangle - \vec{z}_{i} \right)^{2}$$



#### How to Bayesianize

1. Replace each linear layer with a *Bayesian* layer

2. Add additional regularisation term to likelihood loss

 $\overrightarrow{x}$ 

Input











Figure from J.Ho et al.: arXiv:2006.11239







#### How to Bayesianize - DDPM



$$\frac{1}{2\sigma_t^2} \frac{\beta_t^2}{(1-\beta_t)\bar{\beta}_t} |\epsilon(t) - \epsilon_{\theta}(t)|^2$$





#### How to Bayesianize - DDPM







#### How to Bayesianize - DDPM







## Diffusion Models (CFM)



Evolution go

Figure from J.Ho et al.: arXiv:2006.11239

overned by 
$$v \equiv \frac{dx}{dt}$$





#### Diffusion Models (CFM)

 $t \sim \mathcal{U}([0,1])$  $x_0 \sim p(x_0), x_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \longrightarrow x(t|x_0) = (1-t)x_0 + tx_1$ 





#### How to Bayesianize - CFM



$$\left(v_{\theta} - (x_1 - x_0)\right)^2$$

+ ???



#### How to Bayesianize - CFM



#### Choosing Test Phase-Space



Figure from A. Butter et al.: arXiv:2203.07460, R. Winterhalder



## Concrete Application — LHC





3 - 5 final state particles (including jets)

12 - 20 dimensional phase space

Smart preprocessing:

**Global Phase Shift** 

Drop muon masses

→ reduces phase space to 9 - 17 dimensions



## Concrete Application — LHC





 $\rightarrow p_{j_3}$ 



Percent level precision (comparable to statistical uncertainty)





Percent level precision (comparable to statistical uncertainty)



Percent level precision (comparable to statistical uncertainty)

Uncertainty well-defined







Uncertainty well-defined

Surpasses INN precision (A. Butter et al.: arXiv:2110.13632)





By construction:

Systematic failure modes of network not covered by Bayesian uncertainties





#### And now what?



(Bayesian) Diffusion models show potential to be applied to particle physics tasks

- Diffusion Models can compete with current benchmark (precision-wise)
  - A lot of on-going research (generation speed up, precision, etc.)
  - Bayesian Versions seem to estimate training uncertainty correctly



# Backup



$$q(x_1, \dots, x_T | x_0) = \prod_{t=1}^T q(x_t)$$
$$q(x_t | x_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(x_t; \sqrt{1 - \beta_t} x_t)$$

Figure from J.Ho et al.: arXiv:2006.11239

$$(x_{t-1})$$

#### $x_{t-1}, \beta_t$ where $\beta_t$ follows noise scheduler







...but we don't know

Figure from J.Ho et al.: arXiv:2006.11239

$$-1 | x_t) = \frac{q(x_t | x_{t-1})q(x_{t-1})}{q(x_t)}$$
  
w  $q(x_t) \& q(x_{t-1}) \quad \bigotimes \quad \bigotimes$ 







$$x_t) = \mathcal{N}(x_{t-1}; \mu_{\theta}(x_t, t), \sigma_{\theta}^2(x_t, t))$$
  
$$x_T(\theta) = p(x_T) \prod_{t=1}^T p_{\theta}(x_{t-1} | x_t)$$





$$\mathscr{L}_{DDPM} = -\log p_{\theta}(x_0) \approx \frac{1}{2\sigma_t^2} \frac{\beta_t^2}{(1-\beta_t)\bar{\beta}_t} |\epsilon(t) - \epsilon_{\theta}(t)|^2$$

Figure from J.Ho et al.: arXiv:2006.11239

#### Latent Space $x_T \sim p(x_T)(=\mathcal{N}(0,1))$







$$\frac{1}{2\sigma_t^2} \frac{\beta_t^2}{(1-\beta_t)\bar{\beta}_t} |\epsilon(t) - \epsilon_{\theta}(t)|^2$$
Predicted and actual

noise added at time t





$$\mathscr{L}_{DDPM} = -\log p_{\theta}(x_0) \approx \frac{1}{2\sigma_t^2} \frac{\beta_t^2}{(1-\beta_t)\bar{\beta}_t} |\epsilon(t) - \epsilon_{\theta}(t)|^2$$



Figure from J.Ho et al.: arXiv:2006.11239

#### Latent Space $x_T \sim p(x_T) (= \mathcal{N}(0,1))$

#### Denoising



## Diffusion Models (CFM)



Figure from J.Ho et al.: arXiv:2006.11239

## Diffusion Models (CFM)



Figure from J.Ho et al.: arXiv:2006.11239