

Boosted Jet Tagging and Calibration in CMS

Oz Amram

On Behalf of the CMS Collaboration

Overview

- Latest boosted jet **tagger** in CMS
- Performance **calibration** in data
- **New** method for calibrating **high-prong** jets using the Lund Jet Plane
- Won't cover heavy flavor jets
 - See Matteo's talk!

CMS Jet Tagging

arXiv:1902.08570
CMS: DP-2020-002

Jets : Anti-kt R=0.8, PUPPI
Up to 100 jet constituents (42 feats. per)
Up to 7 secondary vertices (15 feats per.)

ParticleNet





FIG. 1: The structure of the EdgeConv block.



(a) ParticleNet

- Architecture : **Graph based**
 - Processes inputs in permutation invariant way
 - Based on EdgeConv blocks
- Output: binary classification scores
 - X vs QCD


Jet Mass Regression

CMS-DP-2021-017

Training objective :

$$M_{\text{target}} = \begin{cases} M_{\text{SD}}^{\text{gen}} & \text{if jet is QCD} \\ m_{\text{H}} \in [15, 250] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- **ParticleNet** also used to regress jet mass
- Significant improvement wrt **CMS soft drop** implementation*




*CMS parameters ($\beta=1.0$, $Z_{\text{cut}} = 0.1$) may be causing the over-grooming

Jet Mass Regression

CMS-DP-2021-017

Training objective :

$$M_{\text{target}} = \begin{cases} M_{\text{SD}}^{\text{gen}} & \text{if jet is QCD} \\ m_{\text{H}} \in [15, 250] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$






- **ParticleNet** also used to regress jet mass to regress jet mass
- Significant improvement wrt **CMS soft drop** implementation*
- Doesn't distort shape for QCD jets

*CMS parameters ($\beta=1.0$, $Z_{\text{cut}} = 0.1$) may be causing the over-grooming

Mass Decorrelation


DP-2020-002
CMS-DP-2021-017

- **Crucial** for analyses doing bump-hunts in jet mass
- **ParticleNet MD** trains on samples generated & reweighted to be flat in m_{SD} & p_T
 - **DeepAK8 MD** used adversarial network
- **ParticleNet MD** achieves slightly better decorrelation on Higgs peak





Tagging Efficiency Calibration

CMS-DP-2020-025




- Calibrating tagging efficiency is crucial for usage by analyzers
- Pick a tagging cut \rightarrow create pass/fail regions \rightarrow fit for relative normalization
- Often done in semi-lep. $t\bar{t}$ for clean sample of **W's** and **top's**

High Prong Jets?




High Prong Jets?



- To calibrate (B)SM jets typically use SM proxy with same number of prongs
- What to do for high prong (>3) jets ?
 - No abundant SM proxies in data...


High Prong Jets?



- To calibrate (B)SM jets typically use SM proxy with same number of prongs
 - What to do for high prong (> 3) jets
 - No abundant SM proxies in data...
- New Method!**
Calibrate each prong separately via Lund Jet Plane Reweighting


Multi-Prong Calibration Technique

CMS DP-2023/046



Multi-Prong Calibration Technique


CMS DP-2023/046



- **Recluster** AK8 jet so each prong in a **separate subjet**

Multi-Prong Calibration Technique

CMS DP-2023/046




Key assumption : Each prong originates from a SM quark

- **Recluster** AK8 jet so each prong in a **separate subjet**
- Data-driven correction for each **subjet** using the **Lund Jet Plane**
- Correction is ‘per-prong’ so can extrapolate to higher-prong jets!

Semi-lep. $t\bar{t}$

CMS DP-2023/046


- Extract & test data-driven subjet correction using semi-leptonic $t\bar{t}$ events
- Derive data/sim. ratio of **Lund Jet Plane** from **boosted W 's**
- Test calibration on **W 's** and **top's**



The Lund Jet Plane (LJP)


1807.04758

- A 2D representation of the density of splittings inside the jet
- To construct our **subject Lund Jet Plane**
 - **Recluster** AK8 jet into #prongs using **exclusive kt** algorithm
 - Recluster each subjet using **Cambridge/Aachen** to get splitting history
 - **Fill** points based on **splittings** along hardest branch



Derivation of Correction

CMS DP-2023/046



- Recluster AK8 jets from **W-region** into 2 subjets
- Construct **LJP**'s of data and sim. → take ratio
 - Done in 6 bins of subjet p_T
- Use this ratio to **correct simulated jets**
- For each prong, reweight based on the multiplication of the **LJP** ratio of prong's splittings


Application to W Jets

CMS DP-2023/046

Application of **correction** to **W jets** significantly improves data/sim. agreement!

Not just τ_{21} !

Other substructure variables also improved (see backup)



NB: Non-perfect closure b/c bkg processes are not corrected 17



Application to Top Jets

- Recluster **top jets** into 3 subjets
- Apply data/sim **LJP** correction derived from **W's**

Application to Top Jets

CMS DP-2023/046

- Recluster **top jets** into 3 subjets
- Apply data/sim **LJP** correction derived from **W's**



NB: Non-perfect closure b/c bkg processes are not corrected


Correction significantly improves agreement!

Uncertainties

CMS DP-2023/046



- **Stat.** and **sys.** on extraction of data/sim. **LJP** ratio
- **Matching uncertainty** on how well the reclustered subjets correspond to the quarks from the hard process
 - Largest unc., grows with # of prongs
 -
- Calibrated tagging efficiencies from the LJP agree with standard methods for W & top
 - Larger uncertainties b/c more general method

Reclustering works even for **6 prong** jets!



Conclusions

- **ParticleNet** tagger now standard in CMS, excellent performance
 - Also used for regressing jet mass
- Proper **calibration** of substructure tagging crucial for ML taggers
- **New method** to calibrate high prong jets using the **Lund Jet Plane**
- Look out for the usage of these techniques in future CMS searches!




Backup

Taggers : Deep AK8


Jets : Anti-kt R=0.8, PUPPI
 Up to 100 jet constituents (42 feats. per)
 Up to 7 secondary vertices (15 feats per.)

DeepAK8

- Architecture : **1D CNN's**
 - Order inputs by p_T & 2D IP
- Output: Multi-class scores
 - W/Z/t/H/other, split by decay modes (17 scores)
 - Build discriminants by taking ratios
- Mass-decorrelated version trained with an adversary




DeepAK8 gives
 ~**10x** improvement
 in bkg rejection
 wrt traditional vars



DeepAK8 W-Tagging Standard Calibration



CMS-DP-2020-025




- Precise calibration of tagging efficiency, O(few %)
- Efficiency often significantly different in data vs. MC!

Tagger Backup

arXiv:2004.08262






CMS: DP-2020-002




Additional W-Jets Substructure Variables

CMS DP-2023/046



NB: Non-perfect closure b/c bkg processes are not corrected

All Data/Sim. Lund Jet Plane Ratios



CMS DP-2023/046

Figure 2: Ratios of the LJP in data and simulation in each subject p_T bin. The combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the ratio is represented by the area of the hatched region in each bin. Bins with no data or simulation events are shown as white, but assumed to have a ratio value of unity and 100% uncertainty.

Table of Uncertainties

CMS DP-2023/046


Jet Type (# Prongs)	Selection Var.	Ratio Stat. Unc.	Ratio Sys. Unc.	p_T Extrap. Unc.	b Unc.	Matching Unc.	Tot. Unc.
W (2)	τ_{21}	0.03	0.04	-	-	0.07	0.09
W (2)	DeepAK8	0.01	0.02	-	-	0.08	0.08
W (2)	DeepAK8_MD	0.01	0.02	-	-	0.08	0.08
top (3)	τ_{32}	0.03	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.14	0.16
$Y \rightarrow qq$ (2)	τ_{21}	0.01	0.12	0.04	-	0.04	0.13
$R \rightarrow WW$ (4)	Deep-WH	0.02	0.02	0.06	-	0.28	0.29
$T' \rightarrow tZ$ (5)	τ_{43}	0.02	0.09	0.02	0.01	0.37	0.38
$H \rightarrow tt$ (6)	τ_{43}	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.50	0.50

Table 1: Uncertainties on the LJP calibration of the efficiency for tagging jets of various kinds using various substructure variables. For the tagging of W jets, both τ_{21} and two versions of the DeepAK8 discriminant (mass decorrelated and not) are evaluated. The matching uncertainty is seen to be dominant, and grows for jets with higher numbers of prongs due to denser environment leading to less well separated subjets.

Correction Factor Comparison

CMS DP-2023/046

- Use method to calibrate tagging efficiency
- Compare correction factor ($\epsilon_{\text{data}} / \epsilon_{\text{sim}}$) from **std technique** and **LJP reweighting**
 - Good agreement
- **LJP** has larger uncertainties b/c more general method
 - BUT enables calibration of high prong jets!



Correction Factors

- To further validate the method, the LJP correction procedure is applied to various jet types and used to compute a correction factor. The CF is defined as the ratio of the efficiency in the corrected simulation divided by the efficiency of the nominal simulation.
- For tagging of W and top jets, the LJP CFs are compared to those measured in data using standard methods [7,10]. The LJP CFs are found to agree with the standard ones within uncertainties.
- CFs are also derived for higher prong jets from the decays of beyond standard model particles as example use cases.

Correction Factor Table

CMS DP-2023/046

Jet Type (# Prongs)	Selection Variable	Lund Jet Plane	Comparison
W (2)	τ_{21}	$0.80 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.08$	0.85 ± 0.04
W (2)	DeepAK8 W-score	$0.91 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.08$	1.03 ± 0.06
W (2)	DeepAK8_MD W-score	$0.92 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.08$	0.89 ± 0.04
top (3)	τ_{32}	$0.82 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.15$	0.91 ± 0.02
$Y \rightarrow qq$ (2)	τ_{21}	$0.81 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.13$	-
$R \rightarrow WW$ (4)	Deep-WH	$0.94 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.29$	0.66 ± 0.35
$T' \rightarrow tZ$ (5)	τ_{43}	$0.82 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.37$	-
$H \rightarrow tt$ (6)	τ_{43}	$0.84 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.50$	-

Table 2: A comparison of CFs derived using the LJP correction procedure and other sources. The first uncertainty listed with the LJP value is statistical and the second is systematic. For W and top tagging, CFs derived with the LJP have larger uncertainties but agree well with those from traditional methods. For the $R \rightarrow WW$ SF, the LJP correction factor is compared to the one obtained in a recent CMS search [11] which utilized top quarks with a hard gluon emission as a 4-prong proxy. No comparison correction factors exist for the higher prong signals.


Uncertainties

- **Statistical uncertainty:** the limited number of data events in each bin of the LJP ratio. This uncertainty is propagated to the final correction.
- **Systematic uncertainty:** uncertainties in the efficiencies of the muon and jet selections used, and the modeling of the background processes in the W-region.
- **Matching uncertainty:** How well the reclustered subjects correspond to the quarks from the hard process. This uncertainty is evaluated in simulation based on how often the reclustered subjects fail a $\Delta R < 0.2$ match to a quark from the hard process, how often two quarks are matched to the same subject and how often a quark is only partially contained in the AK8 jet.
- **High p_T extrapolation:** Events in the W-region contained limited numbers of high p_T subjects. The application of the correction to a higher p_T subject therefore requires an extrapolation to the correction as a function of subject p_T . The correction factor in each bin of the LJP is fit as a function of subject p_T . This extrapolation is used for subjects with $p_T > 350$ GeV, and the uncertainty of the fit is propagated to the correction.
- **b-jet uncertainty:** Subjects originating from bottom quarks may shower differently than those of light quarks due to the larger bottom quark mass. This difference is assessed by comparing the difference between the LJP of b quarks and light quarks in simulation. This difference is taken as an uncertainty when the correction procedure is applied to b-quark initiated subjects.

Subjet p_T Extrapolation

- W-jets we derive LPR from are in a limited range of p_T
→ need to extrapolate for some signals
- For splittings with $k_T \ll p_T$, expect LP density is indep. of p_T
 - Corrections scale as $z = k_T / (\Delta p_T)$, ie $1/p_T$
- For each bin of LPR, fit dependence vs **1/subjet p_T**
- F-test to determine order of fit
 - Almost all bins prefer constant order, few prefer linear
- For subjets with $p_T > 350$, fitted functions are used instead of directly measured LPR
 - Any bins without a measured data/MC ratio, assume a LPR value of 1 with 100% uncertainty

Theoretical Scaling
(LO QCD)



P_T Extrapolation Theory

- From theory, we expect the extrapolation in subject pt to be well behaved
- At LO in QCD, the density in a Lund Plane bin (Δ, k_t) is given by :

(source)
$$\rho(\Delta, k_t) = \frac{1}{N_{\text{jet}}} \frac{dn_{\text{emission}}}{d\ln(k_t) d\ln(1/\Delta)} = \frac{\alpha_s(k_T) C_F}{\pi} \bar{z} (p_{gq}(\bar{z}) + p_{gq}(1 - \bar{z}))$$




$$\bar{z} = \frac{k_t}{p_{t,\text{jet}} \Delta}$$

$$p_{gq}(\bar{z}) = \frac{1 + (1 - \bar{z})^2}{\bar{z}}$$

- All the dependence on jet pt comes from the \bar{z} part
- For $\bar{z} \ll 1$, ie soft/large angle splittings and/or high jet p_T , the \bar{z} dependence is : $2 - z + 2z^2 + 2z^3 + O(z^4)$
 - ie it asymptotes to 2

Jet Mass Scale Calibration


CMS-DP-
2023-044



- Use substructure cuts (or **ParticleNet**) to construct pure samples of W's & top's
- Fit for jet mass scale in data vs sim.

Jet Mass Scale Calibration

CMS-DP-2023-044




Data vs Sim. JMS agree within **2%** after JEC applied

CMS Jet Tagging

arXiv:1902.08570
CMS: DP-2020-002


Jets : Anti-kt R=0.8, PUPPI
Up to 100 jet constituents (42 feats. per)
Up to 7 secondary vertices (15 feats per.)



ParticleNet ~2x
bkg rejection wrt
prev. tagger
(**DeepAK8**)

DeepAK8 W-Tagging Standard Calibration

CMS-DP-2020-025



- Precise calibration of tagging efficiency, O(few %)
- Efficiency often significantly different in data vs. MC!