Normalizing Flows for Physics Data Analyses

Jan Gavranovič (jan.gavranovic@ijs.si)^{1,2} ^{1,2} Borut Paul Kerševan (borut.kersevan@ijs.si)^{1,2} 1 Jožef Stefan Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia ² Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Introduction

- **LHC produces big data** \Rightarrow MC and analysis need to follow
- Can generative models be used to support physics modeling?
- **Problem**: do not know the true generating data distribution
- Objective: approximate $p_{data}(\boldsymbol{x})$ to enable infinite sampling
- *Learn <code>true</code>* $p_{\sf data}({\bm{x}})$ *from* ${\bm{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^D$ *using approximate* $p_{\sf model, \bm{\theta}}({\bm{x}}) \approx p_{\sf data}({\bm{x}})$
- Focus on LHC *analysis-specific* distributions of *final* analysis variables

- 21 low-level and 7 high-level variables
- Data preprocessing (*feature scaling*) is a crucial step in training
- Task: train ML model to generate *new background events*

Higgs Benchmark Dataset

Publicly available dataset with 11M events and 28 variables Binary classification problem: signal (BSM) vs. background $(t\bar{t})$

> $T = T_K \circ \dots \circ T_1$ and $T^{-1} = T_1^{-1} \circ \dots \circ T_K^{-1}$ *K*

- Transformations *T* are (invertible) neural networks with parameters *φ*
- Generative process:

Use as test for LHC *final* event simulation with normalizing flows

- Similar to autoencoder: forward mode ⇔ decoder, backward mode ⇔ encoder
- **Loss function** has two terms (log-likelihood + log-determinant):

Normalizing Flows (Invertible Neural Networks)

- **Two pieces:**
- 1. base distribution $p_u(\boldsymbol{u})$, typically $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u}|\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{l})$
- 2. differentiable transformation $\boldsymbol{x} = T(\boldsymbol{u})$ with an inverse $\boldsymbol{u} = T^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x})$

Construct a flow by composing together many transformations *T*:

Upper limits on the signal strength μ for the likelihood fit to the classifier score distribution as a function of ML-generated events were calculated

- Generative modeling is a **promising new tool** for physics data analyses
- Needs careful performance evaluation and validation for physics use cases

$$
\boldsymbol{x} = T(\boldsymbol{u}) \approx p_x(\boldsymbol{x}) \quad \text{with sampling} \quad \boldsymbol{u} \sim p_u(\boldsymbol{u})
$$

Density evaluation using change of variables formula:

 $p_x(\boldsymbol{x}) = p_u(T^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}))$ $\begin{array}{c} \hline \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} \hline \end{array}$ $\overline{}$ $\det \frac{\partial T^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}}$ *∂x* $\begin{array}{c} \hline \end{array}$ $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ \vert

Forward and Inverse Directions

Forward direction: $z_k = T_k(z_{k-1})$ for $k = 1, \ldots, K$ with $z_0 = u$ (infer) Inverse direction: $\boldsymbol{z}_{k-1} = T_k^{-1}$ $\mathbf{z}_k^{t-1}(\boldsymbol{z}_k)$ for $k=K,\ldots,1$ with $\boldsymbol{z}_K=\boldsymbol{x}$ (train)

$$
\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left[\log p_u \left(T^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\phi}); \boldsymbol{\psi} \right) + \log |\det J_{T^{-1}}(\boldsymbol{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\phi})| \right]
$$

Use *gradient descent* to get the best parameters:

$$
\hat{\theta} = \underset{\theta}{\text{argmin}} \mathcal{L}(\theta), \quad \theta \equiv \{\phi, \psi\}
$$

Performance Evaluation

- Comparison of ML *generated* and MC *simulated* distributions
- *Best* model was selected for the final analysis
- **Performance was measured using statistical distances and classifier two** sample testing

Physics Analysis

A simplified analysis was performed, involving preselection (baseline cuts) and a NN-based classifer final selection

Summary

References

[1] J. Gavranovič and B. P. Kerševan.

Systematic evaluation of generative machine learning capability to simulate distributions of observables at the large hadron collider. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 84(9):911, 2024.

Conference on Computing in High Energy and Nuclear Physics