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Calculating signal is slow!

Comparing your favourite model to LHC data means calculating the number of signal events in a specific signal region.

This calculation involves very expensive MC calculations. $O(10 \text{ min})$ for a single set of parameter values using fast simulator (e.g. Delphes).

Global scans of high dimensional theories can require $O(10^6-10^8)$ likelihood evaluations.

$$N_s = L \sigma \epsilon$$

$$\mathcal{L}(N_{\text{obs}} | N_s + N_b)$$
Machine learning is fast!

Replace the expensive MC calculation with a surrogate function.

\[ \epsilon = f(\theta) + \xi \]

In ML language this a supervised regression problem. Many algorithms, we will use Gaussian processes.
Gaussian Processes

**Non-parametric:** No need to assume a functional form.

**Probabilistic:** Produces posteriors, i.e. estimates its own error.

**Bayesian:** Needs a prior on the type of functions. Kernel/covariance function.

\[
k_y(x_p, x_q) = \sigma_f^2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\ell^2}(x_p - x_q)^2\right) + \sigma_n^2 \delta_{pq}.
\]

Picking hyperparameters is the learning task in Gaussian processes.

To deal with large training dataset, we use Distributed Gaussian Processes Deisenroth & Ng, arXiv:1502.02843

---

Figure 1.1: Panel (a) shows four samples drawn from the prior distribution. Panel (b) shows the situation after two datapoints have been observed. The mean prediction is shown as the solid line and four samples from the posterior are shown as dashed lines. In both plots the shaded region denotes twice the standard deviation at each input value \(x\).

“Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning”
Rasmussen & Williams, 2006

www.gaussianprocess.org
Natural SUSY

Natural because it stabilizes the electroweak scale without fine-tuning.

Only few SUSY states needs to be light.

\[ \theta = \{ \tan \beta, \mu, M_3, m_{\tilde{Q}_L}, m_{\tilde{t}_R}, A_t \} \]

Low-dimensional yet realistic theory.

We already had the training data from previous paper.

“Natural SUSY: Now or Never?” Kim et al. arXiv:1606.06738
Two Signal Regions

Defined in ATLAS-PHYS-PUB-2013-011

Looking direct stop production with HL-LHC, 14 TeV with 3000 fb⁻¹

Stops decay typically to top or b quarks, W/Z or Higgs bosons, and a LSP. Multiple jets, b-jets, large MET, possibly leptons.

1-lepton

MET > 750 GeV
m_{T}(lepton, MET) > 550 GeV
Total bkg: 21.1 ± 5.9

0-lepton

MET > 800 GeV
m_{T}(b-jet, MET) > 400 GeV
Total bkg: 12.2 ± 3.9
Training the Gaussian Processes

18647 models split into 16647 models for training and 2000 models for testing.

$O(10 \text{ min})$ to train per signal region.

The lunch is not free, just cheaper!

SPheno, Pythia, NLLFAST, CheckMATE, Delphes etc. still needed to generate training data.

Models uniformly sampled from these ranges:

- $0.1 \text{ TeV} \leq |\mu| \leq 1.0 \text{ TeV}$,
- $0.1 \text{ TeV} \leq m_{\tilde{q}_t} \leq 2.0 \text{ TeV}$,
- $0.1 \text{ TeV} \leq m_{\tilde{\ell}_R} \leq 2.0 \text{ TeV}$,
- $0.1 \text{ TeV} \leq |M_3| \leq 3.0 \text{ TeV}$,
- $|A_t| \leq 3.0 \text{ TeV}$,
- $1 \leq \tan \beta \leq 20$.

All models avoid LEP-II chargino limit, and have reasonable Higgs boson mass.
Is it fast?
0.06 sec/eval

4 GHz single core, unoptimized Python

Compare with $O(10 \text{ min})$ for MC approach.
Is it right?
0-lepton signal region
1-lepton signal region
Proof-of-concept Reconstruction

Assume one particular model is true, and measured at the LHC.

Try to reconstruct the parameters using our two signal regions.

Reasonable Higgs mass, LEP chargino limit.

Benchmark model has

63.2 events in 0-lepton SR

161.8 events in 1-lepton SR

(Bkg: $12.2 \pm 3.9$ and $21.1 \pm 5.9$)
No MC performed!
No event generation.
No detector simulation.
~100k likelihood eval.

Reconstruction, 3D scan
Outlook

Investigate the noise model of our MC calculators. Other kernels or Student-t processes are possibilities.

Extend to MSSM, other theories, more SRs. Online training.

Also collaborating with the iDark group of Sascha Caron (authors of SUSY-AI). iDark = ML + HEP + astrophysics expertise.
To conclude...

Gaussian processes makes LHC inference really really fast.

Bypasses event generation, detector simulation.

The speed enables a fast reconstruction of theory parameters, and eventually dark matter properties.

The method is completely generic, with many possible applications.
Backup slides
Reconstruction, 3D scan
Distributed Gaussian Processes

The standard Gaussian process scales badly with $N$ the size of the training dataset. It involves inverting $N \times N$ matrices.

We use distributed Gaussian processes to avoid this. The data is randomly partitioned and on each partition a Gaussian process is defined. Predictions from each process is then combined.

“Distributed Gaussian Processes”
Deisenroth & Ng, arXiv:1502.02843
Benchmark

\[
\begin{align*}
\mu &= -192.5 \\
M_3 &= 2100 \\
m_{\tilde{Q}_3} &= 1300 \\
m_{\tilde{t}_R} &= 1200 \\
\tan \beta &= 8.43 \\
A_t &= 2000
\end{align*}
\]