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Main challenges:

- High dimensionality, both # observation and # dimensions of each observation
- Link between model parameters $\theta$ and data only implicitly defined via forward simulation
Realistic experimental modelling can only be carried out through forward sampling via complex computer programs in many scientific disciplines. Thus $p(x|\theta)$ is not tractable and we resort to likelihood-free inference techniques or non-parametric likelihoods, often requiring using low-dim summaries $s(D)$. 
Simulated data samples can be obtained via complex physics-based Monte Carlo programs but $p(x|\theta)$ cannot be directly evaluated.

Good approximations of $p(x|\theta)$ are effectively unachievable due to curse of dimensionality. So a dim. reduction $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{O(1)}$ step is used to build a summary statistic $s(D)$ keeping as much information for inference as possible.
A QUEST FOR POWERFUL SUMMARY STATISTICS

How to choose a good summary statistic $s(D)$ for statistical inference of the parameters of interest $\theta$?

Ideally we want a **sufficient summary statistic**, defined as:

$$p(D|\theta) = h(D)g(s(D)|\theta)$$

classical sufficiency

Such statistic is problem specific and might not exist or could not be obtained because $p(D|\theta)$ is not known
WHY SIGNAL VS BACKGROUND CLASSIFICATION IS OFTEN USED?

IF

A two-component mixture problem, e.g. signal $f_s(x|\theta)$ and background $f_b(x|\theta)$, which is common in many disciplines:

$$p(x|\mu, \theta) = \mu f_s(x|\theta) + (1 - \mu) f_b(x|\theta)$$

2-component mixture

and the mixture coefficient $\mu$ is the only unknown parameter, i.e. all other parameters $\theta$ are known and fixed

THEN

$$s_{clf}(x|\theta) = \frac{f_s(x|\theta)}{f_s(x|\theta) + f_b(x|\theta)}$$

is a one-dimensional sufficient summary statistic for inference about $\mu$

Can be approximated from simulated $s$ and $b$ samples using probabilistic classification models (e.g. neural network minimizing cross entropy)
A PRACTICAL EXAMPLE: 3D SYNTHETIC MIXTURE

A two-component mixture model:

\[ p(x|\mu, r, \lambda) = (1 - \mu)f_b(x|\lambda) + \mu f_s(x) \]

where each component is:

\[ f_b(x|\lambda) = \mathcal{N}\left((x_0, x_1)|(2 + r, 0), \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 0 \\ 0 & 9 \end{bmatrix}\right)\text{Exp}(x_2|\lambda) \]

\[ f_s(x) = \mathcal{N}\left((x_0, x_1)|(1, 1), \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right)\text{Exp}(x_2|2) \]

can also be parametrised:

\[ p(x|s, r, \lambda, b) = \frac{b}{s + b}f_b(x|\lambda) + \frac{s}{s + b}f_s(x) \]
Classification machine learning techniques (e.g. binary cross entropy neural network) can be used to obtain really good approximations of $s_{\text{clf}}(x|\theta)$ with enough simulated samples.

Bayes optimal classifier $s_{\text{clf}}(x|\theta)$ using 3D synthetic example analytical density.

Output of neural network trained using using sig and bkg classification.
CLASSIFIER-BASED INFERENCE

A trained probabilistic classifier $d(x)$ provides a fixed approximation of $s_{\text{clf}}(x|\theta)$.

How can it be used for statistical inference given data $D$?

1-D $\rightarrow$ cut or histogram to build a Poisson counts non-parametric likelihood

$$L(\mu|\theta) = \prod_{i \in \text{bins}} \text{Pois}(n_i | \mu \cdot s_i(\theta) + b_i(\theta))$$

which can be used for statistical inference, such as measuring $\mu$ given $D$. 

![Graph showing NN classifier output per event with counts on the y-axis and classification results on the x-axis.](image-url)
REAL WORLD: MODELLING UNCERTAINTIES DEGRADE INFERENCE

Simulations are imperfect, mainly due to the limited information of the system being modelled

Lack of knowledge for inference accounted by additional unknown parameters (nuisance parameters $\eta$)

Causes a degradation of classifier-based inference, leading to larger measurement uncertainties

UPPER LIMIT OF ML USEFULNESS IN LHC ANALYSES

Classifiers can be made pivotal as described in "Learning to Pivot" by G. Louppe et al. A review/benchmarks on how to deal with systematics when using machine learning can be found in Adversarial learning to eliminate systematic errors: a case study in High Energy Physics by Victor Estrade et al NIPS2017.
EXPLORING WITH NEW MACHINE LEARNING PATHS

Embed some of the knowledge about modelling and statistical inference such as the uncertainty due to nuisance parameters in the dimensionality-reduction step.
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GLUE → AUTODIFF GRAPH FRAMEWORKS
An approach to learn non-linear summary statistics by directly minimizing an approximation the expected profiled (or marginalised) interval width accounting for the effect of nuisance parameters.

Check arxiv.org/abs/1806.04743 for a more detailed description.
Differentiable approximation of the effect of parameters of interest $\theta$ and nuisance parameters $\eta$ over a given simulated event/observation $(x_i, z_i, w_i)$.

In general is a non-linear function that depends on the problem details, transforming features $x_i$ or weights $w_i$.

Implemented in autodiff frameworks such as TensorFlow or PyTorch.

Simple graphical example: shift for background in 2D, i.e $x' = x + \eta \cdot v$.
Parameters $\phi$ will be learnt during the optimisation process, defining summary statistic transformation $s(x | \phi)$

Could re-use the same techniques and architectures as for standard supervised deep learning

A two-hidden layer MLP (100 units each, ReLU activation, He normal init) used for synthetic examples in this work
We can approximate a histogram-like summary statistic from the NN output applying softmax for each event and summing over each dataset

\[ L(\theta, \eta; \phi) = \prod_{i \in \text{bins}} \text{Pois}(n_i | \alpha_s s_i + \alpha_b b_i) \]

The likelihood depends both on the neural network parameters \( \phi \) and the statistical model parameters \((\theta, \eta)\)
If we expand negative log-likelihood around known minimum (e.g. Asimov)
\[ n_i = \alpha_s s_i + \alpha_b b_i \]:

\[ \text{covariance} \approx H^{-1}(\ln \mathcal{L}) \]
can use as loss function directly the approximate variance estimator on the
pars of interests:

\[ \text{loss} \approx \text{Var}(\mu) \quad \text{(expected)} \]
that accounts for the effect of unknowns nuisance parameters

\[ \text{EQUIVALENT TO THE LAPLACE APPROXIMATION IN BAYESIAN INFERENCE} \]
SYNTHETIC INFERENCE BENCHMARKS

Several inference problems regarding \( s = \frac{\mu b l}{1 - \mu} \) are considered based on the 3D benchmark mentioned before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benchmark 0</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interest pars</td>
<td>1 (s)</td>
<td>1 (s)</td>
<td>1 (s)</td>
<td>1 (s)</td>
<td>1 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuisance pars</td>
<td>0 (all fixed)</td>
<td>1 (r)</td>
<td>2 (r and ( \lambda ))</td>
<td>2 (r and ( \lambda ))</td>
<td>3 (r, ( \lambda ) and ( b ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r ) (bkg shift)</td>
<td>0.0 (fixed)</td>
<td>free (init 0.0)</td>
<td>free (init 0.0)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{N}(\lambda</td>
<td>3.0, 1.0) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda ) (bkg exp rate)</td>
<td>3.0 (fixed)</td>
<td>3.0 (fixed)</td>
<td>free (init 3.0)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{N}(\lambda</td>
<td>3.0, 1.0) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b ) (bkg normalisation)</td>
<td>1000 (fixed)</td>
<td>1000 (fixed)</td>
<td>1000 (fixed)</td>
<td>1000 (fixed)</td>
<td>( \mathcal{N}(b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information about the inference problem can be used within INFERNO but not with probabilistic classifiers
3D SYNTHETIC MIXTURE RESULTS (BENCHMARK 2)

**INFERNO** consistently converges to low-variance summary statistics

Clearly outperforms classifiers in the presence of nuisance parameters
COMPARISON WITH CLASSIFICATION-BASED APPROACH

A more systematic comparison, shows that INFERNO clearly outperforms any classifier (even optimal Bayes) when nuisance parameters are relevant.

Table 1: Expected uncertainty on the parameter of interest $s$ for each of the inference benchmarks considered using a cross-entropy trained neural network model, INFERNO customised for each problem and the optimal classifier and likelihood based results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benchmark 0</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NN classifier</td>
<td>14.99±0.02</td>
<td>18.94±0.11</td>
<td>23.94±0.52</td>
<td>21.54±0.27</td>
<td>26.71±0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFERNO 0</td>
<td>15.51±0.09</td>
<td>18.34±0.51</td>
<td>23.24±6.54</td>
<td>21.38±3.15</td>
<td>26.38±7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFERNO 1</td>
<td>15.80±0.14</td>
<td>16.79±0.17</td>
<td>21.41±2.00</td>
<td>20.29±1.20</td>
<td>24.26±2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFERNO 2</td>
<td>15.79±0.15</td>
<td>16.87±0.19</td>
<td>$\text{16.95±0.18}$</td>
<td>16.88±0.17</td>
<td>18.67±0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFERNO 3</td>
<td>15.70±0.21</td>
<td>16.91±0.20</td>
<td>16.97±0.21</td>
<td>16.89±0.18</td>
<td>18.69±0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFERNO 4</td>
<td>15.71±0.32</td>
<td>16.89±0.30</td>
<td>16.95±0.38</td>
<td>16.88±0.40</td>
<td>$\text{18.68±0.58}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal classifier</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>27.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical likelihood</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>16.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS

Alternative ways to construct summary statistics in cases where nuisance parameters are important could greatly increase the discovery reach of scientific experiments based on simulation-based inference.

The proposed INFERNO technique obtains non-linear summary statistics by minimising the expected uncertainty accounting for the effect of nuisance parameters.

Early results are really promising but studies applied to more complex problems (see talk by Victor Estrade later today) and comparisons with alternative techniques [1] are needed to shed more light on real-world usefulness.

ON ANSWERING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS...

Far better an approximate answer to the right question, which is often vague, than an exact answer to the wrong question, which can always be made precise

John Wilder Tukey (1915-2000) in The future of data analysis (1962)
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Complex computer simulations are commonly required for accurate data modelling in many scientific disciplines, making statistical inference challenging due to the intractability of the likelihood evaluation for the observed data. Furthermore, sometimes one is interested on inference drawn over a subset of the generative model parameters while taking into account model uncertainty or misspecification on the remaining nuisance parameters. In this work, we show how non-linear summary statistics can be constructed by minimising inference-motivated losses via stochastic gradient descent such they provided the smallest uncertainty for the parameters of interest. As a use case, the problem of confidence interval estimation for the mixture coefficient in a multi-dimensional two-component mixture model (i.e. signal vs background) is considered, where the proposed technique clearly outperforms summary statistics based on probabilistic classification, which are a commonly used alternative but do not account for the presence of nuisance parameters.
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