ML in (LHC) Experiments



Deep Thinking vs Deep Learning

Deepak Kar deepak.kar@cern.ch





National Research Foundation





Session 2: (ML4)Jets

Use of ML in object reconstruction

Signal: H -> AA ->γγγγ (merged) BG: H->γγ

Use: end to end ML approach, makes use of more granular information



https://cms-results.web.cern.ch/cms-results/public-results/publications/EGM-20-001/



Number of ECAL crystals in either direction, each pixel in the image exactly corresponds to the energy deposited in a single ECAL crystal.

To improve spatial resolution: split the ECAL images described above into a two-layer image that contains the transverse and longitudinal components of the crystal energy. And include the crystal seed coordinates.



No rotation is performed on the images since electromagnetic showers are not rotationally symmetric. In addition to the η-φ symmetry being broken by the CMS magnetic field, general rotations of square pixels are destructive operations that distort the particle shower pattern

er image

To improve spatial resolution: split the ECAL

that contains the transverse and longitudinal components of the crystal energy. And include the crystal seed coordinates.

RESNET CNN, outputs regressed mass in a global maximum pooling layer. Concatenated with the crystal seed coordinates, gives regressed diphoton mass.





RESNET CNN, outputs regressed mass in a global maximum pooling layer. Concatenated with the crystal seed coordinates, gives regressed diphoton mass.

BUT...

When regressing below the mass resolution, the left tail of the mass distribution becomes underrepresented in the training set. Middle: As mA \rightarrow 0, only half of the mass distribution is represented. The regressor subsequently defaults to the last full mass distribution at mA $\approx \sigma(mA)$. With domain continuation, the generated mass distribution of the original training samples (A $\rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, red region) is augmented with topologically similar samples that are randomly assigned nonphysical masse. This allows the regressor to see a full mass distribution over the entire region of interest



Effectivel



Used in Search:

https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.06197



10

Example: b/c-jet tagging



Input	Description		Summed tracks E _T ratio	
$\frac{s_{d0}}{s_{z0}}$ $\log p_{\rm T}^{frac}$ $\log \Delta R$ IBL hits PIX1 hits shared IBL hits split IBL hits	d_0/σ_{d0} : Transverse IP significance $z_0 \sin \theta / \sigma_{z0 \sin \theta}$: Longitudinal IP significance $\log p_{\rm T}^{track} / p_{\rm T}^{jet}$: Logarithm of fraction of the jet Logarithm of opening angle between the track Number of hits in the IBL: could be { 0, 1, or Number of hits in the next-to-innermost pixel Number of shared hits in the IBL Number of split hits in the IBL	p_{T} carried by the track and the jet axis 2 } layer: could be { 0, 1, or 2	$\Delta R(\text{summed tracks, jet})$ First track 2D IP signific Number of selected trac Jet p_T Jet η 2 }	
nPixHits shared pixel hits split pixel hits nSCTHits shared SCT hits	Combined number of hits in the pixel layers Number of shared hits in the pixel layers Number of split hits in the pixel layers Combined number of hits in the SCT layers Number of shared hits in the SCT layers	Using deep se jets as a se	ets, modelling et of tracks	

<u>CMS</u>

Input variable		Run 1 CSV	CSVv2
SV 2D flight distance significance		x	x
Number of SV		—	x
Track $\eta_{\rm rel}$		x	x
Corrected SV mass		x	x
Number of tracks from SV		x	x
SV energy ratio		x	x
$\Delta R(SV, jet)$		—	x
3D IP significance of the first four tracks		x	x
Track $p_{\rm T,rel}$		—	x
$\Delta R(\text{track}, \text{jet})$		—	x
Track $p_{\rm T,rel}$ ratio		—	x
Track distance		—	x
Track decay length		—	x
Summed tracks <i>E</i> _T ratio		—	x
ΔR (summed tracks, jet)		—	x
First track 2D IP significance above c threshold		—	x
Number of selected tracks		—	x
Jet <i>p</i> _T			x
Jet η			x
l	DeepCSV tagge	er	

11





Why so much effort on b-tagging?

Example: b/c-jet tagging



2D IP/ σ of most displaced track

Example: b/c-jet tagging

ATLAS

CMS



An aside: ROC Curves









Signal efficiency: fraction of signal events

right of the line

From MC Inverse background efficiency: **Arbitrary Units** inverse fraction of background events Z, Z' $\rightarrow \tau\tau$, W $\rightarrow \tau\nu$ (Simulation) 0.25 right of the line Multi-Jet (Data 2012) 0.2 p_{_}> 15 GeV, ΙηΙ< 2.5 10⁴ Background Efficiency 0.15 1-track ••• 1-track ATLAS $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV 0.1 10³ ---- 3-track Tau identification 0.05 *p*_> 40 GeV, *l*η*l*< 2.5 10^{2} 0.2 0.8 0.4Inverse cent 10 **ATLAS** Scan over the Data 2012, vs=8TeV full range 0.2 0.3 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 b.1 0.4 Signal Efficiency

Signal efficiency: fraction of signal events

right of the line From MC Inverse background efficiency: **Arbitrary Units** inverse fraction of background events 0.25 $\rightarrow \tau \tau$, W $\rightarrow \tau v$ (Simulation) right of the line Multi-Jet (Data 2012) 0.2 10⁴ 15 GeV, $|\eta| < 2.5$ erse Background Efficiency 0.15 1-t ack ••• 1-track **ATLAS** $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ 0.1 10³ ---- 3-track Tau identification 0.05 *p*_> 40 GeV, *l*η*l*< 2.5 10^{2} 0 0.6 0.8 f_{cent} Ę ATI AS JU Scan over the Data 2012, \s=81e full range 0.2 0.5 0.6 0.8 0.9 0.3 0.7 . 1 0.4 Signal Efficiency



Jet Tagging

Jet Substructure



Motivation

- Large number of jets in final state, a combinatorial nightmare
- Large multijet background

Any way out?

Motivation

- For a two body decay, we can write: $p_{T_1} = zp_T$
- For a (quasi)collinear splitting:

 $p_{\mathrm{T}_2} = (1-z)p_{\mathrm{T}},$

 $M^{2} = (E_{1} + E_{2})^{2} - (p_{T_{1}} + p_{T_{2}}) \times (p_{T_{1}} + p_{T_{2}}) = 2p_{T_{1}}p_{T_{2}}$

• In terms of the angular separation:

$$M^{2} = p_{T_{1}} p_{T_{2}} \Delta R^{2} = z(z-1) p_{T}^{2} \Delta R^{2}$$
$$\Delta R^{2} = 4M^{2} / p_{T}^{2}$$



Jet constituents are almost massless, then how can jets have mass?

Jet mass

Jet mass: the constituents of a jet usually have zero or very small mass, however the jet itself often ends up having a non-negligible mass, as the jet mass can be calculated as:

$$m = \sqrt{(\sum_{i \in \text{jet}} E_i)^2 - (\sum_{i \in \text{jet}} \vec{p}_i)^2},$$

Motivation



A large radius jet of $R = 2m/p_T^2$ can contain all decay products

Boost!



High p_T means transverse Lorentz boost!

More probable with higher LHC energy

Hadronically decaying top quark, Higgs/W/Z bosons, new heavy particles ...

Boost





Hadronic side









Signal vs Background

The boosted jet coming from top quark (hadronic) decay should be distinguishable from the boosted jet coming from events with no top quarks.



We want to exploit the "substructure" of the large-radius jet to identify original particles

Background: light quark/gluon/lepton jets



Can you think of any possible disadvantage of using large-radius jets?

First Application

- The so-called BDRS paper (Butterworth-Davison-Rubin-Salam, 2008)
- Looked at VH (V=W/Z), with H decaying to bbbar.
- Charged leptons in the final state help to reduce background.
- Conventional methods result in Hbb swamped by multijet background.
- Start with fat (C-A 1.2) boosted ($p_T > 200$) b-tagged jet.
- 1. Break the jet j into two subjets by undoing its last stage of clustering. Label the two subjets j_1, j_2 such that $m_{j_1} > m_{j_2}$.
- 2. If there was a significant mass drop (MD), $m_{j_1} < \mu m_j$, and the splitting is not too asymmetric, $y = \frac{\min(p_{tj_1}^2, p_{tj_2}^2)}{m_j^2} \Delta R_{j_1, j_2}^2 > y_{\text{cut}}$, then deem j to be the heavy-particle neighbourhood and exit the loop. Note that $y \simeq \min(p_{tj_1}, p_{tj_2}) / \max(p_{tj_1}, p_{tj_2})$.¹
 - 3. Otherwise redefine j to be equal to j_1 and go back to step 1. $\mu = 0.67 \qquad y_{cut} = 0.09.$

• Start with fat (C-A 1.2) boosted ($p_T > 200$) b-tagged jet.



- Start with fat (C-A 1.2) boosted ($p_T > 200$) b-tagged jet.
- De-cluster the jet. At each stage, mass drop and symmetric splitting requirement.
- Continue till an interesting splitting has been found.



- Then use the three hardest b-tagged subjets to (re)form the large-radius jet.
- The mass of the large-radius jet is Higgs boson mass.
- For a 115 GeV Higgs, 4.5 σ for 30 fb⁻¹.



Lessons

- We need to clean the jet.
- We need observables (like jet mass) to discriminate signal against background.
- BDRS technique did not work in ATLAS/CMS directly.

Jet Grooming

- Jets need to be "groomed".
- Need observables which would be sensitive to signal-like or background-like nature of these jets.

Why?

The large-radius jets not only include particles coming from the interesting decays, but also from pileup, underlying event

Jet Grooming

Jets need to be "groomed".



Cutting, Trimming, Pruning



Hedges by design, are usually (but not exclusively) maintained by hedge trimming, rather than by pruning. We can maintain your hedging any size, anywhere, and our maintenance can be arranged to be carried out yearly for effective long term management. We can also shape your hedging as requested.

Our experts can maintain and improve lawn and grassy areas of any scale. We can control weed issues through cultural weed control (essentially removing the weeds by hand) or through



selective chemical weed killing which can control weeds without damaging unwanted shrubbery.

Jet Grooming

- Mass drop filtering
- Pruning
- Trimming
- Soft Drop

Soft Drop

Start with a jet j and it is split into last two subjets

If:
$$\frac{\min(p_{T1}, p_{T2})}{p_{T1} + p_{T2}} > z_{cut} \left(\frac{\Delta R_{12}}{R_0}\right)^{\beta}$$

Then j is the final soft drop jet.

Otherwise the higher p_T subjet is taken as j and iterated ...

Advantage: can be compared directly to analytic calculations

Tagging boosted objects: observables and taggers



particles!

Tag people in your posts

Add tags to anything you post, including photos and updates. Tags can point to your friends or anyone else on Facebook. Adding a tag creates a link that people can follow to learn more.

Target is to identify jets resulting from the decay of top quark or Higgs against jets coming f_{40} m light quark/gluons.

Mass



Mass peaks clearly visible over background!

Subjet multiplicity



kt splitting scale

 $\sqrt{d_{ij}} = \min(p_{\mathrm{T}i}, p_{\mathrm{T}j}) \times \Delta R_{ij}$

When combining two subjets with k_t algorithm:



Merge $1 \rightarrow 0$

 B_{-}



Symmetric for heavy particle two body decay

N-Subjettiness

Quantify the degree to which jet radiation is aligned along specific subjet axes.

$$\tau_{N} \equiv \frac{1}{d_{0}} \sum_{k=1}^{M} \left(p_{\mathrm{T},k} \times \underbrace{\Delta R_{\min,k}}_{\text{distance to nearest subjet}} \right)$$

 $d_0 = R \times \text{sum of } p_T$ of all constituents

Smaller values: N or less energy deposits

Larger values: more than N energy deposit

 $\tau_{N-1} > \tau_N$ for N prong substructure

Calculated by k_t clustering the constituents, and requiring exactly N subjets $_{50}$

N-Subjettiness

The ratio of τ_N/τ_{N-1} is used as discriminant



N-Subjettiness

52

The ratio of τ_N/τ_{N-1} is used as discriminant





More like 3 subjets than 2



Energy Correlation Functions

Discriminate between:



Signal:Two-prong jet

Characteristic angular size determined by mass



Background: One-prong jet

No intrinsic angular size

ECF

Over all constituents (beta: angular exponent):

$$\begin{split} & \operatorname{ECF}(1,\beta) = \sum_{i} p_{Ti} \\ & \operatorname{ECF}(2,\beta) = \sum_{i < j} p_{Ti} \, p_{Tj} \, (R_{ij})^{\beta} \, \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \operatorname{see Banfi, Salam, Zanderighi;} \\ & \operatorname{Jankowiak, Larkoski} \end{bmatrix} \\ & \operatorname{ECF}(3,\beta) = \sum_{i < j < k} p_{Ti} \, p_{Tj} \, p_{Tk} \, (R_{ij} R_{jk} R_{ki})^{\beta} \\ & \operatorname{ECF}(N,\beta) = \sum_{\operatorname{sets of } N} (N \text{ energies}) \times \left(\begin{pmatrix} N \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \operatorname{angles} \right)^{\beta} \end{split}$$

Define (double) ratio = [ECF(N+1)/ECF(N)]/[ECF(N)/ECF(N-1)]

$$C_N^{(\beta)} = \frac{\text{ECF}(N+1,\beta) \text{ECF}(N-1,\beta)}{\text{ECF}(N,\beta)^2}$$
 Analogous to N-subjettiness ratio

The energy correlation double ratio C_N effectively measures higher-order radiation from leading order (LO) substructure. For a system with N subjets, the LO substructure consists of N hard prongs, so if C_N is small, then the higher-order radiation must be soft or collinear with respect to the LO structure. If C_N is large, then the higher-order radiation is not strongly-ordered with respect to the LO structure, so the system has more than N subjets. Thus, if C_N is small and C_{N-1} is large, then <u>a</u>ge can say that a system has N subjets.

ECF

For this multiple soft radiation case, with only 1 **real** subjet



$$C_2 > \tau_{21}$$

Nsubjettiness will identify this as more 2 subjet-like while ECF will identify more as 1 subjet-like

D-observables are further optimised by exploiting boostinvariance of the difference of one and two prong

ECF results





apologies for omitted taggers, arguable links, etc.

HEPTopTagger

Browsing through all the branches of jet recombination history:



HEPTopTagger results



 $\langle \mu \rangle$



What does HEP in HEPTopTagger stand for?

Shower deconstruction



Top quark jet shower history

Light quark jet shower history



Shower deconstruction

- Decompose the largeradius jet into small radius subjets.
- Build all possible shower histories with the subjets.
- Assign probability whether signal-like or background-like.
- A single analytic function:

 $\chi(\{p\}_N) = \frac{P(\{p\}_N | \mathbf{S})}{P(\{p\}_N | \mathbf{R})}$









SD with data



Signal over background discrimination



Tagger Comparison (W)



Tagger comparison (top)



Better top quark finding efficiency with SD at the same rejection of multijets when compared to other taggers

Example: top tagging in ATLAS



	•	
Iroining	Innut	arouno
	1111111	
- runn y	IIIput	MICUPO
- J		3 - 1 -

	W Boson Tagging								Top Quark Tagging													
	DNN Test Groups							Choser	n Inputs	DNN Test Groups									Chosen Inputs			
Observable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	BDT	DNN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	BDT	DNN
m ^{comb}	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
p_{T}	0	0			0	0		0	0	0	0			0	0			0	0	0	0	0
<i>e</i> ₃	0	0				0			0						0			0		0	0	0
C_2			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0		0
D_2			0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0		0
τ_1	0	0				0			0	0					0			0		0		0
τ_2	0	0				0			0						0			0		0	0	0
$ au_3$															0			0		0		0
$ au_{21}$			0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0
$ au_{32}$												0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0
$R_2^{\rm FW}$			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
$\bar{\mathcal{P}}$			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
a_3			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
A			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
Zcut			0	0	0		0	0	0		0											
$\sqrt{d_{12}}$		0				0	0	0	0	0	0					0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\sqrt{d_{23}}$																0	0	0	0	0	0	0
KtDR		0				0	0	0	0	0	0											
Q_w																0	0	0	0	0	0	0

http://atlas.web.cern.ch/Atlas/GROUPS/PHYSICS/PAPERS/JETM-2018-03/

Example: top tagging in ATLAS



Example: tagging in CMS



DeepAK8: a multiclass classifier for the identification of hadronically decaying particles with five main categories, W/Z/ H/t/other. A mass-decorrelated related version as well.

https://cms-results.web.cern.ch/cms-results/public-results/publications/JME-18-002/

Example: top tagging in CMS



Example: top tagging in CMS



Experimental Considerations in Jet Tagging
Truth Labelling

- In order to calculate the efficiency of the taggers, the labelling of the initiating particle is necessary.
- Three step process: match jets to truth jets, truth jets to truth top/W, then partonic decay products of top/W to match jets. Rather generator dependent.
- Update: b-hadron ghost associated, and mass/kt splitting scale requirments.

Truth Labelling



Containment



Mass Sculpting

- Jet mass dependence of tagging efficiency
- Difficulty for analyses using sideband for background estimation or bumphunting



Modelling Dependance



Modelling Dependance



Uncertainties

