# EVENT CLASSIFICATION PART II

Monday, February 27, 2012

# FINAL PROJECT

- Placed an ntuple on blackboard under the folder Final Project
- Simulated LHC data your job is to convince me for evidence of particle production (of both known and unknown particles!)
- See instructions for detail due one week from Tuesday

# DISCRIMINANT

- Say we have two hypothesis for what an event is:
  - background H0
  - signal H1
- Some variable or discriminant which we can classify the event as more likely signal or background
- This can be a function of many variables but now the question is how to optimally separate the two



 $R_0$  (accept  $H_0$ )  $R_1$  (reject  $H_0$ )

### DEFINITIONS

Significance Level: Probability to reject H0 when it is true...

$$\alpha = \int_{R_1} f(y|H_0) dy$$

Power: Probability to accept H0 when H1 is true...

$$\beta = \int_{R_0} f(y|H_1) dy$$

# PURITY/ MISCLASSIFICATION RATE

- Consider the probability that an event is correctly assigned
- We can use Bayes' theorem to calculate this  $P(s|x \in R_1) = \frac{P(x \in R_1|s)P(s)}{P(x \in R_1|s)P(s) + P(x \in R_0|b)P(b)}$
- Note that purity depends on prior probability (i.e. s and b cross-sections)

### CHOOSING ONE ...



• Characterize the performance by plotting the efficiency versus rejection. Best to be in the upper right hand corner!

• Can use area under curve as a measure of quality

# NEYMAN-PERSON LEMMA

- The Neyman-Pearson lemma states: to obtain the highest background rejection for a given signal efficiency (highest power for a given significance level), choose the acceptance region for signal choosing c for a given efficiency
- Equivalently , it states that the optimal discriminant is given by the ratio of probabilities or the likelihood ratio

 $\frac{p(\vec{x}|s)}{p(\vec{x}|b)} > c$ 



#### Prior odds

# Posterior odds



Likelihood / Ratio Since we can't change the prior odds making a cut on the likelihood ratio is equivalent to maximizing the posterior odds of the event classification

#### SO THEN WHAT

- The problem is that we usually don't have explicit formulae for the pdfs p(x | s), p(x | b), so for a given x we can't evaluate the likelihood ratio.
- Instead we may have Monte Carlo models for signal and background processes, so we can produce simulated data:

generate 
$$\vec{x} \sim p(\vec{x}|s) \longrightarrow \vec{x_{1,\dots,x_{N_s}}}$$
 "training data"  
generate  $\vec{x} \sim p(\vec{x}|b) \longrightarrow \vec{x_{1,\dots,x_{N_b}}}$  events of known type

### COMPROMISE

• Simulate monte carlo events and get an approximate pdf

 Or form a test statistic from those approximate pdfs

# FISHER DISCRIMINANT

- Form a test statistic which is a weighted sum of the inputs
- Want large separation between mean value and small variance
- So maximize:

$$J(\vec{w}) = \frac{(\tau_{s} - \tau_{b})^{2}}{\Sigma_{s}^{2} + \Sigma_{b}^{2}}$$

$$y(\vec{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i = \vec{w}^T \vec{x}$$



### CALCULATION

$$(\mu_k)_i = \int x_i p(\vec{x}|H_k) d\vec{x} \qquad \text{mean, covariance of } x$$
$$(V_k)_{ij} = \int (x - \mu_k)_i (x - \mu_k)_j p(\vec{x}|H_k) d\vec{x}$$

 Making the optimal selection reduces to the problem of finding the optimal weights of the variables

$$\tau_k = \int y(\vec{x}) p(\vec{x}|H_k) d\vec{x} = \vec{w}^T \vec{\mu}_k$$

$$\Sigma_{k}^{2} = \int (y(\vec{x}) - \tau_{k})^{s} p(\vec{x}|H_{k}) d\vec{x} = \vec{w}^{T} V_{k} \vec{w}$$

### CONTINUED...

$$(\tau_{0} - \tau_{1})^{2} = \sum_{i, j=1}^{n} w_{i} w_{j} (\mu_{0} - \mu_{1})_{i} (\mu_{0} - \mu_{1})_{j}$$
  
'between' classes  
$$= \sum_{i, j=1}^{n} w_{i} w_{j} B_{ij} = \vec{w}^{T} B \vec{w}$$

and the denominator is

'within' classes

$$\Sigma_{0}^{2} + \Sigma_{1}^{2} = \sum_{i, j=1}^{n} w_{i} w_{j} (V_{0} + V_{1})_{ij} = \vec{w}^{T} W \vec{w}$$

→ maximize  $J(\vec{w}) = \frac{\vec{w}^T B \vec{w}}{\vec{w}^T W \vec{w}} = \frac{\text{separation between classes}}{\text{separation within classes}}$ 

### EXAMPLE



### LOG LIKELIHOOD



Monday, February 27, 2012

### FINALLY



0.9

D<sub>LB</sub>

Monday, February 27, 2012