

**Faculty of Physics** 



### Machine Learning based Unfolding to reduce noise on lattice QCD observables

Simran Singh *(University of Bielefeld)* 

*work done with* Christian Schmidt

41st Lattice Conference @ University of Liverpool

July , 2024

# **Outline**

- I. Proposed solution : Machine Learning based unfolding
- II. The problem : Noisy trace estimation with few sources
- III. Distribution of noise vectors and their correlations
- IV. The method applied to mock matrices data
- V. Using lattice data
- VI. Summary

# Machine Learning based Unfolding I

‣ Unfolding : Inversion problem aimed at getting *genuine physics* data from *measured smeared* data

$$
X_{observed} = P \circledast Y_{true} \leq 1. \text{ Identify } P^{-1} \text{ for given } (x_i, y_i)
$$
\n
$$
X_{observed} = P \circledast Y_{true} \leq 2. \text{ Apply } P^{-1} X_i \text{ to get } Y_i
$$

- ‣ Used extensively in particle physics experiments to de-correlate *detector defects* from measurements
- ‣ Both ML and non-ML (IBU, TUnfold, SVD …) algorithms exist for data unfolding
- ‣ Main advantage of ML based unfolding : *no binning of data required*!





# Machine Learning based Unfolding II

#### I. Re-weighting approach II. Generative approach

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS 124, 182001 (2020)

OmniFold: A Method to Simultaneously Unfold All Observables Anders Andreassen  $\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{1}, 2, 3, *$  Patrick T. Komiske  $\mathbf{Q}, 4, †$  Eric M. Metodiev  $\mathbf{Q}, 4, †$  Benjamin Nachman  $\mathbf{Q}, 2,$ § and Jesse Thaler  $\mathbf{Q}, 4, \parallel$ Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA <sup>2</sup>

#### $\Omega_{\text{N}}$  physical Laboratory,  $\Omega_{\text{N}}$ Google, Mountain View, California 94043, USA <sup>4</sup> **simulated phys. data w/o**



obtaining the set of  $\mathbf{r}$  $\blacktriangleright$  The final goal  $\blacktriangleright$  $\cdot$  The final goal :

$$
p_{unfold}^{(n)}(x) = w_n \otimes p_{gen}(x)
$$

‣ Two popular methods - Schrödinger bridges and Direct Diffusion

Improving Generative Model-based Unfolding with Schrödinger Bridges Sascha Diefenbacher,<sup>1,\*</sup> Guan-Horng Liu,<sup>2,†</sup> Vinicius Mikuni,<sup>3,‡</sup> Benjamin Nachman,<sup>1,4,§</sup> and Weili Nie<sup>5,¶</sup> **SciPost Physics Submission**

#### Kicking it Off(-shell) with Direct Diffusion<br>Ania Butter<sup>1,3</sup> Tomáš Ježo<sup>2</sup> Michael Klasen<sup>2</sup>

Mathias Kuschick<sup>2</sup>, Sofia Palacios Schweitzer<sup>1</sup>, and Tilman Plehn<sup>1</sup> section measurements. Two main approaches have emerged in this research area: one based on Anja Butter<sup>1,3</sup>, Tomáš Ježo<sup>2</sup>, Michael Klasen<sup>2</sup>,

- better to regions of phase space with little data. We propose to use Schr¨odinger Bridges and  $2$ oth ot those mothods aim to combine  $\overline{\rm \nu}$ uli verative models. The key feature of  $\overline{\rm \nu}$ is the case for normalizing flows and standard direction models. We show that SBU needs that SBU needs achieve excellent performance compared to state of the art methods on a synthetic *Z*+jets dataset.  $\mathcal{F}$  to enother  $\mathcal{F}$  wis  $\mathcal{F}$  and Correcting detector e↵ects – called *deconvolution* or  $\bigcap_{\alpha}$  of the central statistical tasks in the contract in cross section in particle, nuclear, nuclear, nuclear, nuclear, nuclear, nuclear,  $\sim$ trophysics. Classical unfolding methods are based on  $m$   $v$  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ **• Both of these methods aim to** morph one non-trivial distribution **same time, challenging to simulate. We show how a generative diffusion network learns**  $p_{\textit{oon}}$  to allother  $p_{\textit{sim}}$  via JDL and  $\delta$ **c**  $\delta$ *f* ODE respectively  $p_{gen}^{}$  to another  $p_{sim}^{}$  via SDE and
- potential to revolutionize di↵erential cross section mea- $\mathbf{A}$  surements by the angle  $\mathbf{A}$  $\blacksquare$  . A number of machine learning  $\blacksquare$ folding techniques have been proposed for  $\mathbf{1}$  $\mathbb{R}$  for an overview) and the OmniFold method  $\mathbb{R}$  $\mathbb{R}$  recently been applied to the studies of  $\mathbb{R}$  $\mathbb{R}$   $\blacksquare$   $\$ *<sup>p</sup>*˜sim.(*x*) ⌘ <sup>R</sup> <sup>d</sup>*z p*sim.(*x, z*) ⌫*i*(*z*)  $P_{data}(y)$  to ge  $\sim$  ADDIV the final to  $D_{data}(V)$  to get  $\alpha$  **b**  $\alpha$ **s 3**  $\mathbf{I}$  unjoin  $\mathbf{v}$  $\cdot$  Apply the map to  $p_{data}(y)$  to get *punfold*(*x*)

histograms, which result in binned measurements in a small number of dimensions. Machine learning has the

4

### Lattice observables via trace estimation

- Observables in lattice QCD calculations can often be expressed as derivatives of ln , e.g. quark number density : *Z* ∂ ln det *Mf* ∂*μ<sup>f</sup>*  $= Tr \left(M_f^{-1}\right)$ *f* ∂*Mf*  $\partial \mu_f$  )
- **•** Typical size of Fermion matrices **:**  $N_{\sigma}^3 \times N_{\tau} \times N_c \times 4$ , can go up to ~  $O(10^7 - 10^9)$
- **‣** *Estimating* the trace of the *inverse* of such large matrices is only accessible through "random noise method" that requires drawing random vectors  $\eta_i^n$  (i<sup>th</sup> component of the  $n<sup>th</sup>$  vector) which satisfy

$$
\langle \eta_i \rangle = \lim_{L \to \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{m=1}^L \eta_i^m = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \eta_i \eta_j \rangle = \lim_{L \to \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{m=1}^L \eta_i^m \eta_j^m = \delta_{ij}
$$

### Noisy trace estimation with few sources

 $\rightarrow$  The goal is to draw  $L < N$  (linear dimension of M) vectors to estimate

$$
\langle \eta^T M \eta \rangle_L \simeq Tr M + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{f(M)}{\sqrt{L}}\right) \quad \text{involy get the true}
$$
\n
$$
\langle \eta_i M_{i,i} \eta_i \rangle \sim M_{i,i} \quad \langle \eta_i M_{i,j} \eta_j \rangle_{i \neq j} \sim 0
$$

- ‣ Why is it important to try and use less random vectors?
- ‣ On the lattice we have extra steps to reach the observable !
- Need to estimate traces of  $M^{-1}$ ,  $M^{-1}\frac{\partial M}{\partial u}$  ... ∂*μ*
- $\cdot$  First we need to solve  $Mx = \eta^l$  , as many times, using CG, as the sources to get *x* and construct the estimator  $\langle \eta x \rangle$

# Can Machine Learning help ?

• The idea to reduce the number noise vectors to estimate the trace using *machine learnt probe vectors* is not new



 $h$ ong of troj  $\mathbf{N}$  applications require the matrix whose explicit form is not given but only its not given but only effect of small number of random vectors is available. An example is the inverse calculation of the inverse calcul  $\frac{1}{2}$  diraction  $\frac{1}{2}$ . The Dirac matrix is lattice quantum chromodynamics ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )  $\frac{1}{2}$ ‣ The idea of this project was to look at the distributions of traces with varying number of sources - in the hope of training a NN to *unlearn* the

$$
\langle \eta^T M \eta \rangle_{L_1} = f_{L_1, L_2} \otimes \langle \eta^T M \eta \rangle_{L_2} \quad \text{when} \quad L_1 < L_2
$$

# Distribution of random vectors & correlations

‣ **Observation I** : Distributions change with L *non-trivially* and depend on the random sources rather than matrix structure



## Distribution of random vectors & correlations



# Distribution of random vectors & correlations

‣ **Observation II** : Distributions differ for different L - *not an artefact of low statistics !*



• As L *increases*, skewness *decreases* and binder cumulant *increases* 

# Results for mock matrices I

‣ A simple fully connected, network with 3 hidden layers



‣ Training : Iteratively update the network parameters to minimize the difference || A L1 - L2 || to learn A 35



11

# Results for mock matrices II

‣ The same model applied to other matrices or different structures and sizes



# Lattice data : What happens here?

- ‣ To apply this to lattice we need data in the form of various independent sets of measurements for different number of random sources
- ‣ Using data from our (Bielefeld Parma collaboration ) recent imaginary *μ* simulations [arXiv:<u>2405.10196</u>] Complex  $\mu \rightarrow$  complex traces !
- ‣ Can we spilt the analysis into real and imaginary parts of observables since Trace and  $E$  are linear operation?





# Lattice data : What happens here?

- ‣ Although distributions not like mock data low statistics and/or no fixed matrix?
- ‣ What does the model learn?



## Summary

- Invitation to consider the well-developed Unfolding algorithms developed by the experimental community to lattice problems like inversion
- Motivate the problem of trace estimation as a "detector defect" problem that can be unfolded
- ‣ Some success on mock matrix data
- ‣ Lattice : There is no fixed matrix as each gauge configuration has statistical fluctuations. This adds a dimension of complexity not present in the mock data
- ‣ Can one think of other ways to improve the Hutchinson trace estimator?

A BOUND FOR THE ERROR IN THE NORMAL APPROXIMATION TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF A SUM OF DEPENDENT RANDOM VARIABLES

> CHARLES STEIN STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Bernoulli Society for Mathematical Statistics and Probability

On Stein's method for products of normal random variables and zero bias couplings Author(s): ROBERT E. GAUNT

 $\mathbf{D}$  is defined and the other more and the other more abstract. In the other Section 3, bounds are obtained under certain conditions for the departure of the distribution of the sum of  $\mathbf{I}$ • Data from other projects very welcome