Machine Learning on data with sPlot background subtraction
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ABSTRACT: Data analysis in high energy physics often deals with data samples consisting of a mixture of signal and background events. The sPlot technique is a common method to subtract the contribution of the background by assigning weights to events. Part of the weights are by design negative. Negative weights lead to the divergence of some machine learning algorithms training due to absence of the lower bound in the loss function. In this paper we propose a mathematically rigorous way to train machine learning algorithms on data samples with background described by sPlot to obtain signal probabilities conditioned on observables, without encountering negative event weight at all. This allows usage of any out-of-the-box machine learning methods on such data.
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1 Introduction

Experimental data obtained in high energy physics experiments usually consists of contributions from different event sources. We consider the case, where the distribution of some variables is known for each source and call these variables discriminative. Usually, the variable is the reconstructed invariant mass, and the probability densities are estimated by a maximum likelihood fit. The distribution of other (control) variables also presents interest, as an analysis quality check or a training sample of a machine learning algorithm. The sPlot technique [1] allows to reconstruct the distribution of the control variables, provided they are independent of the discriminative variables. sPlot assigns weights (sWeights) to events, some of them negative. This does not present a problem for simple one-dimensional analysis tools, like histograms, but is an obstacle for multivariate machine learning methods that require the loss function to be bounded from below.

This paper is structured as following. In section 2 we briefly introduce the sPlot technique. In section 3 we describe the literature concerning machine learning on data weighted with the sPlot. In section 4 we discuss the implications of negative event weights on training of machine learning methods.
algorithms. In section 5 we propose methods to robustly obtain class probabilities conditioned on the control variables. In section 6 we present experimental results that demonstrate practical viability of the proposed method.

2 sPlot

Take a dataset populated by events from two sources, signal and background. Let \( M \) be the set of discriminative variables. Let \( P \) by the matrix of class probabilities obtained from the discriminative variables:

\[
P = \begin{bmatrix}
    p_{1,1} & 1 - p_{1,1} & \text{events 1} \\
    p_{2,1} & 1 - p_{2,1} & \text{events 2} \\
    p_{3,1} & 1 - p_{3,1} & \text{events 3} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \vdots
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Then the sWeights are obtained using the following linear transformation:

\[
sWeights = P \cdot \left( \left( P^T \cdot P \right)^{-1} \cdot \left[ \sum_i p_{i,1}, \sum_i 1 - p_{i,1} \right] \right)
\]

If the dataset is weighted with the sWeights, the distribution of the control variables will be an unbiased estimate of the distribution of pure signal. An example of sPlot application is presented on figure 1.

![Figure 1](image)

**Figure 1**: An example of sPlot application. To the left: the known distributions of \( m \). To the right: the mixture and reconstructed distribution of \( x \).

3 Related work

There are several works concerning machine learning and sWeights: [2–5]. They propose a training procedure for the case where a classifier is desired to separate the same signal and background
that are defined by the sPlot. Take each event twice, once as signal, once as background with the corresponding sWeights, then train the classifier as usual. The works also demonstrate practical viability of using machine learning methods on data weighted with sPlot. They, however, do not attempt to analyze the core issue of negative weights impact on machine learning algorithms, limiting themselves to requiring that the classifier supports negative weights. One of them [3] makes an erroneous claim on the subject: "a negative weight of an event in a certain class is always complemented by a larger positive weight when combining the weights of all other classes. Thus, negative sWeights do not remove the lower bound of the loss function." Let us consider an event with positive signal weight $w_s > 0$ and negative background weight $w_b < 0$ and the classic cross-entropy loss function:

$$L = -w_s \log(p_s) - w_b \log(1 - p_s),$$

where $p_s$ is the model output – the predicted probability of this event being signal.

$$\lim_{p_s \to 1} L = -(-|w_b|) \lim_{p_s \to 1} \log(1 - p_s) = -\infty.$$

4 The problem of negative weights

As shown in section 3, directly incorporating sWeights into the cross-entropy loss causes it to lose the lower bound. The same holds for the mean squared error and other losses without an upper bound in the unweighted case. Training most machine learning algorithms is an optimization problem, and, for some algorithms, such as a large-capacity fully-connected neural network, negative event weights make this optimization problem ill-defined, as the underlying optimization target loses the lower bound as well. An example illustrating diverging training is present on figure 2.

However, most machine learning algorithms do not blindly minimize the loss value on the training dataset, as this is likely to lead to overfitting. They add various regularization terms to the optimized functional that, in general, penalize model complexity or overconfidence. We are not aware of peer-reviewed literature exploring the impact of regularization on learning with negative weights. One such technique appears in discussions within the High Energy Physics community [6]. They propose avoiding the unbounded loss by requiring leafs of decision tree to have positive total weight. It is also possible to regularize neural networks into having bounded loss. For example, by using the L2 regularization on weights and taking the root of the degree equal to the number of layers plus one from the cross-entropy loss.

Nevertheless, it is unclear how negative weights combined with such regularization would affect classifier performance. A more detailed study falls outside of the scope of this paper, which presents a principled approach to avoid the problem entirely.

5 Our approaches

5.1 sWeights averaging (Constrained MSE)

Let $m$ be the variable that was used to compute the sWeights, $x$ the rest of the variables.

It can be shown that:

$$\mathbb{E}_m [w(m) \mid x] = \frac{p_{\text{signal}}(x)}{p_{\text{mix}}(x)},$$

(5.1)
Figure 2: Learning curves of a neural network trained on the Higgs dataset using the true labels and the artificially introduced sWeights. The model training using the sWeights as event weights quickly diverges in contrast to the same model training using the true labels or our losses. The latter does not even start to overfit – the test score keeps climbing, while the former’s test score becomes essentially random noise. Likelihood and Constrained MSE methods are described in section 5, the dataset in section 6, and the network in B.

The formal proof is available in A.1. Notice, that the right-hand side of (5.1) is the optimal output of a classifier, while the left-hand side can be estimated by a regression model. Our first proposed approach is to perform mean-square regression directly on sWeights. Since the optimal output lies in \([0, 1]\), one can easily avoid a priori incorrect solutions by, for example, applying sigmoid function to the model output. The resulting loss function is the following:

\[
L = \sum_i \left( w_i - \frac{e^{f_\theta(x_i)}}{1 + e^{f_\theta(x_i)}} \right)^2 ,
\]

where \(w_i\) is the sWeight and \(f_\theta(x_i)\) is the model output. This loss has been implemented for the Catboost machine learning library \([7]\) and is available on GitHub.\(^1\)

5.2 Exact maximum likelihood

Alternatively, one can invoke Maximum Likelihood principle and avoid the sPlot technique altogether. Which leads to the following loss function (derivation is in A.2):

\[
L(\theta) = -\sum_i \log \left[ f_\theta(x_i)p_{signal}(m_i) + (1 - f_\theta(x_i))p_{background}(m_i) \right] ,
\]

\(^1\)https://github.com/kazeevn/catboost/tree/constrained_regression
Figure 3: Experimental evaluation of performance of different loss functions on the Higgs dataset as a function of train dataset size. True labels – logloss using the true labels; Likelihood – our likelihood (5.3); Constrained MSE – our regression on sWeights (5.2); sWeight – cross-entropy weighted with sWeights, it is not reported for the neural network due to divergence of optimization and, hence, highly stochastic nature of the results.

where \( f_\theta(x_i) \) is the output of the model; \( p_{\text{signal}}(m_i) \) and \( p_{\text{background}}(m_i) \) are the probability densities of the signal and background \( m \) distributions.

Note, that by substituting \( p_{\text{signal}}|_{\text{background}}(m_i) \) by the class indicator \( (y_i = 1 \text{ if } x_i \text{ is a signal sample, } y_i = 0 \text{ otherwise}) \) in loss (5.3), a conventional expression for cross-entropy loss can be obtained.

6 Experimental evaluation

To demonstrate viability of our methods on practical problems, we tested them on the ATLAS Higgs dataset [8]. We used neural network and gradient boosting models, their detailed description is in B. The dataset is the largest open dataset from the field of High-Energy Physics. It has 28 tabular features. We split it into train and test parts containing \( 8.8 \cdot 10^6 \) and \( 2.2 \cdot 10^6 \) events respectively. The dataset is labeled and it does not feature sWeights, so we introduced them artificially. For both signal and background events we added a virtual "mass" distributed as shown on figure 1 and used it to compute sWeights.

The results are presented on figures 2 and 3. The code of the experiments is available on GitHub.\(^2\)

\(^2\)https://github.com/yandexdataschool/ML-sWeights-experiments
7 Conclusion

Training a machine learning algorithm on a dataset with negative weights means dealing with a loss that potentially has no lower bound. The implications depend on the algorithm in question. In our experiments, neural network training diverges, while gradient boosting over oblivious decision trees does not.

Our contribution is the two loss functions that allow a machine learning algorithm to obtain class probabilities from background-subtracted data without encountering negative event weight at all. They pave a rigorous way to use any machine learning methods on such data.
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A Proofs

A.1 Constrained MSE

Let \( m \) be the variable that was used to compute the sWeights, \( x \) be the rest of variables and \( f(x) \) is any smooth function of \( x \).

\[
E_{x-p_{\text{sig}}}(f(x)) = \int dx f(x)p_{\text{sig}}(x)
\]
define

\[
W(x) = \frac{p_{\text{sig}}(x)}{p_{\text{mix}}(x)}
\]

Then

\[
E_{x-p_{\text{sig}}}(f(x)) = \int dx f(x)W(x)p_{\text{mix}}(x)
\]

(A.1)

By definition of sWeights:

\[
E_{x-p_{\text{sig}}}(f(x)) = \int dm \cdot w(m)f(x)p_{\text{mix}}(x,m),
\]

where \( w(m) \) is the sWeight.

Rearrange the multipliers in the double integral:

\[
E_{x-p_{\text{sig}}}(f(x)) = \int dx \int dm w(m)f(x)p_{\text{mix}}(x,m|x)
\]

From equation A.1

\[
\int dx f(x)W(x)p_{\text{mix}}(x) = \int dx f(x)p_{\text{mix}}(x) \int dm w(m)p_{\text{mix}}(m|x)
\]

Therefore,

\[
W(x) = \int dm w(m)p_{\text{mix}}(m|x) = \mathbb{E}_m(\text{sWeight}(x,m))
\]

A.2 Exact maximum likelihood

Let us denote signal and background classes as \( S \) and \( B \), model parameters as \( \theta \). By definition on the log-likelihood log-likelihood \( l(\theta) \):

\[
l(\theta) = \sum_i \log p(x_i, m_i | \theta) = \sum_i \log [p(x_i, m_i | \theta, S)P(S) + p(x_i, m_i | \theta, B)P(B)].
\]

(A.2)
Since $x_i$ and $m_i$ are assumed to be independent within individual classes, expression (A.2) can be simplified further:

$$
l(\theta) = \sum_i \log \left[ p(x_i \mid \theta, S)p(m_i \mid S)P(S) + p(x_i \mid \theta, B)p(m_i \mid B)P(B) \right] = \\
\sum_i \log \left[ P(S \mid x_i, \theta)p(m_i \mid S)p(x_i) + P(B \mid x_i, \theta)p(m_i \mid B)p(x_i) \right] = \\
\sum_i \log \left[ P(S \mid x_i, \theta)p(m_i \mid S) + P(B \mid x_i, \theta)p(m_i \mid B) \right] + \text{const}, \quad (A.3)
$$

which leads to the following loss function:

$$
L(\theta) = -\sum_i \log \left[ f_\theta(x_i)p(m_i \mid S) + (1 - f_\theta(x_i))p(m_i \mid B) \right] \quad (A.4)
$$

### B Models parameters

- Fully-connected neural network (NN): 3 layers, 128, 64, 32 neurons in layer, leaky ReLu (0.05), optimized by adam [9] algorithm with learning rate $10^{-3}$, $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$, trained for 32 epochs;

- Catboost: 1000 trees, leaf_estimation_method="Gradient", version 0.10.2 with our losses added and check for negative weights removed: https://github.com/kazeevn/catboost/tree/constrained_regression