

# Boosted decision trees

Yann Coadou

CPPM Marseille



European School of Instrumentation  
in Particle & Astroparticle Physics

Archamps, 7 February 2017





**esipap**...  
European School of Instrumentation  
in Particle & Astroparticle Physics

---

**PHYSICS OF PARTICLE AND  
ASTROPARTICLE DETECTORS**  
— 23 January to 17 February 2017  
4 WEEK COURSE

---

**TECHNOLOGIES & APPLICATIONS**  
— 20 February to 17 March 2017  
4 SEPARATE MODULES :

<b>Module 1</b> Detector Technologies & Electronics 20 to 24 February	<b>Module 2</b> Real Time Computing & Data Handling 27 February to 3 March	<b>Module 3</b> Mechanics & Medical Applications 6 to 10 March	<b>Module 4</b> Offline Computing 13 to 17 March
--	---	--	---

**FEES**  
200 / 500€  
per Module  
(student / Prof)

**APPLY NOW**

[www.esi-archamps.eu](http://www.esi-archamps.eu)



ESI / ESIPAP - octobre 2016  
Credits photo : ESIPAP - Cern  
[www.indelebile-creation.com](http://www.indelebile-creation.com)

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Growing a tree
- 3 Tree (in)stability
- 4 Boosting
- 5 BDT performance
- 6 Concrete examples
- 7 Other averaging techniques
- 8 BDTs in real physics cases
- 9 BDT systematics
- 10 Software
- 11 Conclusion
- 12 References



**!!! VERY IMPORTANT !!!**

**Understand your inputs well  
before you start playing with multivariate techniques**

## Decision tree origin

- Machine-learning technique, widely used in social sciences. Originally data mining/pattern recognition, then medical diagnostic, insurance/loan screening, etc.



L. Breiman *et al.*, “Classification and Regression Trees” (1984)

## Basic principle

- Extend cut-based selection
  - many (most?) events do not have *all* characteristics of signal or background
  - try not to rule out events failing a particular criterion
- Keep events rejected by one criterion and see whether other criteria could help classify them properly

## Binary trees

- Trees can be built with branches splitting into many sub-branches
- In this lecture: mostly binary trees

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Growing a tree**
- 3 Tree (in)stability
- 4 Boosting
- 5 BDT performance
- 6 Concrete examples
- 7 Other averaging techniques
- 8 BDTs in real physics cases
- 9 BDT systematics
- 10 Software
- 11 Conclusion
- 12 References

## Start with all events (signal and background) = first (root) node

- sort all events by each variable
- for each variable, find splitting value with best separation between two children
  - mostly signal in one child
  - mostly background in the other
- select variable and splitting value with best separation, produce two branches (nodes)
  - events failing criterion on one side
  - events passing it on the other

## Keep splitting

- Now have two new nodes. Repeat algorithm recursively on each node
- Can reuse the same variable
- Iterate until stopping criterion is reached
- Splitting stops: terminal node = leaf

- Consider signal ( $s_i$ ) and background ( $b_j$ ) events described by 3 variables:  $p_T$  of leading jet, top mass  $M_t$  and scalar sum of  $p_T$ 's of all objects in the event  $H_T$



- Consider signal ( $s_i$ ) and background ( $b_j$ ) events described by 3 variables:  $p_T$  of leading jet, top mass  $M_t$  and scalar sum of  $p_T$ 's of all objects in the event  $H_T$ 
  - sort all events by each variable:
    - $p_T^{s_1} \leq p_T^{b_{34}} \leq \dots \leq p_T^{b_2} \leq p_T^{s_{12}}$
    - $H_T^{b_5} \leq H_T^{b_3} \leq \dots \leq H_T^{s_{67}} \leq H_T^{s_{43}}$
    - $M_t^{b_6} \leq M_t^{s_8} \leq \dots \leq M_t^{s_{12}} \leq M_t^{b_9}$






- Consider signal ( $s_i$ ) and background ( $b_j$ ) events described by 3 variables:  $p_T$  of leading jet, top mass  $M_t$  and scalar sum of  $p_T$ 's of all objects in the event  $H_T$ 
  - sort all events by each variable:
    - $p_T^{s_1} \leq p_T^{b_{34}} \leq \dots \leq p_T^{b_2} \leq p_T^{s_{12}}$
    - $H_T^{b_5} \leq H_T^{b_3} \leq \dots \leq H_T^{s_{67}} \leq H_T^{s_{43}}$
    - $M_t^{b_6} \leq M_t^{s_8} \leq \dots \leq M_t^{s_{12}} \leq M_t^{b_9}$
  - best split (arbitrary unit):
    - $p_T < 56$  GeV, separation = 3
    - $H_T < 242$  GeV, separation = 5
    - $M_t < 105$  GeV, separation = 0.7




- Consider signal ( $s_i$ ) and background ( $b_j$ ) events described by 3 variables:  $p_T$  of leading jet, top mass  $M_t$  and scalar sum of  $p_T$ 's of all objects in the event  $H_T$ 
  - sort all events by each variable:
    - $p_T^{s_1} \leq p_T^{b_{34}} \leq \dots \leq p_T^{b_2} \leq p_T^{s_{12}}$
    - $H_T^{b_5} \leq H_T^{b_3} \leq \dots \leq H_T^{s_{67}} \leq H_T^{s_{43}}$
    - $M_t^{b_6} \leq M_t^{s_8} \leq \dots \leq M_t^{s_{12}} \leq M_t^{b_9}$
  - best split (arbitrary unit):
    - $p_T < 56 \text{ GeV}$ , separation = 3
    - $H_T < 242 \text{ GeV}$ , separation = 5
    - $M_t < 105 \text{ GeV}$ , separation = 0.7




- Consider signal ( $s_i$ ) and background ( $b_j$ ) events described by 3 variables:  $p_T$  of leading jet, top mass  $M_t$  and scalar sum of  $p_T$ 's of all objects in the event  $H_T$ 
  - sort all events by each variable:
    - $p_T^{s_1} \leq p_T^{b_{34}} \leq \dots \leq p_T^{b_2} \leq p_T^{s_{12}}$
    - $H_T^{b_5} \leq H_T^{b_3} \leq \dots \leq H_T^{s_{67}} \leq H_T^{s_{43}}$
    - $M_t^{b_6} \leq M_t^{s_8} \leq \dots \leq M_t^{s_{12}} \leq M_t^{b_9}$
  - best split (arbitrary unit):
    - $p_T < 56$  GeV, separation = 3
    - $H_T < 242$  GeV, separation = 5
    - $M_t < 105$  GeV, separation = 0.7
  - split events in two branches: pass or fail  $H_T < 242$  GeV



- Consider signal ( $s_i$ ) and background ( $b_j$ ) events described by 3 variables:  $p_T$  of leading jet, top mass  $M_t$  and scalar sum of  $p_T$ 's of all objects in the event  $H_T$ 
  - sort all events by each variable:
    - $p_T^{s_1} \leq p_T^{b_{34}} \leq \dots \leq p_T^{b_2} \leq p_T^{s_{12}}$
    - $H_T^{b_5} \leq H_T^{b_3} \leq \dots \leq H_T^{s_{67}} \leq H_T^{s_{43}}$
    - $M_t^{b_6} \leq M_t^{s_8} \leq \dots \leq M_t^{s_{12}} \leq M_t^{b_9}$
  - best split (arbitrary unit):
    - $p_T < 56$  GeV, separation = 3
    - $H_T < 242$  GeV, separation = 5
    - $M_t < 105$  GeV, separation = 0.7
  - split events in two branches: pass or fail  $H_T < 242$  GeV
- Repeat recursively on each node



- Consider signal ( $s_j$ ) and background ( $b_j$ ) events described by 3 variables:  $p_T$  of leading jet, top mass  $M_t$  and scalar sum of  $p_T$ 's of all objects in the event  $H_T$ 
  - sort all events by each variable:
    - $p_T^{s_1} \leq p_T^{b_{34}} \leq \dots \leq p_T^{b_2} \leq p_T^{s_{12}}$
    - $H_T^{b_5} \leq H_T^{b_3} \leq \dots \leq H_T^{s_{67}} \leq H_T^{s_{43}}$
    - $M_t^{b_6} \leq M_t^{s_8} \leq \dots \leq M_t^{s_{12}} \leq M_t^{b_9}$
  - best split (arbitrary unit):
    - $p_T < 56$  GeV, separation = 3
    - $H_T < 242$  GeV, separation = 5
    - $M_t < 105$  GeV, separation = 0.7
  - split events in two branches: pass or fail  $H_T < 242$  GeV
- Repeat recursively on each node
- Splitting stops: e.g. events with  $H_T < 242$  GeV and  $M_t > 162$  GeV are signal like ( $p = 0.82$ )



## Run event through tree

- Start from root node
- Apply first best cut
- Go to left or right child node
- Apply best cut for this node
- ...Keep going until...
- Event ends up in leaf

## DT Output

- Purity ( $\frac{s}{s+b}$ , with weighted events) of leaf, close to 1 for signal and 0 for background
- or binary answer (discriminant function +1 for signal, -1 or 0 for background) based on purity above/below specified value (e.g.  $\frac{1}{2}$ ) in leaf
- E.g. events with  $H_T < 242$  GeV and  $M_t > 162$  GeV have a DT output of 0.82 or +1

## Normalization of signal and background before training

- same total weight for signal and background events ( $p = 0.5$ , maximal mixing)

## Selection of splits

- list of questions ( $variable_i < cut_i?$ , “Is the sky blue or overcast?”)
- goodness of split (separation measure)

## Decision to stop splitting (declare a node terminal)

- minimum leaf size (for statistical significance, e.g. 100 events)
- insufficient improvement from further splitting
- perfect classification (all events in leaf belong to same class)
- maximal tree depth (like-size trees choice or computing concerns)

## Assignment of terminal node to a class

- signal leaf if purity  $> 0.5$ , background otherwise

## Impurity measure $i(t)$

- maximal for equal mix of signal and background
- symmetric in  $p_{\text{signal}}$  and  $p_{\text{background}}$
- minimal for node with either signal only or background only
- strictly concave  $\Rightarrow$  reward purer nodes (favours end cuts with one smaller node and one larger node)

## Optimal split: figure of merit

- Decrease of impurity for split  $s$  of node  $t$  into children  $t_P$  and  $t_F$  (goodness of split):
$$\Delta i(s, t) = i(t) - p_P \cdot i(t_P) - p_F \cdot i(t_F)$$
- Aim: find split  $s^*$  such that:
$$\Delta i(s^*, t) = \max_{s \in \{\text{splits}\}} \Delta i(s, t)$$

## Stopping condition

- See previous slide
- When not enough improvement ( $\Delta i(s^*, t) < \beta$ )
- Careful with early-stopping conditions

- Maximising  $\Delta i(s, t) \equiv$  minimizing overall tree impurity



## Node purity

- Signal (background) event  $i$  with weight  $w_s^i$  ( $w_b^i$ )

$$p = \frac{\sum_{i \in \text{signal}} w_s^i}{\sum_{i \in \text{signal}} w_s^i + \sum_{j \in \text{bkg}} w_b^j}$$

- Signal purity (= purity)


$$p_s = p = \frac{s}{s+b}$$

- Background purity

$$p_b = \frac{b}{s+b} = 1 - p_s = 1 - p$$

## Common impurity functions

- misclassification error  
 $= 1 - \max(p, 1 - p)$
- (cross) entropy  
 $= - \sum_{i=s,b} p_i \log p_i$
- Gini index



- Also cross section ( $-\frac{s^2}{s+b}$ ) and excess significance ( $-\frac{s^2}{b}$ )

## Defined for many classes

- $$\text{Gini} = \sum_{i,j \in \{\text{classes}\}}^{i \neq j} p_i p_j$$

## Statistical interpretation

- Assign random object to class  $i$  with probability  $p_i$ .
- Probability that it is actually in class  $j$  is  $p_j$
- $\Rightarrow$  Gini = probability of misclassification

## For two classes (signal and background)

- $i = s, b$  and  $p_s = p = 1 - p_b$
- $\Rightarrow \text{Gini} = 1 - \sum_{i=s,b} p_i^2 = 2p(1 - p) = \frac{2sb}{(s+b)^2}$
- Most popular in DT implementations
- Usually similar performance to e.g. entropy

## Reminder

- Need model giving good description of data

## Reminder

- Need model giving good description of data

## Playing with variables

- Number of variables:
  - not affected too much by “curse of dimensionality”
  - CPU consumption scales as  $nN \log N$  with  $n$  variables and  $N$  training events
- Insensitive to duplicate variables (give same ordering  $\Rightarrow$  same DT)
- Variable order does not matter: all variables treated equal
- Order of training events is irrelevant (batch training)
- Irrelevant variables:
  - no discriminative power  $\Rightarrow$  not used
  - only costs a little CPU time, no added noise
- Can use continuous and discrete variables, simultaneously

## Transforming input variables

- Completely insensitive to the replacement of any subset of input variables by (possibly different) arbitrary strictly monotone functions of them:
  - let  $f : x_i \rightarrow f(x_i)$  be strictly monotone
  - if  $x > y$  then  $f(x) > f(y)$
  - ordering of events by  $x_i$  is the same as by  $f(x_i)$
  - $\Rightarrow$  produces the same DT
- Examples:
  - convert MeV  $\rightarrow$  GeV
  - no need to make all variables fit in the same range
  - no need to regularise variables (e.g. taking the log)
- $\Rightarrow$  Some immunity against outliers

## Transforming input variables

- Completely insensitive to the replacement of any subset of input variables by (possibly different) arbitrary strictly monotone functions of them:
  - let  $f : x_i \rightarrow f(x_i)$  be strictly monotone
  - if  $x > y$  then  $f(x) > f(y)$
  - ordering of events by  $x_i$  is the same as by  $f(x_i)$
  - $\Rightarrow$  produces the same DT
- Examples:
  - convert MeV  $\rightarrow$  GeV
  - no need to make all variables fit in the same range
  - no need to regularise variables (e.g. taking the log)
- $\Rightarrow$  Some immunity against outliers

## Note about actual implementation

- The above is strictly true only if testing all possible cut values
- If there is some computational optimisation (e.g., check only 20 possible cuts on each variable), it may not work anymore.

## Variable ranking

- Ranking of  $x_i$ : add up decrease of impurity each time  $x_i$  is used
- Largest decrease of impurity = best variable

## Shortcoming: masking of variables

- $x_j$  may be just a little worse than  $x_i$  but will never be picked
- $x_j$  is ranked as irrelevant
- But remove  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  becomes very relevant  
⇒ careful with interpreting ranking

## Solution: surrogate split

- Compare which events are sent left or right by optimal split and by any other split
- Give higher score to split that mimics better the optimal split
- Highest score = surrogate split
- Can be included in variable ranking
- Helps in case of missing data: replace optimal split by surrogate

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Growing a tree
- 3 Tree (in)stability**
- 4 Boosting
- 5 BDT performance
- 6 Concrete examples
- 7 Other averaging techniques
- 8 BDTs in real physics cases
- 9 BDT systematics
- 10 Software
- 11 Conclusion
- 12 References



- Small changes in sample can lead to very different tree structures
- Performance on testing events may be as good, or not
- Not optimal to understand data from DT rules
- Does not give confidence in result:
  - DT output distribution discrete by nature
  - granularity related to tree complexity
  - tendency to have spikes at certain purity values (or just two delta functions at  $\pm 1$  if not using purity)

- Possible to get a perfect classifier on training events
- Mathematically misclassification error can be made as little as wanted
- E.g. tree with one class only per leaf (down to 1 event per leaf if necessary)
- Training error is zero
- But run new independent events through tree (testing or validation sample): misclassification is probably  $> 0$ , overtraining
- Pruning: eliminate subtrees (branches) that seem too specific to training sample:
  - a node and all its descendants turn into a leaf

## Pre-pruning

- Stop tree growth during building phase
- Already seen: minimum leaf size, minimum separation improvement, maximum depth, etc.
- Careful: early stopping condition may prevent from discovering further useful splitting

## Expected error pruning

- Grow full tree
- When result from children not significantly different from result of parent, prune children
- Can measure statistical error estimate with binomial error  $\sqrt{p(1-p)/N}$  for node with purity  $p$  and  $N$  training events
- No need for testing sample
- Known to be “too aggressive”

- Idea: penalise “complex” trees (many nodes/leaves) and find compromise between good fit to training data (larger tree) and good generalisation properties (smaller tree)
- With misclassification rate  $R(T)$  of subtree  $T$  (with  $N_T$  nodes) of fully grown tree  $T_{max}$ :

$$\text{cost complexity } R_\alpha(T) = R(T) + \alpha N_T$$

$\alpha$  = complexity parameter


- Minimise  $R_\alpha(T)$ :
  - small  $\alpha$ : pick  $T_{max}$
  - large  $\alpha$ : keep root node only,  $T_{max}$  fully pruned
- First-pass pruning, for terminal nodes  $t_L, t_R$  from split of  $t$ :
  - by construction  $R(t) \geq R(t_L) + R(t_R)$
  - if  $R(t) = R(t_L) + R(t_R)$  prune off  $t_L$  and  $t_R$

- For node  $t$  and subtree  $T_t$ :
  - if  $t$  non-terminal,  $R(t) > R(T_t)$  by construction
  - $R_\alpha(\{t\}) = R_\alpha(t) = R(t) + \alpha$  ( $N_T = 1$ )
  - if  $R_\alpha(T_t) < R_\alpha(t)$  then branch has smaller cost-complexity than single node and should be kept
  - at critical  $\alpha = \rho_t$ , node is preferable
  - to find  $\rho_t$ , solve  $R_{\rho_t}(T_t) = R_{\rho_t}(t)$ , or:  $\rho_t = \frac{R(t) - R(T_t)}{N_T - 1}$
  - node with smallest  $\rho_t$  is *weakest link* and gets pruned
  - apply recursively till you get to the root node
- This generates sequence of decreasing cost-complexity subtrees
- Compute their true misclassification rate on validation sample:
  - will first decrease with cost-complexity
  - then goes through a minimum and increases again
  - pick this tree at the minimum as the best pruned tree


Note: best pruned tree may not be optimal in a forest

# Decision tree score card


- ✓ Training is fast
- ✓ Human readable (not a black box, can interpret tree as selection rules or physics)
- ✓ Deals with continuous and discrete variables simultaneously
- ✓ No need to transform inputs
- ✓ Resistant to irrelevant variables
- ✓ Works well with many variables
- ✗ Good variables can be masked
- ✓ Very few parameters
- ✗ Not that “original” in HEP anymore
- ✗ Unstable tree structure
- ✗ Piecewise nature of output
- ✗ Need at least as many training examples as variations in target function



- One tree:
  - one information about event (one leaf)
  - cannot really generalise to variations not covered in training set (at most as many leaves as input size)
- Many trees:
  - **distributed representation**: number of intersections of leaves exponential in number of trees
  - many leaves contain the event  $\Rightarrow$  richer description of input pattern



- Build several trees and average the output



- K-fold cross-validation (good for small samples)
  - divide training sample  $\mathcal{L}$  in  $K$  subsets of equal size:  $\mathcal{L} = \bigcup_{k=1..K} \mathcal{L}_k$
  - Train tree  $T_k$  on  $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{L}_k$ , test on  $\mathcal{L}_k$
  - DT output =  $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1..K} T_k$
- Bagging, boosting, random forests, etc.



- 1 Introduction
- 2 Growing a tree
- 3 Tree (in)stability
- 4 Boosting**
- 5 BDT performance
- 6 Concrete examples
- 7 Other averaging techniques
- 8 BDTs in real physics cases
- 9 BDT systematics
- 10 Software
- 11 Conclusion
- 12 References

## First provable algorithm by Schapire (1990)

- Train classifier  $T_1$  on  $N$  events
- Train  $T_2$  on new  $N$ -sample, half of which misclassified by  $T_1$
- Build  $T_3$  on events where  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  disagree
- Boosted classifier: MajorityVote( $T_1, T_2, T_3$ )

## First provable algorithm by Schapire (1990)

- Train classifier  $T_1$  on  $N$  events
- Train  $T_2$  on new  $N$ -sample, half of which misclassified by  $T_1$
- Build  $T_3$  on events where  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  disagree
- Boosted classifier: MajorityVote( $T_1, T_2, T_3$ )

## Then

- Variation by Freund (1995): boost by majority (combining many learners with fixed error rate)
- Freund&Schapire joined forces: 1<sup>st</sup> functional model **AdaBoost** (1996)

# A brief history of boosting

## First provable algorithm by Schapire (1990)

- Train classifier  $T_1$  on  $N$  events
- Train  $T_2$  on new  $N$ -sample, half of which misclassified by  $T_1$
- Build  $T_3$  on events where  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  disagree
- Boosted classifier: MajorityVote( $T_1, T_2, T_3$ )

## Then

- Variation by Freund (1995): boost by majority (combining many learners with fixed error rate)
- Freund&Schapire joined forces: 1<sup>st</sup> functional model **AdaBoost** (1996)

## When it really picked up in HEP

- MiniBooNe compared performance of different boosting algorithms and neural networks for particle ID (2005)
- D0 claimed first evidence for single top quark production (2006)
- CDF copied 😊 (2008). Both used BDT for single top observation

## What is boosting?

- General method, not limited to decision trees
- Hard to make a very good learner, but easy to make simple, error-prone ones (but still better than random guessing)
- Goal: combine such weak classifiers into a new more stable one, with smaller error

## Algorithm

- Training sample  $\mathbb{T}_k$  of  $N$  events. For  $i^{th}$  event:
  - weight  $w_i^k$
  - vector of discriminative variables  $x_i$
  - class label  $y_i = +1$  for signal,  $-1$  for background
- Pseudocode:
  - Initialise  $\mathbb{T}_1$
  - for  $k$  in  $1..N_{tree}$ 
    - train classifier  $T_k$  on  $\mathbb{T}_k$
    - assign weight  $\alpha_k$  to  $T_k$
    - modify  $\mathbb{T}_k$  into  $\mathbb{T}_{k+1}$
- Boosted output:  $F(T_1, \dots, T_{N_{tree}})$

- Introduced by Freund&Schapire in 1996
- Stands for *adaptive boosting*
- Learning procedure adjusts to training data to classify it better
- Many variations on the same theme for actual implementation
- Most common boosting algorithm around
- Usually leads to better results than without boosting

- Check which events of training sample  $\mathbb{T}_k$  are misclassified by  $T_k$ :
  - $\mathbb{I}(X) = 1$  if  $X$  is true, 0 otherwise
  - for DT output in  $\{\pm 1\}$ :  $\text{isMisclassified}_k(i) = \mathbb{I}(y_i \times T_k(x_i) \leq 0)$
  - or  $\text{isMisclassified}_k(i) = \mathbb{I}(y_i \times (T_k(x_i) - 0.5) \leq 0)$  in purity convention
  - misclassification rate:

$$R(T_k) = \varepsilon_k = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i^k \times \text{isMisclassified}_k(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i^k}$$

- Derive tree weight  $\alpha_k = \beta \times \ln((1 - \varepsilon_k)/\varepsilon_k)$
- Increase weight of misclassified events in  $\mathbb{T}_k$  to create  $\mathbb{T}_{k+1}$ :

$$w_i^k \rightarrow w_i^{k+1} = w_i^k \times e^{\alpha_k}$$

- Train  $T_{k+1}$  on  $\mathbb{T}_{k+1}$
- Boosted result of event  $i$ :

$$T(i) = \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{tree}}} \alpha_k} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{tree}}} \alpha_k T_k(i)$$

- Assume  $\beta = 1$

## Not-so-good classifier

- Assume error rate  $\varepsilon = 40\%$
- Then  $\alpha = \ln \frac{1-0.4}{0.4} = 0.4$
- Misclassified events get their weight multiplied by  $e^{0.4}=1.5$
- $\Rightarrow$  next tree will have to work a bit harder on these events

## Good classifier

- Error rate  $\varepsilon = 5\%$
- Then  $\alpha = \ln \frac{1-0.05}{0.05} = 2.9$
- Misclassified events get their weight multiplied by  $e^{2.9}=19 (!!)$
- $\Rightarrow$  being failed by a good classifier means a big penalty:
  - must be a difficult case
  - next tree will have to pay much more attention to this event and try to get it right




## Misclassification rate $\varepsilon$ on training sample

- Can be shown to be bound:
$$\varepsilon \leq \prod_{k=1}^{N_{tree}} 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_k(1 - \varepsilon_k)}$$
- If each tree has  $\varepsilon_k \neq 0.5$  (i.e. better than random guessing):  
*the error rate falls to zero for sufficiently large  $N_{tree}$*
- Corollary: training data is over fitted

## Overtraining?


- Error rate on test sample may reach a minimum and then potentially rise. Stop boosting at the minimum.
- In principle AdaBoost *must* overfit training sample
- In many cases in literature, no loss of performance due to overtraining
  - may have to do with fact that successive trees get in general smaller and smaller weights
  - trees that lead to overtraining contribute very little to final DT output on validation sample

Efficiency vs. background fraction




- Clear overtraining, but still better performance after boosting

# Cross section significance $\left(s/\sqrt{s+b}\right)$




- More relevant than testing error
- Reaches plateau
- Afterwards, boosting does not hurt (just wasted CPU)
- Applicable to any other figure of merit of interest for your use case

Misclassification rate for each tree







Tree weight  $\alpha_k$




- First tree is best, others are minor corrections
- Specialised trees do not perform well on most events  $\Rightarrow$  decreasing tree weight and increasing misclassification rate
- Last tree is not better evolution of first tree, but rather a pretty bad DT that only does a good job on few cases that the other trees could not get right

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Growing a tree
- 3 Tree (in)stability
- 4 Boosting
- 5 BDT performance
- 6 Concrete examples**
- 7 Other averaging techniques
- 8 BDTs in real physics cases
- 9 BDT systematics
- 10 Software
- 11 Conclusion
- 12 References









- Specialised trees









# Concrete example: XOR



# Concrete example: XOR





# Concrete example: XOR with 100 events





## Small statistics

- Single tree or Fischer discriminant not so good
- BDT very good: high performance discriminant from combination of weak classifiers




- Using TMVA and create\_circ macro from `$ROOTSYS/tmva/test/createData.C` (`$ROOTSYS/tutorials/tmva/createData.C` in latest ROOT versions) to generate dataset
- Plots: `TMVA::TMVAGui("filename")`




## Boosting longer

- Compare performance of Fisher discriminant, single DT and BDT with more and more trees (5 to 400)
- All other parameters at TMVA default (would be 400 trees)




- Fisher bad (expected)
- Single (small) DT: not so good
- More trees  $\Rightarrow$  improve performance until saturation



- Fisher bad (expected)
- Note: max tree depth = 3
- Single (small) DT: not so good. Note: a larger tree would solve this problem
- More trees  $\Rightarrow$  improve performance (less step-like, closer to optimal separation) until saturation
- Largest BDTs: wiggle a little around the contour  $\Rightarrow$  picked up features of training sample, that is, overtraining


## Training/testing output



- Better shape with more trees: quasi-continuous
  - Overtraining because of disagreement between training and testing?
- Let's see




## Performance in optimal significance




- Best significance actually obtained with last BDT, 400 trees!
- But to be fair, equivalent performance with 10 trees already
- Less “stepped” output desirable?  $\Rightarrow$  maybe 50 is reasonable

- Boosting weight decreases fast and stabilises
- First trees have small error fractions, then increases towards 0.5 (random guess)
- $\Rightarrow$  confirms that best trees are first ones, others are small corrections

Boost weights vs tree




error fraction vs tree number



## Separation criterion for node splitting

- Compare performance of Gini, entropy, misclassification error,  $\frac{s}{\sqrt{s+b}}$
- All other parameters at TMVA default


Background rejection versus Signal efficiency




- Very similar performance (even zooming on corner)
- Small degradation (in this particular case) for  $\frac{s}{\sqrt{s+b}}$ : only criterion that does not respect good properties of impurity measure (see earlier: maximal for equal mix of signal and bkg, symmetric in  $p_{sig}$  and  $p_{bkg}$ , minimal for node with either signal only or bkg only, strictly concave)

## Performance in optimal significance


Cut efficiencies and optimal cut value




Cut efficiencies and optimal cut value




Cut efficiencies and optimal cut value



Cut efficiencies and optimal cut value





Cut efficiencies and optimal cut value



- Confirms previous page: very similar performance, worse for BDT optimised with significance!

# Many small trees or fewer large trees?

- Using same `create_circ` macro but generating larger dataset to avoid stats limitations
- 20 or 400 trees; minimum leaf size: 10 or 500 events
- Maximum depth (max number of cuts to reach leaf): 3 or 20




- Overall: very comparable performance. Depends on use case.

# TMVA code example




```
TFile* outputFile = TFile::Open("output.root","RECREATE");  
TMVA::Factory *factory = new TMVA::Factory( "TMVAClassification", outputFile,  
      "!V:Color:DrawProgressBar:Transformations=I:AnalysisType=Classification");
```

```
TFile* outputFile = TFile::Open("output.root","RECREATE");
TMVA::Factory *factory = new TMVA::Factory( "TMVAClassification", outputFile,
      "!V:Color:DrawProgressBar:Transformations=I:AnalysisType=Classification");
TFile* inputFile = new TFile("../copy_from_macros/dataSchachbrett.root");
TTree* sig = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeS");
TTree* bkg = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeB");
double sigWeight = 1.0;
double bkgWeight = 1.0;
factory->SetInputTrees(sig, bkg, sigWeight, bkgWeight);
```




```
TFile* outputFile = TFile::Open("output.root","RECREATE");
TMVA::Factory *factory = new TMVA::Factory( "TMVAClassification", outputFile,
    "!V:Color:DrawProgressBar:Transformations=I:AnalysisType=Classification");
TFile* inputFile = new TFile("../copy_from_macros/dataSchachbrett.root");
TTree* sig = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeS");
TTree* bkg = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeB");
double sigWeight = 1.0;
double bkgWeight = 1.0;
factory->SetInputTrees(sig, bkg, sigWeight, bkgWeight);
factory->AddVariable("var0", 'F');
factory->AddVariable("var1", 'F');
TCut mycut = "";
```






# TMVA code example


```
TFile* outputFile = TFile::Open("output.root","RECREATE");
TMVA::Factory *factory = new TMVA::Factory( "TMVAClassification", outputFile,
    "!V:Color:DrawProgressBar:Transformations=I:AnalysisType=Classification");
TFile* inputFile = new TFile("../copy_from_macros/dataSchachbrett.root");
TTree* sig = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeS");
TTree* bkg = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeB");
double sigWeight = 1.0;
double bkgWeight = 1.0;
factory->SetInputTrees(sig, bkg, sigWeight, bkgWeight);
factory->AddVariable("var0", 'F');
factory->AddVariable("var1", 'F');
TCut mycut = "";
factory->PrepareTrainingAndTestTree(mycut,"SplitMode=Random:NormMode=EqualNumEvents
```



```
TFile* outputFile = TFile::Open("output.root","RECREATE");
TMVA::Factory *factory = new TMVA::Factory( "TMVAClassification", outputFile,
    "!V:Color:DrawProgressBar:Transformations=I:AnalysisType=Classification");
TFile* inputFile = new TFile("../copy_from_macros/dataSchachbrett.root");
TTree* sig = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeS");
TTree* bkg = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeB");
double sigWeight = 1.0;
double bkgWeight = 1.0;
factory->SetInputTrees(sig, bkg, sigWeight, bkgWeight);
factory->AddVariable("var0", 'F');
factory->AddVariable("var1", 'F');
TCut mycut = "";
factory->PrepareTrainingAndTestTree(mycut,"SplitMode=Random:NormMode=EqualNumEvents
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kBDT, "BDT", "!H:!V:NTrees=400:MinNodeSize=4%:
    MaxDepth=5:BoostType=AdaBoost:AdaBoostBeta=0.15:nCuts=80");
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kFisher, "Fisher", "H:!V:Fisher");
```




```
TFile* outputFile = TFile::Open("output.root","RECREATE");
TMVA::Factory *factory = new TMVA::Factory( "TMVAClassification", outputFile,
    "!V:Color:DrawProgressBar:Transformations=I:AnalysisType=Classification");
TFile* inputFile = new TFile("../copy_from_macros/dataSchachbrett.root");
TTree* sig = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeS");
TTree* bkg = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeB");
double sigWeight = 1.0;
double bkgWeight = 1.0;
factory->SetInputTrees(sig, bkg, sigWeight, bkgWeight);
factory->AddVariable("var0", 'F');
factory->AddVariable("var1", 'F');
TCut mycut = "";
factory->PrepareTrainingAndTestTree(mycut,"SplitMode=Random:NormMode=EqualNumEvents
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kBDT, "BDT", "!H:!V:NTrees=400:MinNodeSize=4%:
    MaxDepth=5:BoostType=AdaBoost:AdaBoostBeta=0.15:nCuts=80");
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kFisher, "Fisher", "H:!V:Fisher");
// Train MVAs using the set of training events
factory->TrainAllMethods();
```




# TMVA code example

```
TFile* outputFile = TFile::Open("output.root","RECREATE");
TMVA::Factory *factory = new TMVA::Factory( "TMVAClassification", outputFile,
    "!V:Color:DrawProgressBar:Transformations=I:AnalysisType=Classification");
TFile* inputFile = new TFile("../copy_from_macros/dataSchachbrett.root");
TTree* sig = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeS");
TTree* bkg = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeB");
double sigWeight = 1.0;
double bkgWeight = 1.0;
factory->SetInputTrees(sig, bkg, sigWeight, bkgWeight);
factory->AddVariable("var0", 'F');
factory->AddVariable("var1", 'F');
TCut mycut = "";
factory->PrepareTrainingAndTestTree(mycut,"SplitMode=Random:NormMode=EqualNumEvents
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kBDT, "BDT", "!H:!V:NTrees=400:MinNodeSize=4%:
    MaxDepth=5:BoostType=AdaBoost:AdaBoostBeta=0.15:nCuts=80");
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kFisher, "Fisher", "H:!V:Fisher");
// Train MVAs using the set of training events
factory->TrainAllMethods();
// ---- Evaluate all MVAs using the set of test events
factory->TestAllMethods();
```




# TMVA code example

```
TFile* outputFile = TFile::Open("output.root","RECREATE");
TMVA::Factory *factory = new TMVA::Factory( "TMVAClassification", outputFile,
    "!V:Color:DrawProgressBar:Transformations=I:AnalysisType=Classification");
TFile* inputFile = new TFile("../copy_from_macros/dataSchachbrett.root");
TTree* sig = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeS");
TTree* bkg = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeB");
double sigWeight = 1.0;
double bkgWeight = 1.0;
factory->SetInputTrees(sig, bkg, sigWeight, bkgWeight);
factory->AddVariable("var0", 'F');
factory->AddVariable("var1", 'F');
TCut mycut = "";
factory->PrepareTrainingAndTestTree(mycut,"SplitMode=Random:NormMode=EqualNumEvents
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kBDT, "BDT", "!H:!V:NTrees=400:MinNodeSize=4%:
    MaxDepth=5:BoostType=AdaBoost:AdaBoostBeta=0.15:nCuts=80");
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kFisher, "Fisher", "H:!V:Fisher");
// Train MVAs using the set of training events
factory->TrainAllMethods();
// ---- Evaluate all MVAs using the set of test events
factory->TestAllMethods();
// ----- Evaluate and compare performance of all configured MVAs
factory->EvaluateAllMethods();
```




# TMVA code example

```
TFile* outputFile = TFile::Open("output.root","RECREATE");
TMVA::Factory *factory = new TMVA::Factory( "TMVAClassification", outputFile,
    "!V:Color:DrawProgressBar:Transformations=I:AnalysisType=Classification");
TFile* inputFile = new TFile("../copy_from_macros/dataSchachbrett.root");
TTree* sig = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeS");
TTree* bkg = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeB");
double sigWeight = 1.0;
double bkgWeight = 1.0;
factory->SetInputTrees(sig, bkg, sigWeight, bkgWeight);
factory->AddVariable("var0", 'F');
factory->AddVariable("var1", 'F');
TCut mycut = "";
factory->PrepareTrainingAndTestTree(mycut,"SplitMode=Random:NormMode=EqualNumEvents
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kBDT, "BDT", "!H:!V:NTrees=400:MinNodeSize=4%:
    MaxDepth=5:BoostType=AdaBoost:AdaBoostBeta=0.15:nCuts=80");
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kFisher, "Fisher", "H:!V:Fisher");
// Train MVAs using the set of training events
factory->TrainAllMethods();
// ---- Evaluate all MVAs using the set of test events
factory->TestAllMethods();
// ----- Evaluate and compare performance of all configured MVAs
factory->EvaluateAllMethods();
outputFile->Close();
delete factory;
```



# TMVA code example

```
TFile* outputFile = TFile::Open("output.root","RECREATE");
TMVA::Factory *factory = new TMVA::Factory( "TMVAClassification", outputFile,
    "!V:Color:DrawProgressBar:Transformations=I:AnalysisType=Classification");
TFile* inputFile = new TFile("../copy_from_macros/dataSchachbrett.root");
TTree* sig = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeS");
TTree* bkg = (TTree*)inputFile->Get("TreeB");
double sigWeight = 1.0;
double bkgWeight = 1.0;
factory->SetInputTrees(sig, bkg, sigWeight, bkgWeight);
factory->AddVariable("var0", 'F');
factory->AddVariable("var1", 'F');
TCut mycut = "";
factory->PrepareTrainingAndTestTree(mycut,"SplitMode=Random:NormMode=EqualNumEvents
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kBDT, "BDT", "!H:!V:NTrees=400:MinNodeSize=4%:
    MaxDepth=5:BoostType=AdaBoost:AdaBoostBeta=0.15:nCuts=80");
factory->BookMethod(TMVA::Types::kFisher, "Fisher", "H:!V:Fisher");
// Train MVAs using the set of training events
factory->TrainAllMethods();
// ---- Evaluate all MVAs using the set of test events
factory->TestAllMethods();
// ----- Evaluate and compare performance of all configured MVAs
factory->EvaluateAllMethods();
outputFile->Close();
delete factory;
```



**TMVA::TMVAGui("output.root");**

## $\varepsilon$ -Boost (shrinkage)

- reweight misclassified events by a fixed  $e^{2\varepsilon}$  factor
- $T(i) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{tree}}} \varepsilon T_k(i)$

## $\varepsilon$ -LogitBoost

- reweight misclassified events by logistic function  $\frac{e^{-y_i T_k(x_i)}}{1 + e^{-y_i T_k(x_i)}}$
- $T(i) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{tree}}} \varepsilon T_k(i)$

## Real AdaBoost

- DT output is  $T_k(i) = 0.5 \times \ln \frac{p_k(i)}{1 - p_k(i)}$  where  $p_k(i)$  is purity of leaf on which event  $i$  falls
- reweight events by  $e^{-y_i T_k(i)}$
- $T(i) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{tree}}} T_k(i)$
- $\varepsilon$ -HingeBoost, LogitBoost, Gentle AdaBoost, GradientBoost, etc.



## Bagging (Bootstrap aggregating)

- Before building tree  $T_k$  take random sample of  $N$  events from training sample with replacement
- Train  $T_k$  on it
- Events not picked form “out of bag” validation sample

## Bagging (Bootstrap aggregating)

- Before building tree  $T_k$  take random sample of  $N$  events from training sample with replacement
- Train  $T_k$  on it
- Events not picked form “out of bag” validation sample

## Random forests

- Same as bagging
- In addition, pick random subset of variables to consider for each node split
- Two levels of randomisation, much more stable output

## Bagging (Bootstrap aggregating)

- Before building tree  $T_k$  take random sample of  $N$  events from training sample with replacement
- Train  $T_k$  on it
- Events not picked form “out of bag” validation sample

## Random forests

- Same as bagging
- In addition, pick random subset of variables to consider for each node split
- Two levels of randomisation, much more stable output

## Trimming



- Not exactly the same. Used to speed up training
- After some boosting, very few high weight events may contribute
- $\Rightarrow$  ignore events with too small a weight

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Growing a tree
- 3 Tree (in)stability
- 4 Boosting
- 5 BDT performance
- 6 Concrete examples
- 7 Other averaging techniques
- 8 BDTs in real physics cases**
- 9 BDT systematics
- 10 Software
- 11 Conclusion
- 12 References

# Single top production evidence at D0 (2006)

- Three multivariate techniques:  
BDT, Matrix Elements, BNN
- Most sensitive: BDT

$\sigma_{s+t} = 4.9 \pm 1.4 \text{ pb}$   
 $p\text{-value} = 0.035\% (3.4\sigma)$   
 SM compatibility: 11% ( $1.3\sigma$ )



$$\sigma_s = 1.0 \pm 0.9 \text{ pb}$$

$$\sigma_t = 4.2^{+1.8}_{-1.4} \text{ pb}$$

► Phys. Rev. D78, 012005 (2008)

## Object Kinematics

$p_T(\text{jet1})$   
 $p_T(\text{jet2})$   
 $p_T(\text{jet3})$   
 $p_T(\text{jet4})$   
 $p_T(\text{best1})$   
 $p_T(\text{notbest1})$   
 $p_T(\text{notbest2})$   
 $p_T(\text{tag1})$   
 $p_T(\text{untag1})$   
 $p_T(\text{untag2})$

## Angular Correlations

$\Delta R(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2})$   
 $\cos(\text{best1}, \text{lepton})_{\text{besttop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{best1}, \text{notbest1})_{\text{besttop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{tag1}, \text{alljets})_{\text{alljets}}$   
 $\cos(\text{tag1}, \text{lepton})_{\text{btaggedtop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{jet1}, \text{alljets})_{\text{alljets}}$   
 $\cos(\text{jet1}, \text{lepton})_{\text{btaggedtop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{jet2}, \text{alljets})_{\text{alljets}}$   
 $\cos(\text{jet2}, \text{lepton})_{\text{btaggedtop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{lepton}, Q(\text{lepton}) \times z)_{\text{besttop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{lepton}_{\text{besttop}}, \text{besttop}_{\text{CMframe}})$   
 $\cos(\text{lepton}_{\text{btaggedtop}}, \text{btaggedtop}_{\text{CMframe}})$   
 $\cos(\text{notbest}, \text{alljets})_{\text{alljets}}$   
 $\cos(\text{notbest}, \text{lepton})_{\text{besttop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{untag1}, \text{alljets})_{\text{alljets}}$   
 $\cos(\text{untag1}, \text{lepton})_{\text{btaggedtop}}$

## Event Kinematics

Aplanarity(alljets,  $W$ )  
 $M(W, \text{best1})$  ("best" top mass)  
 $M(W, \text{tag1})$  ("b-tagged" top mass)  
 $H_T(\text{alljets})$   
 $H_T(\text{alljets} - \text{best1})$   
 $H_T(\text{alljets} - \text{tag1})$   
 $H_T(\text{alljets}, W)$   
 $H_T(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2})$   
 $H_T(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2}, W)$   
 $M(\text{alljets})$   
 $M(\text{alljets} - \text{best1})$   
 $M(\text{alljets} - \text{tag1})$   
 $M(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2})$   
 $M(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2}, W)$   
 $M_T(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2})$   
 $M_T(W)$   
Missing  $E_T$   
 $p_T(\text{alljets} - \text{best1})$   
 $p_T(\text{alljets} - \text{tag1})$   
 $p_T(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2})$   
 $Q(\text{lepton}) \times \eta(\text{untag1})$   
 $\sqrt{s}$   
Sphericity(alljets,  $W$ )

- Adding variables did not degrade performance
- Tested shorter lists, lost some sensitivity
- Same list used for all channels

## Object Kinematics

$p_T(\text{jet1})$   
 $p_T(\text{jet2})$   
 $p_T(\text{jet3})$   
 $p_T(\text{jet4})$   
 $p_T(\text{best1})$   
 $p_T(\text{notbest1})$   
 $p_T(\text{notbest2})$   
 $p_T(\text{tag1})$   
 $p_T(\text{untag1})$   
 $p_T(\text{untag2})$

## Angular Correlations



$\Delta R(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2})$   
 $\cos(\text{best1}, \text{lepton})_{\text{besttop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{best1}, \text{notbest1})_{\text{besttop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{tag1}, \text{alljets})_{\text{alljets}}$   
 $\cos(\text{tag1}, \text{lepton})_{\text{btaggedtop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{jet1}, \text{alljets})_{\text{alljets}}$   
 $\cos(\text{jet1}, \text{lepton})_{\text{btaggedtop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{jet2}, \text{alljets})_{\text{alljets}}$   
 $\cos(\text{jet2}, \text{lepton})_{\text{btaggedtop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{lepton}, Q(\text{lepton}) \times z)_{\text{besttop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{lepton}_{\text{besttop}}, \text{besttop}_{\text{CMframe}})$   
 $\cos(\text{lepton}_{\text{btaggedtop}}, \text{btaggedtop}_{\text{CMframe}})$   
 $\cos(\text{notbest}, \text{alljets})_{\text{alljets}}$   
 $\cos(\text{notbest}, \text{lepton})_{\text{besttop}}$   
 $\cos(\text{untag1}, \text{alljets})_{\text{alljets}}$   
 $\cos(\text{untag1}, \text{lepton})_{\text{btaggedtop}}$

## Event Kinematics

$\text{Aplanarity}(\text{alljets}, W)$   
 $M(W, \text{best1})$  (“best” top mass)  
 $M(W, \text{tag1})$  (“b-tagged” top mass)  
 $H_T(\text{alljets})$   
 $H_T(\text{alljets} - \text{best1})$   
 $H_T(\text{alljets} - \text{tag1})$   
 $H_T(\text{alljets}, W)$   
 $H_T(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2})$   
 $H_T(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2}, W)$   
 $M(\text{alljets})$   
 $M(\text{alljets} - \text{best1})$   
 $M(\text{alljets} - \text{tag1})$   
 $M(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2})$   
 $M(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2}, W)$   
 $M_T(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2})$   
 $M_T(W)$   
 $\text{Missing } E_T$   
 $p_T(\text{alljets} - \text{best1})$   
 $p_T(\text{alljets} - \text{tag1})$   
 $p_T(\text{jet1}, \text{jet2})$   
 $Q(\text{lepton}) \times \eta(\text{untag1})$   
 $\sqrt{s}$   
 $\text{Sphericity}(\text{alljets}, W)$

- Adding variables did not degrade performance
- Tested shorter lists, lost some sensitivity
- Same list used for all channels
- Best theoretical variable:  $H_T(\text{alljets}, W)$ . But detector not perfect  $\Rightarrow$  capture the essence from several variations usually helps “dumb” MVA


- Validate method on data in no-signal region
- “ **$W$ +jets**”: = 2 jets,  
 $H_T(\text{lepton}, \cancel{E}_T, \text{all jets}) < 175 \text{ GeV}$
- “ **$t\bar{t}$ bar**”: = 4 jets,  
 $H_T(\text{lepton}, \cancel{E}_T, \text{all jets}) > 300 \text{ GeV}$



- Good agreement




# Boosted decision tree event characteristics




- High BDT region = shows masses of real  $t$  and  $W \Rightarrow$  expected
- Low BDT region = background-like  $\Rightarrow$  expected

# Boosted decision tree event characteristics




- High BDT region = shows masses of real  $t$  and  $W \Rightarrow$  expected
- Low BDT region = background-like  $\Rightarrow$  expected
- Above does NOT tell analysis is ok, but not seeing this could be a sign of a problem

# Comparison for D0 single top evidence





- Cannot know *a priori* which method will work best
- $\Rightarrow$  Need to experiment with different techniques

Power curve




## ATLAS tau identification

- Now used both offline and online
- Systematics: propagate various detector/theory effects to BDT output and measure variation






## ATLAS $Wt$ production evidence

- Phys.Lett. B716 (2012) 142-159
- BDT output used in final fit to measure cross section
- Constraints on systematics from profiling



► Phys.Lett. B717 (2012) 89-108




- BDT for tau ID: one to reject electrons, one against jets
- Fit BDT output to get tau contribution in data



► CMS-PAS-HIG-13-001



Hard to use more BDT in an analysis:

- vertex selected with BDT
- 2<sup>nd</sup> vertex BDT to estimate probability to be within 1cm of interaction point
- photon ID with BDT
- photon energy corrected with BDT regression
- event-by-event energy uncertainty from another BDT
- several BDT to extract signal in different categories




► ATL-PHYS-PUB-2015-022

- Run 1 MV1c: NN trained from output of other taggers
- Run 2 MV2c20: BDT using feature variables of underlying algorithms (impact parameter, secondary vertices) and  $p_T$ ,  $\eta$  of jets
- Run 2: introduced IBL (new innermost pixel layer)  
⇒ explains part of the performance gain, but not all




- No particular rule
- BDT output can be considered as any other cut variable (just more powerful). Evaluate systematics by:
  - varying cut value
  - retraining
  - calibrating, etc.
- Most common (and appropriate, I think): propagate other uncertainties (detector, theory, etc.) up to BDT output and check how much the analysis is affected
- More and more common: profiling.  
Watch out:
  - BDT output powerful
  - signal region (high BDT output) probably low statistics  
⇒ **potential recipe for disaster if modelling is not good**
- May require extra systematics, not so much on technique itself, but because it probes specific corners of phase space and/or wider parameter space (usually loosening pre-BDT selection cuts)






S. Hageböck




S. Hageböck

- Hope: seeing systematics-affected events during training may make the BDT less sensitive to systematic effects
















- Hope: seeing systematics-affected events during training may make the BDT less sensitive to systematic effects



- Go for a fully integrated solution
  - use different multivariate techniques easily
  - **spend your time on understanding your data and model**
- Examples:
  - Weka. Written in Java, open source, very good published manual. Not written for HEP but very complete [▶ http://www.cs.waikato.ac.nz/ml/weka/](http://www.cs.waikato.ac.nz/ml/weka/)
  - StatPatternRecognition [▶ http://statpatrec.sourceforge.net/](http://statpatrec.sourceforge.net/)
  - **TMVA (Toolkit for MultiVariate Analysis)**  
**Integrated in ROOT, complete manual** [▶ http://tmva.sourceforge.net](http://tmva.sourceforge.net)
  - scikit-learn (python) [▶ http://scikit-learn.org](http://scikit-learn.org)
  - pylearn2 (python) [▶ https://github.com/lisa-lab/pylearn2](https://github.com/lisa-lab/pylearn2)
- Dedicated to BDT: XGBoost [▶ arXiv:1603.02754](https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.02754) [▶ https://github.com/dmlc/xgboost](https://github.com/dmlc/xgboost)
- Now also specifically for Deep Learning:
  - Theano (python) [▶ http://deeplearning.net/software/theano/](http://deeplearning.net/software/theano/)
  - TensorFlow [▶ https://www.tensorflow.org/](https://www.tensorflow.org/)
  - Torch (lua) [▶ http://www.torch.ch/](http://www.torch.ch/)
- ... and generic training interfaces like Keras [▶ https://keras.io/](https://keras.io/)

- Decision trees have been around for some time in social sciences
- Natural extension to cut-based analysis
- Greatly improved performance with boosting (and also with bagging, random forests)
- Has become rather fashionable in HEP
- Even so, expect a lot of scepticism: you will have to convince people that your advanced technique leads to meaningful and reliable results  
⇒ ensemble tests, use several techniques, compare to random grid search, show them useless plots like BDT output on training and testing, etc.
- As with other advanced techniques, **no point in using them if data are not understood and well modelled**

-  L. Breiman, J.H. Friedman, R.A. Olshen and C.J. Stone, *Classification and Regression Trees*, Wadsworth, Stamford, 1984
-  J.R. Quinlan, "Induction of decision trees", *Machine Learning*, 1(1):81–106, 1986
-  J.R. Quinlan, "Simplifying decision trees", *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 27(3):221–234, 1987
-  R.E. Schapire, "The strength of weak learnability", *Machine Learning*, 5(2):197–227, 1990
-  Y. Freund, "Boosting a weak learning algorithm by majority", *Information and computation*. 121(2):256–285, 1995
-  Y. Freund and R.E. Schapire, "Experiments with a New Boosting Algorithm" in *Machine Learning: Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference*, edited by L. Saitta (Morgan Kaufmann, San Fransisco, 1996) p. 148
-  Y. Freund and R.E. Schapire, "A short introduction to boosting" *Journal of Japanese Society for Artificial Intelligence*, 14(5):771-780 (1999)

-  Y. Freund and R.E. Schapire, “A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting”, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 55(1):119–139, 1997
-  J.H. Friedman, T. Hastie and R. Tibshirani, “Additive logistic regression: a statistical view of boosting”, *The Annals of Statistics*, 28(2), 377–386, 2000
-  L. Breiman, “Bagging Predictors”, *Machine Learning*, 24 (2), 123–140, 1996
-  L. Breiman, “Random forests”, *Machine Learning*, 45 (1), 5–32, 2001
-  B.P. Roe, H.-J. Yang, J. Zhu, Y. Liu, I. Stancu, and G. McGregor, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect.A 543, 577 (2005); H.-J. Yang, B.P. Roe, and J. Zhu, Nucl. Instrum.Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A 555, 370 (2005)
-  V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], “Evidence for production of single top quarks,”, Phys. Rev. D**78**, 012005 (2008)