

# Normalizing Flows for Domain Adaptation when Identifying $\Lambda$ Hyperon Events

---

R. Kelleher<sup>a,1</sup> A. Vossen<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Physics, Duke University,  
120 Science Drive, Durham, NC 27708, USA*

<sup>b</sup>*Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility,  
12000 Jefferson Ave., Newport News, VA 23606, USA*

*E-mail:* [rowan.kelleher@duke.edu](mailto:rowan.kelleher@duke.edu)

**ABSTRACT:** This study focuses on the novel application of a normalizing flow as a method of domain adaptation. Normalizing flows offer a way to transform data points between two different distributions. The present study investigates a method of transforming latent representations of physics data to a normal distribution and then to a physics distribution again. The final distribution models a simulated distribution. Following the transformation process, the data can be classified by a neural network trained on labeled simulation data. The present study succeeds in training two normalizing flows that can transform between data (or simulation) and a Gaussian distribution.

**KEYWORDS:** Particle identification methods, Analysis and statistical methods, Pattern recognition, cluster finding, calibration and fitting methods

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author.

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Normalizing Flows</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Architecture	2
<b>3</b>	<b>Model Implementation</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>3</b>
4.1	Classifier Input	3
4.2	Distortion Reversal	4
<b>5</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>4</b>
5.1	Transformation	4
5.2	Classification	4
5.3	Distortion Reversal	5

---

## 1 Introduction

In semi-inclusive deep inelastic scattering (SIDIS) experiments [1], electrons are scattered off of protons to probe the spin structure of the proton.  $\Lambda$  hyperons are produced in the scattering experiment at the CLAS12 detector [2], but have a lifetime too short to detect directly in the detector.  $\Lambda$  hyperons primarily decay into a proton and negatively charged pion; events where a proton and  $\pi^-$  are measured in the final state may have produced a  $\Lambda$ . However, protons and  $\pi^-$  may be produced by other reactions, meaning events where a  $\Lambda$  is produced must be distinguished from those where there are only background processes. A signal fit can be applied with a peak at the nominal  $\Lambda$  mass of 1.1157 GeV. Although this process can work well enough, there is a prominent background for these events at CLAS12, meaning that the signal fit alone produces a relatively low signal to background ratio. Improving the signal to background ratio could help increase confidence in the signal and background separation of the fit, reducing statistical uncertainty.

One approach to improving signal extraction consists in training a classifier on kinematic variables related to  $\Lambda$  event candidates so that the classifier can identify which events contained a  $\Lambda$  decay. The CLAS12 detector cannot record data for particles that decay before interacting with the detector volumes. Instead, particles that decay quickly produce decay products that are measured. These products can help us understand the processes that occurred during a collision, but do not provide enough information to definitively identify which decay products resulted from which parent particles. Thus, measured data cannot be labeled as containing  $\Lambda$  hyperons, meaning they cannot be used for training. Simulated data can contain all information about events, allowing it to be labeled. Monte-Carlo event generation (MC) [3] was used to produce SIDIS events that

simulate the physics that occurs in the CLAS12 detector, which is used in the present study. Training a classifier on this simulation data provides a tool to identify which simulated events contain a  $\Lambda$ , but this does not directly translate to datasets composed of measured events. Differences between the simulated and measured data causes the classifier to struggle to accurately classify events from the measured dataset. Previous work has been done in Ref. [4] where a domain adversarial graph neural network was employed to improve the classification process and the signal extraction. The present study builds on the graph neural network (GNN) implementation by adding a domain adaptation stage in the classification process between the GNN and the classification network. The domain adaptation is implemented via the use of two normalizing flow networks that transform the dataset between data and simulation distributions.

## 2 Normalizing Flows

Normalizing flows are a class of neural networks that transform data points between a simple base distribution and a complex distribution. This process is achieved through the layering of many invertible, differentiable mappings. Generated samples consist in the output of these mappings. Both the density of the sample under the base distribution and the change of volume originating from the transformation can be calculated. The product of this density and volume can be treated as a likelihood, and the negative likelihood can be thought of as loss [5].

The change of variables formula is central to the normalizing flow architecture as it enables the computation of the probability density function (PDF) of a complex distribution. We can start with a base distribution  $Z$  for which we know the PDF (in  $D$  dimensions where our input is of dimension  $D$ ), then find a function that transforms  $Z$  to a distribution  $X$  with an unknown but desired PDF,  $p_X(x)$ . With both the base distribution and transformation, we can compute the PDF of  $Z$ ,  $p_Z(z)$  and sample from it. The transformation must be bijective, however, to allow for computations of its inverse. To simplify the task of writing a bijective transformation between  $X$  and  $Z$  we can compose many invertible functions together. Because the composition of multiple invertible functions is itself invertible, we can describe a complex transformation with many simpler functions.

The functions that describe the transformation from  $Z$  to  $X$  can be learned through log-likelihood maximization (or negative log-likelihood minimization). This likelihood is computed by taking the logarithm of the change of variables formula:

$$\log p_X(x) = \log p_Z(f(x)) + \log \left| \det \left( \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x^T} \right) \right| \quad (2.1)$$

The parameters of  $Z$  and  $f(x)$  are trained according to this equation.

### 2.1 Architecture

The present study utilizes a flow model based on the RealNVP architecture introduced by Ref. [6]. The RealNVP architecture implements the transformation as a composition of coupled functions, where each function scales (with scaling function  $s(x)$ ) and translates (with translation function  $t(x)$ ) the input. To improve computation efficiency, the architecture uses coupling functions where

the input vector is split into two segments. The output of the first segment equal to the input of the first segment; the output of the second segment is parameterized by the first segment:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{1:d} &= x_{1:d} \\ y_{d+1:D} &= x_{d+1:D} \cdot \exp(s(x_{1:d})) + t(x_{1:d}) \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

This coupling method improves the computation efficiency for the log-determinant as the coupling forces the transformation’s jacobian to be triangular. The determinant of a triangular matrix is the product of its diagonal entries; because the diagonal entries consist only in the scale portion of the transformation, and the scaling is exponential, the exponentials can be summed. Now, the determinant computation consists only of a summation, which is very favorable for the computation time of the training process.

### 3 Model Implementation

The flow model implemented for this study utilizes the normalizing-flows package [7]. This package provides implementations for the layers needed to create a neural network based on the realNVP architecture. For our study we used a model with 32 masked affine layers, alternating the mask each layer. Now we can write a single parametric function (given in Ref. [6]) to replace eqn. 2.2:

$$y = b \cdot x + (1 - b) \cdot (x \cdot \exp(s(b \cdot)) + t(b \cdot x)) \tag{3.1}$$


The scale and translation functions used in eqn. 3.1 are implemented as multi-layer perceptrons (MLPs) using the pytorch python package [8] by Ref. [7]. Because the GNN output had a dimension of 71 we used 71 as the input and output dimension for the MLPs. We used 2 hidden layers for each MLP, both with dimensions of 142. The normalizing-flows package provides functions for calculating negative log-likelihood as explained in section 2.1, as well as an implementation for back propagating the loss; these functions are used for training the model.

The models were trained on batches of 100 events output by the GNN. The training loop is as follows for each step: the batch of events is transformed using the current model; the likelihood that these samples were drawn from a gaussian distribution is calculated; the model is updated with gradient descent. A validation dataset was used to determine when to stop training. A testing dataset was used at the end of training to ensure the models did not overfit or diverge.

## 4 Application

### 4.1 Classifier Input

The first application aims to improve the performance of a classifier trained to identify simulated  $\Lambda$  events. We designed an approach where: data would first be transformed to a normal distribution via a forward pass with a data-network; second, the normalized data would be passed backwards through a simulation-network such that it ends up "looking like" the simulation data that the classifier was trained on. By using an intermediate normal distribution, we can transform between the data and simulation distributions. Figure 1 visualizes the process.



**Figure 1.** The transformation process inserted between latent space extraction and classification steps.

For this strategy two different networks were trained separately: a data-network was trained to normalize measured data; a simulation-network was trained to normalize simulation data. Because the networks represent bijective functions, they can be reversed to turn normalized samples into simulation-like samples. The data-network was trained over 6 epochs while the simulation-network was trained over 11 epochs (due to the size difference in the datasets).

## 4.2 Distortion Reversal

The second application aims to transform from a distorted dataset to an ideal dataset. The ideal dataset consists of the transverse momentum  $p_T$ , azimuthal angle  $\phi$ , and polar angle  $\theta$  for both the proton and pion in every event. The distorted dataset was generated in two different ways: by drawing a random value from a normal distribution centered at 0 for each event; by taking a set value for all events. In each case, the distortion value was added to the proton  $p_T$ . A strategy similar to that in section 4.1 was employed, where we trained two networks: the first was trained to normalize distorted data; the second was trained to normalize ideal data. The distorted data was then passed forward through the distorted-network and then backwards through the ideal-network.


## 5 Results

### 5.1 Transformation

The models were successful in learning to normalize their respective inputs, as shown in Fig. 2. The validation loss appeared to match the training loss well, suggesting we did not encounter over-fitting. The normalized distributions appear to follow a normal distribution, however we can notice that some dimensions have distributions that differ from the expected result. Some distributions are not centered around 0 and some are skewed.


### 5.2 Classification

The classifier output for the simulation, the data, and the transformed data are shown in Fig. 3. The classifier output for the transformed data matches that of the simulation much better than that of the



**Figure 2.** Histograms are shown for several dimensions of the latent representation of data before (left) and after normalization (right).

data, suggesting that the domain adaptation helped align the data with the inputs that the classifier was trained on. Furthermore, the figure of merit ( $N_{signal}/\sqrt{N_{tot}}$ ) and purity ( $N_{sig}/N_{tot}$ ) for the data and transformed data are shown in Fig. 3, where  $N_{tot}$  represents the total number of events being fit and  $N_{sig}$  represents the number of events that reside inside the fit. The figure of merit appears flatter when transformed with the flow model. The flatness of the curve may be desirable as it allows for cuts to be made almost anywhere on the curve without sacrificing the figure of merit.



**Figure 3.** The classifier output for the data, simulation, and transformed data are shown as well (left). The figure of merit and purity are plotted for both transformed and latent data fits (right).

### 5.3 Distortion Reversal

The flow model did not appear to succeed in the second application’s aim of reversing the distortion (as discussed in section 4.2). The flow model was able to recover the broader features of the distribution, primarily the position of the peak, but failed to reconstruct finer details such as secondary peaks. There are many possible improvements to this attempt at distortion reversal that may be able to improve the results. One change that may be beneficial could be to use conditional flow models. Conditional normalizing flows allow for modeling of conditional probability densities; with a conditional normalizing flow, one could model the distribution of the proton  $p_T$  conditional on the other variables  $\phi$  and  $\theta$ . This strategy may capture correlations between kinematic variables better, allowing for better distortion reversal in future studies.

## References

- [1] C.A. Aidala, S.D. Bass, D. Hasch and G.K. Mallot, *The spin structure of the nucleon*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85** (2013) 655.
- [2] V. Burkert, L. Elouadrhiri, K. Adhikari, S. Adhikari, M. Amarian, D. Anderson et al., *The clas12 spectrometer at jefferson laboratory*, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* **959** (2020) 163419.
- [3] L. Mankiewicz, A. Schäfer and M. Veltri, *Pepsi — a monte carlo generator for polarized lepton production*, *Computer Physics Communications* **71** (1992) 305.
- [4] M. McEneaney and A. Vossen, *Domain-adversarial graph neural networks for lambda hyperon identification with clas12*, *Journal of Instrumentation* **18** (2023) P06002.
- [5] I. Kobyzev, S.J. Prince and M.A. Brubaker, *Normalizing flows: An introduction and review of current methods*, *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **43** (2021) 3964–3979.
- [6] L. Dinh, J.N. Sohl-Dickstein and S. Bengio, *Density estimation using real nvp*, *ArXiv* **abs/1605.08803** (2016) .
- [7] V. Stimper, D. Liu, A. Campbell, V. Berenz, L. Ryll, B. Schölkopf et al., *normflows: A pytorch package for normalizing flows*, *Journal of Open Source Software* **8** (2023) 5361.
- [8] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan et al., *PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library*, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché Buc, E. Fox and R. Garnett, eds., pp. 8024–8035, Curran Associates, Inc., 2019, <http://papers.neurips.cc/paper/9015-pytorch-an-imperative-style-high-performance-deep-learning-library.pdf>.