

TRANSIT your events into a new mass: Fast background interpolation for weakly-supervised anomaly searches

I. Oleksiyuk,^{ab} S. Voloshynovskiy,^b T. Golling^a

^a*Département de Physique Nucléaire et Corpusculaire, University of Geneva, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland*

^b*Department of Computer Science, University of Geneva, Route de Drize 7, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland*

E-mail: ivan.oleksiyuk@unige.ch, svyatoslav.voloshynovskyy@unige.ch, tobias.golling@unige.ch

ABSTRACT: We introduce a new model for conditional and continuous data morphing called TRansport Adversarial Network for Smooth InTerpolation (TRANSIT). We apply it to create a background data template for weakly-supervised searches at the LHC. The method smoothly transforms sideband events to match signal region mass distributions. We demonstrate the performance of TRANSIT using the LHC Olympics R&D dataset. The model captures non-linear mass correlations of features and produces a template that offers a competitive anomaly sensitivity compared to state-of-the-art transport-based template generators. Moreover, the computational training time required for TRANSIT is an order of magnitude lower than that of competing deep learning methods. This makes it ideal for analyses that iterate over many signal regions and signal models. Unlike generative models, which must learn a full probability density distribution, i.e., the correlations between all the variables, the proposed transport model only has to learn a smooth conditional shift of the distribution. This allows for a simpler, more efficient residual architecture, enabling mass uncorrelated features to pass the network unchanged while the mass correlated features are adjusted accordingly. Furthermore, we show that the latent space of the model provides a set of mass decorrelated features useful for anomaly detection without background sculpting.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Dataset	3
3	Method	4
3.1	Main principles	4
3.2	TRANSIT model	5
3.3	Architecture	8
3.4	Anomaly detection strategies	9
4	Results	9
4.1	Template quality	9
4.2	Decorrelation	11
4.3	Anomaly detection	13
4.4	Computational efficiency	15
5	Conclusions	16
A	Proof of the efficiency of transport models over Normalising Flows	17
B	Proof of independence between \hat{X} and M in optimal TRANSIT network	18
C	Sideband to sideband transport	20
D	Transport trajectories	22
E	Example of background sculpting	24
F	Hyperparameters	25

1 Introduction

Since the discovery of the Higgs boson in 2012 [1, 2], the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics has shown phenomenal agreement with most experimental data collected at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). Despite its success, the SM still fails in explaining gravity, neutrino masses, and dark matter, among other shortcomings. The majority of Beyond Standard Model (BSM) theories assume the existence of yet-undiscovered particles, motivating the searches for resonances in the spectra of the invariant mass. However, the proposed particles differ from the known ones not only in their mass but also in many

other observables. Selecting events with a specific model-dependent signature greatly increases the sensitivity of a search to that model’s signal, but, in general, becomes less sensitive to other signals. Despite this, scanning the parameter space of all the proposed BSM models with model-specific searches is extremely resource-consuming. Moreover, the actual BSM physics might lie outside the scope of current theoretical proposals. To address this issue, numerous deep learning (DL) methods capable of detecting a wide range of signals have been developed [3–116]. Several works already apply these methods to real data in high-energy physics (HEP) analyses at ATLAS [117, 118] CMS [119] and DARWIN [120].

A prominent class of model-agnostic methods is weakly supervised anomaly search, which was first introduced to HEP as Classification Without Labels (CWoLa) [3]. This and many of the subsequent methods [4–11] can be described by the same algorithm. First, a signal region (SR) is selected, i.e., a window in the distribution of the resonant variable m , where the signal peak is supposedly localised. The rest of the resonant variable spectrum is then assumed to be nearly signal-free. A part of this signal-poor region is, usually called sidebands (SB), is used to estimate the distribution of the additional observables \mathbf{x} for the background data $p^{\text{background}}(\mathbf{x}|m) \approx p^{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x}|m) \approx p_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}|m)$ for $m \in \text{SB}$ using parametrised models with parameters Θ . This distribution is then interpolated from $m \in \text{SB}$ to $m \in \text{SR}$ to produce a signal-poor template $p_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}|m)$ for $m \in \text{SR}$. Finally, a classifier is trained based on observables \mathbf{x} to distinguish between the signal-poor template and the signal-rich SR. The pivotal point of these approaches is to find a method for high-quality template generation, as a poor-quality template will lead to a high false-positive rate of the CWoLa classifier. The original CWoLa implementation [3] suggests taking the sideband data itself as a crude approximation of the background in SR. A better template can be provided by Monte Carlo generation with reweighting using SALAD [4] or corrections using FETA [5] methods, but it is more desirable to have a fully data-driven method due to the limited availability of high-quality simulation. To the best of our knowledge, all state-of-the-art (SotA) data-driven DL methods [6–11] rely on either normalising flows, diffusion, or a mixture of the two, such as continuous normalising flows (CNF). These methods provide high-quality templates but at a high computational cost, requiring hours to train even on relatively small datasets.

Despite the apparent simplicity of the semi-supervised framework, it usually results in a computationally demanding analysis for several reasons. First of all, location of a supposed signal mass peak is unknown. Thus, one has to apply this method over an order of 10 mass windows. Before unblinding the experimental data, the method at hand has to be rigorously validated by applying it on tens of validation datasets and iterating over tens of random seeds to properly assess the uncertainty arising from the stochastic nature of the DL model fit. Despite such analysis being model-agnostic, it also makes sense to assess the sensitivity of the analysis to tens of different signal models by injecting varying quantities of each signal. This will also help set the limits on the BSM models in case the analysis shows no significant signal presence. Considering that these factors are multiplicative with one another, the typical HEP analysis would have to run this pipeline thousands of times, translating into extreme computational cost. This presents a need for orders-of-magnitude

improvement in method speed and efficiency, which has become the topic of the most recent studies. Two methods, namely CURTAINsF4F [8] and SIGMA [11], investigated efficient ways to reuse the model trained on the entire mass spectrum in every signal region. Additionally, RAD-OT [121] exploits a non-ML-based optimal transport prescription to interpolate the sidebands in the signal region, trading a reduction in template generation time for lower template quality.

In this work, we address the issue of fast generation of high-quality templates by introducing the TRansport Adversarial Network for Smooth InTerpolation (TRANSIT). To increase efficiency, the method leverages the strategy of transporting data from sidebands into the SR, as in CURTAINs [7] and RAD-OT [121], rather than generating the samples from noise. Moreover, the speed-up is achieved thanks to the simplicity of the network’s one-pass feed-forward architecture, which requires less training time than most flow- and diffusion-based methods. At the same time, it provides a template of quality competitive with other methods by employing specifically designed losses. As an additional benefit, the chosen losses lead to independence of the latent space variables from the resonant mass, allowing for an approach to mitigate background sculpting similar to LaCATHODE [122].

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows: Section 2 briefly describes the LHC Olympics (LHCO) R&D dataset, which is used for the comparison of methods. Section 3 introduces the TRANSIT method and explains its working principle. Subsequently, Section 4 presents the performance of the TRANSIT method, comparing it with other approaches. Finally, Section 5 provides the conclusions and outlook.

2 Dataset

One of the most suitable places to apply anomaly detection is a dijet BSM search. Firstly, the hadronic dijet final state is a common signature in high-energy proton-proton collisions. Due to the high background of QCD jets, such a search could greatly benefit from anomaly detection methods aimed at enhancing signal significance. Secondly, BSM signals can produce a variety of unusual jet substructures, e.g., semi-visible jets [123], emerging jets [124], and 4-prong jets [124], so a model-unspecific method is preferred.

The LHCO R&D [125] dataset consists of 1 million background dijet events from SM quark/gluon scattering and 100 thousand signal dijet events produced through a BSM resonance $Z' \rightarrow X(\rightarrow qq)Y(\rightarrow qq)$ events. The resonance has a mass $m_Z = 3.5$ TeV, and the decay products have asymmetric masses $m_X = 500$ GeV and $m_Y = 100$ GeV. The dataset is simulated using PYTHIA 8.219 [126] and DELPHES 3.4.1 [127–129] with default settings. Jets are clustered using the anti- k_T algorithm with radius $R = 1.0$, implemented in the FASTJET package [130]. Only events that have at least one jet with transverse momentum $p_T^J > 1.2$ TeV and pseudorapidity $\eta < 2.5$ are kept. In each event, only the two leading jets are retained.

In order to compare with existing template generation methods, we apply TRANSIT to a commonly used set of high-level variables for dijet events: the mass of the heavier leading jet m_{j1} , the mass difference between the two leading jets Δm , the distance ΔR between these jets in (ϕ, η) space, and the two-to-one subjetiness ratios $\tau_{2,1}^{j1}$ and $\tau_{2,1}^{j2}$. The

distributions of the selected observables are shown in Fig. 1. In addition, we select the interval [3.3, 3.7] TeV as the signal region and [3.0, 3.3] TeV and [3.7, 4.6] TeV as the sideband regions. For evaluation and training, we use all the background available in these regions, but we also add N_{sig} if signal contamination is required. The signal events are sampled randomly based on the training seed, so their stochasticity is included in the errorbars on the plots in Section 4.




Figure 1: Distributions of high-level observables commonly used in weakly supervised searches within the LHCO R&D dataset, presented for the QCD background and Z' signal.

3 Method

3.1 Main principles

In general, generative models aim at approximating the joint probability distribution of observables $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ conditioned on the mass M , namely $p(\mathbf{X}_1, X_2, \dots, X_n | M)$ ¹. Examples of such approaches in the weakly-supervised search context include CATHODE [6], DRAPES [9], and others [10, 11]. The advantage of these methods is that, after training, one can sample events $\mathbf{x} \sim p(\mathbf{X} | M)$ at will for any mass. However, the model has to learn not only the correlations between variables X_1, \dots, X_n and M but also the mass-independent correlations between the variables X_1, \dots, X_n themselves.

As an alternative, one can train a transport model represented by the functional form $f(\mathbf{x}, m, \hat{m}) \rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ that would transform samples of an original mass $\mathbf{x} \sim p(\mathbf{X} | M = m)$ into samples corresponding to a new target mass $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \sim p(\mathbf{X} | M = \hat{m})$. If a variable X_k is uncorrelated with the mass M , the model can satisfy this condition by simply learning the identity transformation. The same holds for the correlations between variables X_i and

¹In our notation, $p(\mathbf{X}) \equiv p_{\mathbf{X}}$ refers to the probability distribution of a random vector \mathbf{X} as a function, while $p(\mathbf{x}) \equiv p_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv p(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$ denotes the value of this function for a specific sample \mathbf{x} .

X_j . If the correlation does not change with the mass, i.e., if one can achieve the correct conditional distribution by transporting each variable separately, then there is no need to learn the correlation between them. For variables with smooth mass dependence, the method would have to simply learn a correction shift to transport events along smooth trajectories into a different mass, as illustrated in the right part of Fig. 2. This reduces the total amount of correlations that have to be encoded in the network compared to a full-generation case, so the transport network should require fewer parameters and less training time. We provide an extended argumentation in App. A.

In the literature, this approach was introduced with the method CURTAINS [7], which is based on training an invertible neural network (INN) conditioned on both the original and target mass. The challenges of estimating $p(\mathbf{X}|M)$ for INN optimisation and the computational expense of training led to the development of an extension of the method in CURTAINS Flows for Flows (F4F) [8], which achieved SotA performance at the time. However, the method remains rather computationally demanding. A more recent method, RAD-OT [121], uses optimal transport to interpolate the template between two sidebands. Despite being computationally light, the method has limited template-building quality, as it only offers a linear interpolation path for each event, neglecting the apparent trends in the sideband regions. These two methods are thus closely related to TRANSIT and will be used for benchmarking.

A different perspective on the template generation problem was introduced in La-CATHODE [122] by prioritising background sculpting mitigation. A conditional normalising flow is used to provide mass-decorrelated variables \mathbf{z} in the latent space, which is restricted to have a multivariate unit Gaussian distribution. The variables \mathbf{z} are then used as a basis for sculpting-free CWoLa-style analysis. Despite this transformation being sufficient for decorrelation, it is excessively restrictive, as it is only necessary that the latent distribution does not depend on mass. For example, in cases where the input variables are already mass-decorrelated, there is no need to transform them into a Gaussian.

In this work, we show that non-linear smooth transport and latent mass decorrelation can both be achieved simultaneously by training a simple residual multi-layer perceptron (MLP) that is efficiently parallelisable on modern hardware, thus leading to significant speedups. The remaining challenge is to design a set of loss functions that satisfy the transport and decorrelation objectives.

3.2 TRANSIT model

The TRANSIT model consists of several key components, depicted on the left in Fig. 2. Starting with the true data event pair (\mathbf{x}, m) , the model passes each event \mathbf{x} via the encoder network e_ϕ conditioned on the corresponding mass m , so that it is encoded in the latent representation $\mathbf{z} = e_\phi(\mathbf{x}, m)$. After that, the model decodes the latent representation conditionally on the target mass \hat{m} into an event $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = d_\theta(\mathbf{z}, \hat{m})$ of the same dimensionality as \mathbf{x} . The mass \hat{m} can be equal to or different from m depending on the context. The aim of the encoder is to decorrelate the variables \mathbf{x} from the original mass m , so that one obtains a mass-independent latent representation \mathbf{z} , and then restores the correlation in




Figure 2: The transport of event form mass m into mass \hat{m} . Left: Passage of data through the TRANSIT model with all the main components and losses. Right: The principle of transporting original events in sidebands (green crosses), corresponding to the original mass m , along the transport curves (dotted lines) to transformed events (red circles) corresponding to a new mass \hat{m} in the signal region. σ_{perm} denotes an operation of random permutation of the batch.

the decoder with a target mass \hat{m} . Together, the encoder and decoder form a transport model (TM), denoted as $f_{\phi,\theta}(\mathbf{x}, m, \hat{m}) = d_{\theta}(e_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, m), \hat{m})$.

Reconstruction loss. In the case where $m = \hat{m}$, the event should be reconstructed as itself as in the case of auto-encoder. To enforce this, the model passes a batch of N events from SB $\{\mathbf{x}\} = \{\mathbf{x}^1 \dots \mathbf{x}^N\}$ through TM with conditioning on the paired masses $\{m\} = \{m^1 \dots m^N\}$ in both encoder and decoder (i.e. $\hat{m}^k = m^k$) and evaluate the mean squared error discrepancy between the input and output, averaged over the batch

$$\mathcal{L}_{rec} = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, m) \sim p_{data}(\mathbf{x}, M)} \|\mathbf{x} - d_{\theta}(e_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, m), m)\|^2. \quad (3.1)$$

During training, we first pre-train the network for several epochs to achieve a small reconstruction loss before enabling the rest of the losses discussed below.

Transport loss. To train the transport into a new mass \hat{m} , we pass a randomly permuted (shuffled) batch of masses $\{\hat{m}\} = \sigma_{perm}(\{m\})$ to the conditional decoder. We require that the transported events created with these shuffled masses $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = d_{\theta}(e_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, m), \hat{m}) \sim \hat{p}_{\phi,\theta}(\hat{X}|\hat{M})$ follow the distribution of the events in the data $p_{data}(X|M)$. As the marginal distributions of masses in the batches are the same, $p(\hat{M}) = p(M)$, using Bayes' theorem, we can conclude that

$$\hat{p}_{\phi,\theta}(\hat{X}|\hat{M}) = p_{data}(X|M) \stackrel{p(M)=p(\hat{M})}{\iff} \hat{p}_{\phi,\theta}(\hat{X}, \hat{M}) = p_{data}(X, M). \quad (3.2)$$

Thus, we have to minimise the discrepancy between these joint distributions. In theory, these distributions can be compared using the Jensen-Shannon Divergence $JSD(\hat{p}_{\phi,\theta}||p_{data})$; however, it is usually computationally intractable. Instead, we use a density ratio estimation trick described in [131], which provides the basis for all generative adversarial networks.

For an optimal discriminator D , the binary cross entropy loss is proportional to JSD with an added constant

$$\begin{aligned} BCE_D(p_{\text{data}}||\hat{p}_{\phi,\theta}) &= -\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x},m)\sim p_{\text{data}}}[\ln(D(\mathbf{x},m))] - \mathbb{E}_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}},\hat{m})\sim \hat{p}_{\phi,\theta}}[\ln(1-D(\hat{\mathbf{x}},\hat{m}))] \\ &= \ln(4) - 2JSD(p_{\text{data}}||\hat{p}_{\phi,\theta}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

This value can be approximated by training a parametrised binary classifier D_ψ in place of an optimal classifier D to distinguish between transported and true pairs (see Fig. 2), namely by minimising

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}} = BCE_{D_\psi}(p_{\text{data}}||\hat{p}_{\phi,\theta}) \quad (3.4)$$

with respect to ψ , and continuously updating the classifier so that it remains close to optimal. Then, by maximising $\mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}}$ with respect to TM parameters ϕ, θ , i.e., “fooling” the discriminator by creating more realistic samples, we can minimise JSD between the generated and true distributions.

In our particular case, we use a simple conditional multilayer perceptron (MLP) as the classifier. We optimise the classifier by performing steps in the $-\nabla_\psi \mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}}$ direction and use $\nabla_{\phi,\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}}$ to update the TM. The loss of the discriminator provides a meaningful step for the TM only if the discriminator is currently able to distinguish between the two distributions with the correct labels. Therefore, if $\mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}} > \ln(4)$, only the discriminator training steps are performed, while the TM parameters are kept constant. Empirically, this results in better convergence of the training. If $\mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}} < \ln(4)$ we perform one step of classifier training per one step of TM training although this ratio may be tuned to better suit the setup (e.g., its optimum depends on the learning rate ratio for the discriminator and the TM).

Consistency loss. A further regularisation of the method is provided with a so-called *consistency* loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}$, described in [132, 133]. The idea is that the latent representation of $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, which can be obtained by passing it through the same encoder network $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = e_\phi(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{m})$ as shown in Fig. 2, should be equal to latent representation \mathbf{z} from which $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ was created. This can be enforced with the MSE loss between these latent representations.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim p(\mathbf{Z}), \hat{m}\sim p(\hat{M})} \|\mathbf{z} - \hat{\mathbf{z}}\|^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim p(\mathbf{Z}), \hat{m}\sim p(\hat{M})} \|\mathbf{z} - e_\phi(d_\theta(\mathbf{z}, \hat{m}), \hat{m})\|^2, \quad (3.5)$$

where we provide \hat{m} by shuffling the mass batches $\{\hat{m}\} = \sigma_{\text{perm}}(\{m\})$ and \mathbf{z} by encoding original event-mass pairs $\mathbf{z} = e_\phi(\mathbf{x}, m) \sim p_\phi(\mathbf{Z})$.

Its first advantage is that if both reconstruction and consistency losses achieve zero simultaneously, the transport can be inverted as

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{\phi,\theta}(f_{\phi,\theta}(x, m, \hat{m}), \hat{m}, m) \\ &= d_\theta(e_\phi(d_\theta(e_\phi(\mathbf{x}, m), \hat{m}), \hat{m}), m) \\ &= d_\theta(e_\phi(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{m}), m) = d(\hat{\mathbf{z}}, m) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}=0}{=} d(\mathbf{z}, m) = \hat{x} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}}=0}{=} x, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

meaning $f_{\phi,\theta}(\cdot, \hat{m}, m) = f_{\phi,\theta}^{-1}(\cdot, m, \hat{m})$.

The second advantage relies on the adversarial discriminator loss to achieve values close to maximum while minimising consistency and reconstruction losses. If $\mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}} = \ln(4)$ with a sufficiently good classifier, we can assume approximate equality between generated and data joint probability distributions $\hat{p}_{\phi,\theta}(\hat{X}, \hat{M}) \approx p_{\text{data}}(X, M)$. In App. B, we prove that the equivalence between these distributions, the invertibility and the specific decomposition of TM result in the independence of \hat{x} and m . Consequently, $\hat{z} = e_{\phi}(\hat{x}, \hat{m}) \perp m$ ² as any function on variables independent on m returns a variable independent of m , and for a zero consistency loss $z = \hat{z} \perp m$. Thus, by minimizing \mathcal{L}_{rec} and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}$ simultaneously with maximising $\mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}}$, we approach the mass decorrelation for the latent variables z .

Additionally, for computing the consistency loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}$, we use the masses \hat{m} not only from the SB but also from the SR. In this way, the bijectivity and continuity of the transport are also ensured in the region between the two sidebands, connecting all three regions and achieving high-quality interpolation.

Full loss. Finally, for training of the TM, we combine all losses with their corresponding weights w_{rec} , w_{disc} and w_{cons} , namely

$$\mathcal{L}_{TM} = w_{\text{rec}}\mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} - w_{\text{disc}}\mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}} + w_{\text{cons}}\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}. \quad (3.7)$$

For interpretability, we prioritise the transport to be fixed to identity for $\hat{m} = m$; thus, we assign the highest weight to the reconstruction loss, namely $w_{\text{rec}} = 1$. \mathcal{L}_{rec} and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}$ are of the same order of magnitude, as both are based on MSE, so we assign $w_{\text{cons}} = 0.1$. $\mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}}$ has a different behaviour; thus an appropriate value for w_{disc} is determined empirically.

3.3 Architecture

In order to achieve maximal training time efficiency, the network architecture has to be adapted to match the task. We are interested in transporting the events between two distributions that are relatively close to each other, and we want mass-decorrelated variables to remain unchanged, thus, we use an MLP with a residual architecture shown in Fig. 3. The skip-connections combine the input of the residual block j with a scaled output of a residual block j as $\mathbf{y}_j = \mathbf{x}_{\text{inp},j} + \alpha_j \odot \mathbf{f}_{\text{block},j}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{inp},j}, m)$, such that the identity transformation is easily learnable by setting learnable parameters α_j equal to 0. This way $\alpha_j \odot \mathbf{f}_{\text{block},j}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{inp},j}, m)$ represents a small mass-conditional correction to the input. Additionally, the latent space vector \mathbf{z} has higher dimensionality than input \mathbf{x} , thus ensuring that the network has no informational bottlenecks, unlike usual auto-encoders.

To make the transport curves smooth, it suffices to use Sigmoid Linear Unit instead of the usual Rectified Linear Unit (ReLU) as we observe empirically³. The adversarial discriminator is a simple conditional MLP with ReLU activations.

Conditioning is applied in every dense layer of decoder, encoder and discriminator by appending m or \hat{m} to the input of each linear layer.

²In our notation the \perp sign denotes statistical independence between two variables.

³One can also achieve a smoothing effect by adding a loss based on the average second derivative of the transport curve, however, this requires more computation.




Figure 3: Architecture of the encoder (light-blue) and decoder (light-green) networks in TRANSIT.

3.4 Anomaly detection strategies

Optimising the speed of the template generation algorithm is beneficial as long as it remains more resource-intensive than the rest of the anomaly detection pipeline. Therefore, we use a CWoLa classifier based on Boosted Decision Trees, which proved to be both fast and performant in [24, 25]. We use the same hyperparameters as [121] for a straightforward result comparison. The same TRANSIT model can be used in two different anomaly detection approaches.

First, to create a template, one can sample events (\boldsymbol{x}, m) from the SB and transport them into the SR by decoding them with masses \hat{m} sampled from the SR. To produce the template, we bootstrap-resample four times as many mass points as there are data points in the SR in total, as recommended in [8]. We then train CWoLa, assuming the created template is signal-poor (label 0) and the data from the signal region is relatively signal-rich (label 1). This is the default approach and will further be referred to as TRANSIT as well.

In a second approach, we transform both the SB and the SR into latent space. As the latent space variables are uncorrelated with mass (for the background distribution), classical SB-versus-SR CWoLa training can be used. This classifies the latent representation of SB data as the signal-poor template (label 0) versus the latent representation of the SR data (label 1). This method is referred to as latent TRANSIT (LaTRANSIT).⁴

4 Results

4.1 Template quality

After generating the template in the SR, we can compare it to the actual background data in the SR. Fig. 4 shows that the template distribution created by transporting SB events into SR mass matches the template distribution closely (within 2.5σ or less in the majority of the bins). This holds even for the ΔR observable, where SB and SR strongly differ. It is noteworthy that our method reconstructs the sharp peak at $\Delta R \approx 3.2$, which is a challenging task for simple interpolators like RAD-OT [121]. Additionally, we verify that TRANSIT produces correct marginal distributions and pairwise correlations between

⁴In analogy with the LaCATHODE method [122].




Figure 4: Distributions of five observables for the SR, SB, and a TRANSIT template created by transporting SB events into SR masses. Pull plots illustrate the difference between the SR distribution and the other distributions, expressed in units of the Poisson standard deviation for each bin.

variables when transporting from the lower to the higher sideband and vice versa, as shown in App. C.

To assess the overall quantitative similarity between the distribution of true data and that of transported events, we employ a classifier test. Namely, we train a BDT classifier to discriminate between the template and background data in the SR. Fig. 5 shows that the two distributions are indeed close, as the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve of this classifier is close to the ROC curve of a random classifier. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) for TRANSIT is only 0.520, which is similar to the values quoted for other methods such as CURTAINS4F and RAD-OT, as given in [121]. We emphasise that smooth nonlinear interpolation is not a well-defined problem and, thus, we expect all interpolation methods to match the signal region distribution with limited precision. We can also look at the adversarial MLP discriminator that is trained as part of the TRANSIT model. At the end of training, the discriminator reaches a plateau where the loss stochastically fluctuates around $\mathcal{L}_{disc} = \ln(4)$, meaning the discriminator cannot distinguish true events from the transported ones. In this state, the scores of this classifier for the transported events should be close to 0.5. This is indeed the case as observed in Fig. 12 in App. D along each of the transport trajectories.

The smoothness and non-linearity of the transport trajectories can also be visually




Figure 5: ROC curves for a BDT trained to discriminate TRANSIT templates from background SR data and for a BDT trained to discriminate SB latent representations from background SR latent representations in LaTRANSIT. Solid lines and filled regions represent the average and the standard deviation range across 6 TRANSIT network trainings with different initialisation seeds. No signal was added in these runs.

inspected in Fig. 12 of App. D.

4.2 Decorrelation

As discussed in Section 3, the TRANSIT training scheme leads to independence between latent variables \mathbf{z} and the mass m , meaning, $p(\mathbf{z}, m) = p(\mathbf{z})p(m)$.

On one hand, independence implies that in any selected mass range, the distribution $p(\mathbf{z})$ for the events in this mass range should remain the same. We apply a classifier test by training a BDT to compare the distributions of $p(\mathbf{z})$ in SB and SR. As demonstrated in Fig. 5, the classifier differs narrowly from a random classifier, thus validating the independence of $p(\mathbf{z})$ on the mass region.




Figure 6: The $\chi^2/n_{d.o.f.}$ discrepancy between the normalised mass distribution of all background events in the region SBUSR and the distribution of a selection of these events, made based on the TRANSIT anomaly score, LaTRANSIT anomaly score, or a random selection. The calculation of $\chi^2/n_{d.o.f.}$ is done with a histogram of 40 equal width bins in [3.0, 4.6] TeV range. Solid lines and filled regions represent the average and the standard deviation for 6 runs with different random seeds and no signal contamination. No signal was added in these runs.

On the other hand, for any region in z -space, the events in it should have the same distribution of mass m if z and m are independent. A score of a classifier trained to distinguish between SB and SR in the latent space only depends on variable z , and thus, selecting the event with the score larger than some threshold should not change the mass distribution significantly. Fig. 6 shows the $\chi^2/n_{d.o.f.}$ difference between the original mass spectrum $p_M(m)$ and the spectrum after a classifier cut. For a random classifier, this difference increases until it reaches $\chi^2/n_{d.o.f.} = 1$, which is the expected discrepancy for two independent samples of the same distribution. Since the TRANSIT method uses variables with significant mass correlation (e.g., ΔR), the classifier score is also mass-dependent, and a cut on this score induces strong background sculpting even for small rejections. In contrast, a LaTRANSIT cut has approximately the same effect on the distribution as a random cut, proving the independence of this classifier score from the event mass. Appendix E also visually demonstrates the presence of the background sculpting effect for the TRANSIT method and its absence in the LaTRANSIT method.

4.3 Anomaly detection

To assess the anomaly detection performance of the proposed method and compare it to benchmarks in the literature, we perform the analysis with an injection of N_{sig} events into our background sample. Most of the signal events land in the selected SR. As discussed before, we choose RAD-OT as one of the fastest methods and CURTAINsF4F as one of the highest-quality template generation methods for comparison.⁵

Additionally, we use two upper bounds on the performance of our method. First, we train a classifier to distinguish a pure background from a pure signal in a *supervised* manner. Since we use exact, noise-free labels for this method, its performance is expected to be higher than that of any semi-supervised method. The *idealised* CWoLa variant represents a case of perfect template generation in a CWoLa-like search. In this method, we use half of our background events as the template and the other half with the injected signal as our data. This way, the background in both datasets is sampled from the same distribution. This version is expected to perform better than any semi-supervised approach but worse than the *supervised* method. The relatively small difference between the *supervised* and *idealised* methods in Figs. 7, and 8 indicates the robustness of the CWoLa classifier to noisy labels. However, neither of these two methods can be used in practice, as the labels are unknown.




Figure 7: Background rejection as a function of signal efficiency (right) and significance improvement as a function of background rejection (left) compared for various methods. The results are produced by injecting 3000 Z' signal events. Solid lines and filled regions represent the average and the standard deviation range for 30 TRANSIT network trainings with different initialisation seeds. For supervised, idealised, RAD-OT, and CURTAINsF4F, the average and the standard deviation are taken by retraining the CWoLa classifier 5 times with various seeds.

First, we inject $N_{\text{sig}} = 3000$ signal events. Fig. 7 shows the relation between background rejection and signal efficiency and the relation between significance improvement

⁵Moreover, the authors of these methods provide sufficient details needed to ensure a fair comparison.

and background rejection (higher curves indicate better performance) for all methods.⁶ One can clearly see that for low signal efficiency, the performance of all ML methods except LaTRANSIT saturates and reaches that of the *supervised* and *idealised* bounds. However, in an analysis, we aim to preserve most of the signal while rejecting a substantial portion of the background, so we are interested in signal efficiencies higher than 0.4 and, consequently, background rejections lower than 10^3 . In this region, one can see that the TRANSIT method outperforms both RAD-OT and CURTAINS4F and, overall, has performance close to the *idealised* case. At the same time, LaTRANSIT exhibits lower anomaly detection performance than the rest of the methods. Since the invariant mass m_{jj} is a defining feature of a resonance, it has high discriminative power in a signal-versus-background classifier. Thus, any strongly mass-correlated variable, such as ΔR , also enhances classifier performance. This explains why LaTRANSIT, where we use only mass-decorrelated observables, inevitably has lower performance than the other methods.

However, a method is even more valuable if it retains sensitivity for a small number of signal events. We present SI as a function of N_{sig} in Fig. 8 for a classifier cut with background rejection of 100 and 1000 for the described methods.⁷ Assuming we can perfectly estimate the background count in SR, a simple counting experiment in this region would provide a significance of $Z = N_{\text{sig,SG}}/\sqrt{N_{\text{bkg,SG}}}$. This means that to detect evidence of a signal, $Z_{\text{evid}} = 3\sigma$, we need a significance improvement of $SI \geq Z_{\text{evid}}\sqrt{N_{\text{bkg,SG}}}/N_{\text{sig,SG}}$, which is shown in Fig. 8 as a gray dashed line. The black dashed line analogously shows the threshold at which a discovery could be claimed with $Z_{\text{disc}} = 5\sigma$.




Figure 8: Significance improvement as a function of the number of injected signal samples using a background rejection value of 100 (right) and 1000 (left), compared for various methods. Solid lines and filled regions represent the average and the standard deviation range for 6 TRANSIT network trainings with different initialisation seeds. For supervised, idealised, RAD-OT, and CURTAINS4F, the average and the standard deviation are taken by retraining the CWoLa classifier 5 times with various seeds.

⁶The results for non-TRANSIT methods are taken from Ref. [121] with permission of the authors.

⁷The results for non-TRANSIT methods are taken from Ref. [121] with permission of the authors.

We observe that the generation of TRANSIT templates yields a higher SI than both RAD-OT and CURTAINS4F across the range of signal contaminations where at least one of the methods achieves $SI > 1$. The TRANSIT curve intersects the evidence and discovery thresholds at a lower number of N_{sig} , thereby having greater discovery potential. It also comes close to the performance of the *idealised* template generator, generally exhibiting SI values that lay in the 2.5 s.d. range of *idealised* classifier.

Despite LaTRANSIT having the lowest SI performance for a high N_{sig} in a given background rejection, it actually outperforms RAD-OT in the region of interest, namely below the 5σ threshold. More importantly, comparing the two subplots in Fig. 7 shows that higher background rejection values lead to better SI performance. As shown in App. E, the distribution of the resonant variable after a cut based on a method that relies on mass-correlated observables (e.g., TRANSIT) becomes increasingly sculpted for higher background rejections. This hinders the fitting of a background fit function, which is often assumed to be smoothly falling, thus restricting the application of methods based on mass-correlated observables to low background rejections. However, the mass-independent variables in LaTRANSIT prevent background sculpting, allowing the use of high background rejections and thus providing similar or better SI performance than RAD-OT, CURTAINS, and TRANSIT when these are limited to low background rejection values. The exact analysis performance depends on the chosen background fitting and bump-hunting procedures and is outside the scope of this work.

4.4 Computational efficiency




Figure 9: Comparison of the approximate time to train a model (if needed) and generate a template of 50000 events for several template generation methods. RAD-OT uses 1 CPU core, while the rest of the methods utilise 1 GPU and 16 CPU.

Fig. 9 shows the estimated time required to obtain a template using TRANSIT and other methods for comparison,⁸ including the time required to train a model on the side-band data and the time needed to generate 500,000 template events in SR. The generation time is usually much shorter than the time required to train an ML model, so we neglect the former for DRAPES, CURTAINS_{F4F}, CURTAINS_s, and CATHODE. RAD-OT [121] does not require training, and the template is computed using one CPU core. For all other methods, training and generation were performed using one NVIDIA[®] RTX 3080 GPU and 16 CPU cores for parallel data loading. Efficient CURTAINS_{F4F} relies on the additional assumption that the “base” flow can be trained only once using all the provided data and that only a small “top” flow needs to be trained for each new signal region. Thus, the cost of training the “base” flow is distributed across all signal regions. We used 10 signal region windows, which is a representative order of magnitude for dijet analyses.

It is evident that TRANSIT achieves more than a tenfold speedup compared to most other ML methods. It is significantly faster than the efficient CURTAINS_{F4F} version for a moderate number of SR windows. TRANSIT also achieves a template generation time comparable to RAD-OT; however, it utilises more computational resources.

5 Conclusions

In this work, we developed TRANSIT, a method for conditional data transport and “implicit” condition decorrelation based on adversarial neural network training. The method was applied to the problem of data-driven generation of background templates for semi-supervised, model-agnostic anomaly searches in high-energy physics and evaluated using the LHCO R&D dataset. Our results show that TRANSIT is capable of smooth and non-linear interpolation of data, creating a high-quality template that closely mimics the background in the signal region. When integrated into the CWoLa framework, TRANSIT achieves competitive anomaly detection performance, substantially outperforming non-ML-based methods such as RAD-OT [121] and surpassing prior transport-based deep learning methods such as CURTAINS_{F4F} [8]. Additionally, TRANSIT requires an order of magnitude less training time than many flow- and diffusion-based models.

One of the most significant insights from this work is that high-quality template generation for weakly supervised searches can be achieved without resorting to complex flow- or diffusion-based models. By simply setting the right optimisation objectives and employing appropriate loss functions, we demonstrated that it is possible to achieve both high performance and computational efficiency. Moreover, the strategy of transporting events instead of generating them from scratch, coupled with an architecture specifically designed to streamline this process, has resulted in a remarkably efficient model. In conclusion, TRANSIT’s simplicity and speed make it a highly scalable solution, capable of handling the computational demands of modern anomaly search analysis pipelines.

Another key feature of TRANSIT is its ability to make latent space variables independent from the invariant mass condition after a convergent training. This enables anomaly

⁸The results for non-TRANSIT methods are taken from references [8, 121] with permission of the authors.

searches to be performed in the space of mass-decorrelated variables, which we have referred to as LaTRANSIT. Despite lower significance improvements for a given background rejection value, LaTRANSIT has high robustness to mass sculpting, providing a beneficial trade-off in the analysis context. Most semi-supervised methods, including TRANSIT, should only be utilised for low background rejection values in order to preserve the shape of the mass spectrum so that it can be fitted in later analysis stages. However, methods such as LaCATHODE [122] and LaTRANSIT provide the possibility to set much higher rejection working points, corresponding to greater analysis sensitivity, without suffering from an increased false discovery probability.

The approach is not limited to low-dimensional tabular data, as the dense networks in the encoder, decoder, and discriminator components could all be replaced with a suitable architecture for a different data representation. Future work could explore the use of transformers to conditionally morph particle clouds. This could prove to be useful for template generation in anomaly searches with low-level observables or for unfolding tasks. An alternative direction is to merge the fast training of TRANSIT with efficient multi-signal-region interpolation in “efficient” CURTAINS4F [8] and SIGMA [11] to achieve even greater speedups.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge funding through the SNSF Sinergia grant CR-SII5_193716 “Robust Deep Density Models for High-Energy Particle Physics and Solar Flare Analysis (RODEM)” and the SNSF project grant 200020_212127 “At the two upgrade frontiers: machine learning and the ITk Pixel detector”.

Code availability

The code used to produce all results presented in this work is available publicly at <https://github.com/IvanOleksiyuk/transit-hep>.

Appendix

A Proof of the efficiency of transport models over Normalising Flows

A conditional generative model that can usually be described by a function $g(\boldsymbol{\eta}, m) \rightarrow \boldsymbol{x} \sim p(\boldsymbol{X}|M = m)$ where $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is sampled from a zero-mean, unit variance Gaussian and m is sampled from a known distribution $p(M)$. In many generative models, this function is invertible, for example, in DDIM, Normalising Flows, and Continuous Flow Matching or quasi-invertible, as in VAE, CycleGAN, meaning that we can return to the latent space representation using $g^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}, m) = \boldsymbol{\eta} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$. Thus, any of these models or a model with a specially learned inverse function, can be turned into a transport model using the relation $f(\boldsymbol{x}, m, \hat{m}) = g(g^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}, m), \hat{m}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} \sim p(\boldsymbol{X}|M = \hat{m})$ for $\boldsymbol{x} \sim p(\boldsymbol{X}|M = m)$.

Consider the space of all possible architectures and methods for creating a high-quality transport model $f(\boldsymbol{x}, m, \hat{m})$. Given hardware and data constraints, each method is assigned

a specific training time $t_{transport}$. The methods for creating a transport model by repurposing an invertible generative model form a subset of this space, with times $t_{generative}$ equal to the time needed to train such a generative model along with its inverse. Therefore, if we were to find a way to create a transport model in the minimum possible time, it would require no more than the time needed for the fastest training of an invertible generative model, namely: $\min(t_{transport}) \leq \min(t_{generative})$.

Thus, we have shown that training a transport model in the optimal case is more efficient than, or at least as efficient as, the optimal training of many popular conditional generative models, including Normalising Flows. Models that do not have an explicit inverse, such as GANs and DDPMs, have analogues with an inbuilt (pseudo-)inverse, such as CycleGAN and DDIM, which have a similar training cost. Therefore, these generative models are also expected to be less cost-efficient than transport training.

B Proof of independence between \hat{X} and M in optimal TRANSIT network

Consider an arbitrary point (\mathbf{x}_1, m_1) and masses m_2, m_3 . Let us define the transport function for the model described in Section 3 as

$$\mathbf{x}_2 = f_{m_1, m_2}(\mathbf{x}_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\mathbf{x}_1, m_1, m_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_\theta(e_\phi(\mathbf{x}_1, m_1), m_2). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

We put m_1 and m_2 as indices to emphasis that in this appendix we consider $f_{m_1, m_2}(\mathbf{x})$ as a function of only vector \mathbf{x} , and different parameters m_1 and m_2 denote different functions in particular $f_{m_1, m_2} \neq f_{m_2, m_1}$. In the case where \mathcal{L}_{rec} and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}$ are zero, f_{m_1, m_2} is invertible with the inverse given by the transport from mass m_2 to mass m_1

$$f_{m_1, m_2}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) = f_{m_2, m_1}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

due to Eq. 3.6, and is therefore bijective. Analogously, we can write

$$\mathbf{x}_3 = f_{m_1, m_3}(\mathbf{x}_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_\theta(e_\phi(\mathbf{x}_1, m_1), m_3). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

If the consistency loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}$ is zero, then $e_\phi(\mathbf{x}_2, m_2) = e_\phi(\mathbf{x}_1, m_1)$, and we obtain

$$f_{m_2, m_3}(\mathbf{x}_2) = d_\theta(e_\phi(\mathbf{x}_2, m_2), m_3) = d_\theta(e_\phi(\mathbf{x}_1, m_1), m_3) = \mathbf{x}_3. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Thus combining Eq. B.3 and Eq. B.4, the transport is transitive

$$f_{m_2, m_3}(f_{m_1, m_2}(\mathbf{x}_1)) = f_{m_1, m_3}(\mathbf{x}_1). \quad (\text{B.5})$$

We use an encoder e_ϕ and a decoder d_θ , both of which consist only of differentiable functions (as shown in Subsection 3.3). Thus, for specific values of m_1 and m_2 , we can differentiate the transport function with respect to its first argument to obtain the Jacobian

$$J_{m_1, m_2}(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial f_{m_1, m_2}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right|. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Using the chain rule of differentiation on Eq. B.5, we obtain a differentiable form of transitivity:

$$J_{m_1, m_3}(\mathbf{x}_1) = J_{m_2, m_3}(f_{m_1, m_2}(\mathbf{x}_1))J_{m_1, m_2}(\mathbf{x}_1). \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Additionally, according to the rule of probability density function transformation, given a p.d.f. of one variable $p_X(x)$ and a transformation function $y = f(y)$, one can express the p.d.f. for y as

$$p_Y(y) = p_X(x) \left| \frac{dx}{dy} \right| = p_X(f^{-1}(y)) \left| \frac{df^{-1}(y)}{dy} \right|. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

In multiple dimensions, this rule is extended for any invertible smooth vector function of a vector variable with the same input and output dimensions so that it holds

$$p_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{y}) = p_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right) \right| = p_{\mathbf{X}}(f^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) J_{f^{-1}(\mathbf{y})}(\mathbf{y}). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

The conditional distributions $p_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{c})$ and $p_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c})$ relate analogically

$$p_{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}) = p_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{c}) \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right) \right| = p_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{C}}(f^{-1}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{c}), \mathbf{c}) J_{f^{-1}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c})}(\mathbf{y}). \quad (\text{B.10})$$

This applies to our function f_{m_1, m_2} to yield

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}, M}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}|\hat{m}, m) &= p_{\mathbf{X}, \hat{M}, M}(f_{\hat{m}, m}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})|\hat{m}, m) J_{\hat{m}, m}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \\ p_{\mathbf{X}, \hat{M}, M}(\mathbf{x}|\hat{m}, m) &= p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}, M}(f_{m, \hat{m}}(\mathbf{x})|\hat{m}, m) J_{m, \hat{m}}(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Additionally, let us recall that \hat{m} is a shuffled version of m and thus is statistically independent of either m or x , meaning

$$p_{\mathbf{X}, M, \hat{M}}(\mathbf{x}|m, \hat{m}) = p_{\mathbf{X}, M}(\mathbf{x}|m) \forall \hat{m}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

However, this ensures that \hat{m} is a shuffled version of m and has the same marginal distribution

$$p_M(k) = p_{\hat{M}}(k). \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Finally, the maximisation of the discriminator \mathcal{L}_{disc} loss up to a value of $\ln(4)$ makes joint distribution for pairs (x, m) and (\hat{x}, \hat{m}) same, and thus

$$p_{\mathbf{X}, M}(k, l) = p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}}(k, l) \stackrel{\text{B.13}}{\Rightarrow} p_{\mathbf{X}, M}(k|l) = p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}}(k|l). \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Consequently, we can summaries that

$$\begin{aligned}
& p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}, M}(\mathbf{a}|b, c) \\
& \stackrel{B.11}{=} p_{\mathbf{X}, \hat{M}, M}(f_{b,c}(\mathbf{a})|b, c) J_{b,c}(\mathbf{a}) \\
& \stackrel{B.12}{=} p_{\mathbf{X}, M}(f_{b,c}(\mathbf{a})|c) J_{b,c}(\mathbf{a}) \\
& \stackrel{B.14}{=} p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}}(f_{b,c}(\mathbf{a})|c) J_{b,c}(\mathbf{a}) \\
& \stackrel{\text{stat.}}{=} \int_{q=\min(M)}^{q=\max(M)} p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}, M}(f_{b,c}(\mathbf{a})|c, q) p_M(q) J_{b,c}(\mathbf{a}) dq \\
\stackrel{B.11}{=} & \int_{q=\min(M)}^{q=\max(M)} p_{\mathbf{X}, \hat{M}, M}(f_{c,q}(f_{b,c}(\mathbf{a}))|c, q) J_{c,q}(f_{b,c}(\mathbf{a})) J_{b,c}(\mathbf{a}) p_M(q) dq \\
& \stackrel{B.12}{=} \int_{q=\min(M)}^{q=\max(M)} p_{\mathbf{X}, M}(f_{c,q}(f_{b,c}(\mathbf{a}))|q) J_{c,q}(f_{b,c}(\mathbf{a})) J_{b,c}(\mathbf{a}) p_M(q) dq \\
& \stackrel{B.5}{=} \int_{q=\min(M)}^{q=\max(M)} p_{\mathbf{X}, M}(f_{b,q}(\mathbf{a})|q) J_{c,q}(f_{b,c}(\mathbf{a})) J_{b,c}(\mathbf{a}) p_M(q) dq \\
& \stackrel{B.7}{=} \int_{q=\min(M)}^{q=\max(M)} p_{\mathbf{X}, M}(f_{b,q}(\mathbf{a})|q) J_{b,q}(\mathbf{a}) p_M(q) dq \\
& \stackrel{B.12}{=} \int_{q=\min(M)}^{q=\max(M)} p_{\mathbf{X}, \hat{M}, M}(f_{b,q}(\mathbf{a})|b, q) J_{b,q}(\mathbf{a}) p_M(q) dq \\
& \stackrel{B.11}{=} \int_{q=\min(M)}^{q=\max(M)} p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}, M}(\mathbf{a}|b, q) p_M(q) dq \\
& \stackrel{\text{stat.}}{=} p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}}(\mathbf{a}|b)
\end{aligned} \tag{B.15}$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned}
& p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}, M}(\mathbf{a}|b, c) = p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}}(\mathbf{a}|b) \\
\Rightarrow & \int_{c=\min(M)}^{c=\max(M)} p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}, M}(\mathbf{a}|b, c) p_M(b) db = \int_{c=\min(M)}^{c=\max(M)} p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{M}}(\mathbf{a}|c) p_M(b) db \\
& \Rightarrow p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, M}(\mathbf{a}|c) = p_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}(\mathbf{a}) \\
& \Rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{X}} \perp M.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.16}$$

In case, \mathcal{L}_{rec} , \mathcal{L}_{cons} are not zero and \mathcal{L}_{trans} do not reach $\ln(4)$, we only expect to achieve an approximate independence of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ and M meaning that the remaining dependence is weak.

C Sideband to sideband transport

One way to validate the transport quality of the TRANSIT model is to transport events from the first sideband to the second sideband and check that they match the true distribution of events in the second sideband, and vice versa. Figs. 10, and 11 show that the transport is carried out successfully, and both the marginals and the correlations between

the variables are well-matched between the transformed and target event sets. Such a validation does not require any signal/background labels and can thus be performed on real data.




Figure 10: Distributions of events in lower “origin” sideband $m_{jj} \in [3.0, 3.3]$ TeV (green) and in higher “target” sideband $m_{jj} \in [3.7, 4.6]$ TeV (blue) along with the distribution of events obtained by transporting events from the lower to the higher sideband using TRANSIT (red). The diagonal elements show the marginal distributions of the features, while the off-diagonal elements show the correlations between the features (using KDE contour plots with 16000 points). No signal was added in this run.




Figure 11: Distributions of events in higher “origin” sideband $m_{jj} \in [3.7, 4.6]$ TeV (green) and lower “target” sideband $m_{jj} \in [3.0, 4.3]$ TeV (blue) along with the distribution of events obtained by transporting events from the higher to the lower sideband using TRANSIT (red). The diagonal elements show the marginal distributions of the features, while the off-diagonal elements show the correlations between the features (using KDE contour plots with 16000 points). No signal was added in this run.

D Transport trajectories

Another data-driven way to ensure the transport quality of the TRANSIT model is to plot the transport curves, shown in Fig. 12. Each curve is created by encoding a point from a sideband region (green cross) into the latent representation of TRANSIT and decoding it using an array of different masses from 3000 GeV to 4600 GeV. The distance between each curve and the original point is negligible, showing that the reconstruction loss is well minimised. Furthermore, we observe that although some curves are non-linear, all of them

are smooth, exhibiting no discontinuities and maintaining moderate curvature at the scale of our problem.




Figure 12: Two-dimensional projections (Δm vs m_{jj} , left, and ΔR vs m_{jj} , right) of the transport curves, formed by applying TRANSIT transport to original SB points (green crosses) using an array of different target masses $\hat{m} = m_{jj}$. The colour map shows the score assigned to each transported point by the adversarial classifier in the TRANSIT model. No signal was added in this run.




Figure 13: Quantile lines of the conditional distributions $p(\Delta m|m_{jj})$ and $p(\Delta R|m_{jj})$ from 5% to 95% with a 5% increment. The lines are created by finding quantiles in each of the 20 m_{jj} bins with 80 GeV width.

We can compare these curves to the quantiles of distributions of the same variables shown in Fig. 13. The observable Δm is nearly independent of m_{jj} in the bulk of the Δm distribution, as evidenced by the flat quantiles. Δm only has a small dependence on m_{jj} in the higher tail of its distribution, corresponding to slightly curved quantiles.

The TRANSIT transport curves follow the same pattern, providing nearly flat trajectories for the bulk of the Δm distribution, while correctly modelling the tail of the

distribution with several curved trajectories at high Δm . On the other hand, ΔR has a strong and partially non-linear correlation with m_{jj} , resulting in non-linear quantiles in Fig. 13. This is reflected in Fig. 12, where the trajectories exhibit an analogous form, expanding, shifting, and morphing the distribution of ΔR for increasing m_{jj} . This validates the core idea of TRANSIT: to preserve an uncorrelated variable while smoothly shifting a mass-correlated variable.

It is important to note that we do not expect the projections of our curves to exactly match the quantiles, except in the simplest cases. The reason for this is that order preservation is ill-defined in more than one dimension. Thus, for certain pairs of distributions, even optimal transport will yield curves that appear to intersect in some two-dimensional projections, whereas the quantiles of the conditional distribution cannot intersect.

For each decoded point, we compute the score of the adversarial classifier and display it using a colour map. Classifier scores closer to 1 indicate that the adversary identifies the point as background, i.e., our model does not generate enough fake samples in that region. Conversely, if the score is closer to 0, the classifier identifies the point on the trajectory as fake. In our case, we observe that all scores lie within the $[0.48, 0.52]$ range, meaning that, apart from some minor fluctuations, for any m_{jj} , the generated conditional distribution $\hat{p}_{\phi, \theta}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}|\hat{M})$ closely matches the true conditional distribution $p(\mathbf{X}|M)$. This match is primarily the result of the maximisation of the adversarial discriminator $\mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}}$ loss by the TM network.

E Example of background sculpting

Fig. 14 shows an example of background sculpting after using the score of a CWoLa classifier trained with either the TRANSIT template or the LaTRANSIT latent space representation, both originating from the same TRANSIT network training. The original data and TRANSIT template have a mass-dependent ΔR observable that induces significant background sculpting. The background distribution deviates further from the original distribution as the rejection threshold increases. On the other hand, the LaTRANSIT method operates only with mass-independent variables and thus does not exhibit any sculpting beyond the level of statistical fluctuations. In general, the shape of the background sculpting depends on the initialisation of both the TRANSIT network and the classifier BDT; here, we provide one representative case.




Figure 14: Distribution of the dijet mass m_{jj} after a cut on CWoLa score for TRANSIT (left) and LaTRANSIT (right) methods for one representative model training. No signal was added in this run.

F Hyperparameters

Table 1: Hyperparameters of the TRANSIT network used for all the results in this publication.

Parameter	value
batch size	2048
training epochs	200
initial learning rate	2×10^{-3}
learning rate decay on milestone	0.5
milestone epochs encoder/decoder	[30, 100, 150, 175]
milestone epochs discriminator	[30, 100, 150, 175]
optimiser	AdamW
weight decay	1×10^{-5}
warmup epochs	5
z dimensionality	8
MLP layers width	128
MLP layers per block	2
# residual blocks encoder	3
# residual blocks decoder	3
discriminator MLP layer width	[64, 64, 64, 64]
w_{rec}	1
w_{trans}	0.2
w_{cons}	0.1

References

- [1] ATLAS Collaboration, *Observation of a new particle in the search for the standard model higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC*, *Physics Letters B* **716** (2012) 1–29 [[1207.7214](#)].
- [2] CMS Collaboration, *Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC*, *Physics Letters B* **716** (2012) 30–61 [[1207.7235](#)].
- [3] E.M. Metodiev, B. Nachman and J. Thaler, *Classification without labels: Learning from mixed samples in high energy physics*, *JHEP* **10** (2017) 174 [[1708.02949](#)].
- [4] A. Andreassen, B. Nachman and D. Shih, *Simulation Assisted Likelihood-free Anomaly Detection*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 095004 [[2001.05001](#)].
- [5] T. Golling, S. Klein, R. Mastandrea and B. Nachman, *Flow-enhanced transportation for anomaly detection*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 096025 [[2212.11285](#)].
- [6] A. Hallin, J. Isaacson, G. Kasieczka, C. Krause, B. Nachman, T. Quadfasel et al., *Classifying Anomalies THrough Outer Density Estimation (CATHODE)*, *Phys.Rev.D* **106** (2021) 055006 [[2109.00546](#)].
- [7] J.A. Raine, S. Klein, D. Sengupta and T. Golling, *CURTAINs for your Sliding Window: Constructing Unobserved Regions by Transforming Adjacent Intervals*, *Front.Big Data* **6** (2022) 899345 [[2203.09470](#)].
- [8] D. Sengupta, S. Klein, J.A. Raine and T. Golling, *CURTAINs Flows For Flows: Constructing Unobserved Regions with Maximum Likelihood Estimation*, *SciPost Phys.* **17** (2023) 046 [[2305.04646](#)].
- [9] D. Sengupta, M. Leigh, J.A. Raine, S. Klein and T. Golling, *Improving new physics searches with diffusion models for event observables and jet constituents*, *JHEP* **04** (2023) 109 [[2312.10130](#)].
- [10] E. Buhmann, C. Ewen, G. Kasieczka, V. Mikuni, B. Nachman and D. Shih, *Full Phase Space Resonant Anomaly Detection*, *Phys.Rev.D* **109** (2023) 055015 [[2310.06897](#)].
- [11] R. Das and D. Shih, *SIGMA: Single Interpolated Generative Model for Anomalies*, [2410.20537](#).
- [12] S. Zhang, K.-X. Chen and J.-C. Yang, *Detect anomalous quartic gauge couplings at muon colliders with quantum kernel k-means*, [2409.07010](#).
- [13] S.V. Chekanov, W. Islam, R. Zhang and N. Luongo, *ADFilter – A Web Tool for New Physics Searches With Autoencoder-Based Anomaly Detection Using Deep Unsupervised Neural Networks*, [2409.03065](#).
- [14] G. Matos, E. Busch, K.R. Park and J. Gonski, *Semi-supervised permutation invariant particle-level anomaly detection*, [2408.17409](#).
- [15] G. Grosso, *Anomaly-aware summary statistic from data batches*, [2407.01249](#).
- [16] C. Li et al., *Accelerating Resonance Searches via Signature-Oriented Pre-training*, [2405.12972](#).
- [17] C.L. Cheng, G. Singh and B. Nachman, *Incorporating Physical Priors into Weakly-Supervised Anomaly Detection*, [2405.08889](#).

- [18] C. Krause, B. Nachman, I. Pang, D. Shih and Y. Zhu, *Anomaly detection with flow-based fast calorimeter simulators*, *Phys.Rev.D* **110** (2023) 035036 [2312.11618].
- [19] CMS Collaboration, *Testing a Neural Network for Anomaly Detection in the CMS Global Trigger Test Crate during Run 3*, in *Topical Workshop on Electronics for Particle Physics*, vol. 19, p. C03029, 12, 2023, DOI [2312.10009].
- [20] E.M. Metodiev, J. Thaler and R. Wynne, *Anomaly Detection in Collider Physics via Factorized Observables*, *Phys.Rev.D* **110** (2023) 055012 [2312.00119].
- [21] R. Liu, A. Gandrakota, J. Ngadiuba, M. Spiropulu and J.-R. Vlimant, *Fast Particle-based Anomaly Detection Algorithm with Variational Autoencoder*, in *37th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 11, 2023 [2311.17162].
- [22] Y.-T. Zhang, X.-T. Wang and J.-C. Yang, *Searching for gluon quartic gauge couplings at muon colliders using the auto-encoder*, *Phys.Rev.D* **109** (2023) 095028 [2311.16627].
- [23] K. Bai, R. Mastandrea and B. Nachman, *Non-resonant Anomaly Detection with Background Extrapolation*, *JHEP* **04** (2023) 059 [2311.12924].
- [24] M. Freytsis, M. Perelstein and Y.C. San, *Anomaly Detection in Presence of Irrelevant Features*, *JHEP* **02** (2023) 220 [2310.13057].
- [25] T. Finke, M. Hein, G. Kasieczka, M. Krämer, A. Mück, P. Prangchaikul et al., *Back To The Roots: Tree-Based Algorithms for Weakly Supervised Anomaly Detection*, *Phys.Rev.D* **109** (2023) 034033 [2309.13111].
- [26] G. Bickendorf, M. Drees, G. Kasieczka, C. Krause and D. Shih, *Combining Resonant and Tail-based Anomaly Detection*, *Phys.Rev.D* **109** (2023) 096031 [2309.12918].
- [27] S.V. Chekanov and R. Zhang, *Boosting sensitivity to new physics with unsupervised anomaly detection in dijet resonance search*, *Eur.Phys.J.Plus* **139** (2023) 237 [2308.02671].
- [28] ATLAS Collaboration, *Anomaly detection search for new resonances decaying into a Higgs boson and a generic new particle X in hadronic final states using $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector*, *Phys.Rev.D* **108** (2023) 052009 [2306.03637].
- [29] L. Vaslin, V. Barra and J. Donini, *GAN-AE : An anomaly detection algorithm for New Physics search in LHC data*, *Eur.Phys.J.C* **83** (2023) 1008 [2305.15179].
- [30] T. Golling, G. Kasieczka, C. Krause, R. Mastandrea, B. Nachman, J.A. Raine et al., *The Interplay of Machine Learning-based Resonant Anomaly Detection Methods*, *Eur.Phys.J.C* **84** (2023) 241 [2307.11157].
- [31] V. Mikuni and B. Nachman, *High-dimensional and Permutation Invariant Anomaly Detection*, *SciPost Phys.* **16** (2023) 062 [2306.03933].
- [32] T. Golling et al., *The Mass-ive Issue: Anomaly Detection in Jet Physics*, in *34th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 3, 2023 [2303.14134].
- [33] S. Roche, Q. Bayer, B. Carlson, W. Ouligian, P. Serhiayenka, J. Stelzer et al., *Nanosecond anomaly detection with decision trees for high energy physics and real-time application to exotic Higgs decays*, *Nature Commun.* **15** (2023) 3527 [2304.03836].
- [34] J. Schuhmacher, L. Boggia, V. Belis, E. Puljak, M. Grossi, M. Pierini et al., *Unravelling physics beyond the standard model with classical and quantum anomaly detection*, *Mach.Learn.Sci.Tech.* **4** (2023) 045031 [2301.10787].

- [35] R. Mastandrea and B. Nachman, *Efficiently Moving Instead of Reweighting Collider Events with Machine Learning*, in *36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 12, 2022 [[2212.06155](#)].
- [36] J.Y. Araz and M. Spannowsky, *Quantum-probabilistic Hamiltonian learning for generative modelling & anomaly detection*, *Phys.Rev.A* **108** (2022) 6 [[2211.03803](#)].
- [37] G. Kasieczka, R. Mastandrea, V. Mikuni, B. Nachman, M. Pettee and D. Shih, *Anomaly Detection under Coordinate Transformations*, *Phys.Rev.D* **107** (2022) 015009 [[2209.06225](#)].
- [38] J.F. Kamenik and M. Szewc, *Null Hypothesis Test for Anomaly Detection*, *Phys.Lett.B* **840** (2022) 137836 [[2210.02226](#)].
- [39] S.E. Park, P. Harris and B. Ostdiek, *Neural Embedding: Learning the Embedding of the Manifold of Physics Data*, *JHEP* **07** (2022) 108 [[2208.05484](#)].
- [40] S. Caron, R.R. de Austri and Z. Zhang, *Mixture-of-theories Training: Can We Find New Physics and Anomalies Better by Mixing Physical Theories?*, *JHEP* **03** (2022) 004 [[2207.07631](#)].
- [41] B.M. Dillon, L. Favaro, T. Plehn, P. Sorrenson and M. Krämer, *A Normalized Autoencoder for LHC Triggers*, *SciPost Phys.Core* **6** (2022) 074 [[2206.14225](#)].
- [42] R. Verheyen, *Event Generation and Density Estimation with Surjective Normalizing Flows*, *SciPost Phys.* **13** (2022) 047 [[2205.01697](#)].
- [43] T. Finke, M. Krämer, M. Lipp and A. Mück, *Boosting mono-jet searches with model-agnostic machine learning*, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 015 [[2204.11889](#)].
- [44] C. Fanelli, J. Giroux and Z. Papandreou, *"Flux+Mutability": A Conditional Generative Approach to One-Class Classification and Anomaly Detection*, *Mach.Learn.Sci.Tech.* **3** (2022) 045012 [[2204.08609](#)].
- [45] M. Letizia, G. Losapio, M. Rando, G. Grosso, A. Wulzer, M. Pierini et al., *Learning new physics efficiently with nonparametric methods*, *Eur.Phys.J.C* **82** (2022) 879 [[2204.02317](#)].
- [46] M. Birman, B. Nachman, R. Sebbah, G. Sela, O. Turetz and S. Bressler, *Data-directed search for new physics based on symmetries of the SM*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 508 [[2203.07529](#)].
- [47] B.M. Dillon, R. Mastandrea and B. Nachman, *Self-supervised Anomaly Detection for New Physics*, *Phys.Rev.D* **106** (2022) 056005 [[2205.10380](#)].
- [48] X.-H. Jiang, A. Juste, Y.-Y. Li and T. Liu, *Detecting new physics as novelty — Complementarity matters*, *JHEP* **10** (2022) 085 [[2202.02165](#)].
- [49] S. Alvi, C. Bauer and B. Nachman, *Quantum Anomaly Detection for Collider Physics*, *JHEP* **02** (2022) 220 [[2206.08391](#)].
- [50] T. Buss, B.M. Dillon, T. Finke, M. Krämer, A. Morandini, A. Mück et al., *What's Anomalous in LHC Jets?*, *SciPost Phys.* **15** (2022) 168 [[2202.00686](#)].
- [51] J.A. Aguilar-Saavedra, *Taming modeling uncertainties with Mass Unspecific Supervised Tagging*, *Eur.Phys.J.C* **82** (2022) 270 [[2201.11143](#)].
- [52] L. Bradshaw, S. Chang and B. Ostdiek, *Creating Simple, Interpretable Anomaly Detectors for New Physics in Jet Substructure*, *Phys.Rev.D* **106** (2022) 035014 [[2203.01343](#)].
- [53] V.S. Ngairangbam, M. Spannowsky and M. Takeuchi, *Anomaly detection in high-energy physics using a quantum autoencoder*, *Phys.Rev.D* **105** (2021) 095004 [[2112.04958](#)].

- [54] F. Canelli, A. de Cosa, L.L. Pottier, J. Niedziela, K. Pedro and M. Pierini, *Autoencoders for Semivisible Jet Detection*, *JHEP* **02** (2021) 074 [2112.02864].
- [55] R.T. d’Agnolo, G. Grosso, M. Pierini, A. Wulzer and M. Zanetti, *Learning New Physics from an Imperfect Machine*, *Eur.Phys.J.C* **82** (2021) 275 [2111.13633].
- [56] S.V. Chekanov and W. Hopkins, *Event-based anomaly detection for new physics searches at the LHC using machine learning*, *Universe* **8** (2021) 494 [2111.12119].
- [57] V. Mikuni, B. Nachman and D. Shih, *Online-compatible Unsupervised Non-resonant Anomaly Detection*, *Phys.Rev.D* **105** (2021) 055006 [2111.06417].
- [58] C.G. Lester and R. Tombs, *Stressed GANs snag desserts, a.k.a Spotting Symmetry Violation with Symmetric Functions*, 2111.00616.
- [59] R. Tombs and C.G. Lester, *A method to challenge symmetries in data with self-supervised learning*, *JINST* **17** (2021) P08024 [2111.05442].
- [60] J.A. Aguilar-Saavedra, *Anomaly detection from mass unspecific jet tagging*, *Eur.Phys.J.C* **82** (2021) 130 [2111.02647].
- [61] J. Herrero-Garcia, R. Patrick and A. Scaffidi, *Signal-agnostic dark matter searches in direct detection data with machine learning*, *JCAP* **02** (2021) 039 [2110.12248].
- [62] P. Jawahar, T. Aarrestad, M. Pierini, K.A. Wozniak, J. Ngadiuba, J. Duarte et al., *Improving Variational Autoencoders for New Physics Detection at the LHC with Normalizing Flows*, *Front.Big Data* **5** (2021) 803685 [2110.08508].
- [63] K. Fraser, S. Homiller, R.K. Mishra, B. Ostdiek and M.D. Schwartz, *Challenges for Unsupervised Anomaly Detection in Particle Physics*, *JHEP* **03** (2021) 066 [2110.06948].
- [64] B. Ostdiek, *Deep Set Auto Encoders for Anomaly Detection in Particle Physics*, *SciPost Phys.* **12** (2021) 045 [2109.01695].
- [65] E. Govorkova et al., *Autoencoders on FPGAs for real-time, unsupervised new physics detection at 40 MHz at the Large Hadron Collider*, *Nature Mach.Intell.* **4** (2021) 154 [2108.03986].
- [66] S. Volkovich, F.D.V. Halevy and S. Bressler, *The Data-Directed Paradigm for BSM searches*, *Eur.Phys.J.C* **82** (2021) 265 [2107.11573].
- [67] G. Kasieczka, B. Nachman and D. Shih, *New Methods and Datasets for Group Anomaly Detection From Fundamental Physics*, in *Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 7, 2021 [2107.02821].
- [68] E. Govorkova, E. Puljak, T. Aarrestad, M. Pierini, K.A. Woźniak and J. Ngadiuba, *LHC physics dataset for unsupervised New Physics detection at 40 MHz*, *Sci. Data* **9** (2021) 118 [2107.02157].
- [69] S. Caron, L. Hendriks and R. Verheyen, *Rare and Different: Anomaly Scores from a combination of likelihood and out-of-distribution models to detect new physics at the LHC*, *SciPost Phys.* **12** (2021) 077 [2106.10164].
- [70] T. Dorigo, M. Fumanelli, C. Maccani, M. Mojsovska, G.C. Strong and B. Scarpa, *RanBox: Anomaly Detection in the Copula Space*, *JHEP* **01** (2021) 008 [2106.05747].
- [71] T. Aarrestad et al., *The Dark Machines Anomaly Score Challenge: Benchmark Data and Model Independent Event Classification for the Large Hadron Collider*, *SciPost Phys.* **12** (2021) 043 [2105.14027].

- [72] A. Kahn, J. Gonski, I. Ochoa, D. Williams and G. Brooijmans, *Anomalous Jet Identification via Sequence Modeling*, *JINST* **16** (2021) P08012 [2105.09274].
- [73] O. Atkinson, A. Bhardwaj, C. Englert, V.S. Ngairangbam and M. Spannowsky, *Anomaly detection with Convolutional Graph Neural Networks*, *JHEP* **08** (2021) 080 [2105.07988].
- [74] D. Shih, M.R. Buckley, L. Necib and J. Tamanas, *Via Machinae: Searching for Stellar Streams using Unsupervised Machine Learning*, *Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc.* **509** (2021) 5992 [2104.12789].
- [75] T. Finke, M. Krämer, A. Morandini, A. Mück and I. Oleksiyuk, *Autoencoders for unsupervised anomaly detection in high energy physics*, *JHEP* **06** (2021) 161 [2104.09051].
- [76] B.M. Dillon, T. Plehn, C. Sauer and P. Sorrenson, *Better Latent Spaces for Better Autoencoders*, *SciPost Phys.* **11** (2021) 061 [2104.08291].
- [77] J.H. Collins, P. Martín-Ramiro, B. Nachman and D. Shih, *Comparing Weak- and Unsupervised Methods for Resonant Anomaly Detection*, *Eur.Phys.J.C* **81** (2021) 617 [2104.02092].
- [78] B. Bortolato, B.M. Dillon, J.F. Kamenik and A. Smolkovič, *Bump Hunting in Latent Space*, *Phys.Rev.D* **105** (2021) 115009 [2103.06595].
- [79] A. Blance and M. Spannowsky, *Unsupervised Event Classification with Graphs on Classical and Photonic Quantum Computers*, *JHEP* **08** (2021) 170 [2103.03897].
- [80] J. Batson, C.G. Haaf, Y. Kahn and D.A. Roberts, *Topological Obstructions to Autoencoding*, *JHEP* **04** (2021) 280 [2102.08380].
- [81] P. Chakravarti, M. Kuusela, J. Lei and L. Wasserman, *Model-Independent Detection of New Physics Signals Using Interpretable Semi-Supervised Classifier Tests*, 2102.07679.
- [82] G. Kasieczka et al., *The LHC Olympics 2020: A Community Challenge for Anomaly Detection in High Energy Physics*, *Rept.Prog.Phys.* **84** (2021) 124201 [2101.08320].
- [83] G. Stein, U. Seljak and B. Dai, *Unsupervised in-distribution anomaly detection of new physics through conditional density estimation*, 2012.11638.
- [84] D.A. Faroughy, *Uncovering hidden patterns in collider events with Bayesian probabilistic models*, *PoS ICHEP2020* (2020) 238 [2012.08579].
- [85] S.E. Park, D. Rankin, S.-M. Udrescu, M. Yunus and P. Harris, *Quasi Anomalous Knowledge: Searching for new physics with embedded knowledge*, *JHEP* **06** (2020) 030 [2011.03550].
- [86] M. van Beekveld, S. Caron, L. Hendriks, P. Jackson, A. Leinweber, S. Otten et al., *Combining outlier analysis algorithms to identify new physics at the LHC*, *JHEP* **09** (2020) 024 [2010.07940].
- [87] V. Mikuni and F. Canelli, *Unsupervised clustering for collider physics*, *Phys.Rev.D* **103** (2020) 092007 [2010.07106].
- [88] Adrian Alan Pol and Victor Berger and Gianluca Cerminara and Cecile Germain and Maurizio Pierini, *Anomaly Detection With Conditional Variational Autoencoders*, 2010.05531.
- [89] K. Benkendorfer, L.L. Pottier and B. Nachman, *Simulation-Assisted Decorrelation for Resonant Anomaly Detection*, *Phys.Rev.D* **104** (2020) 035003 [2009.02205].

- [90] J.A. Aguilar-Saavedra, F.R. Joaquim and J.F. Seabra, *Mass Unspecific Supervised Tagging (MUST) for boosted jets*, [2008.12792](#).
- [91] S. Alexander, S. Gleyzer, H. Parul, P. Reddy, M.W. Toomey, E. Usai et al., *Decoding Dark Matter Substructure without Supervision*, [2008.12731](#).
- [92] P. Thaprasop, K. Zhou, J. Steinheimer and C. Herold, *Unsupervised Outlier Detection in Heavy-Ion Collisions*, *Phys.Scripta* **96** (2020) 064003 [[2007.15830](#)].
- [93] C.K. Khosa and V. Sanz, *Anomaly Awareness*, *SciPost Phys.* **15** (2020) 053 [[2007.14462](#)].
- [94] T. Cheng, J.-F. Arguin, J. Leissner-Martin, J. Pilette and T. Golling, *Variational Autoencoders for Anomalous Jet Tagging*, *Phys.Rev.D* **107** (2020) 016002 [[2007.01850](#)].
- [95] O. Amram and C.M. Suarez, *Tag N' Train: A Technique to Train Improved Classifiers on Unlabeled Data*, [2002.12376](#).
- [96] M.C. Romao, N. Castro and R. Pedro, *Finding New Physics without learning about it: Anomaly Detection as a tool for Searches at Colliders*, [2006.05432](#).
- [97] B.M. Dillon, D.A. Faroughy, J.F. Kamenik and M. Szewc, *Learning the latent structure of collider events*, [2005.12319](#).
- [98] O. Knapp, G. Dissertori, O. Cerri, T.Q. Nguyen, J.-R. Vlimant and M. Pierini, *Adversarially Learned Anomaly Detection on CMS Open Data: re-discovering the top quark*, [2005.01598](#).
- [99] M.C. Romao, N. Castro, J. Milhano, R. Pedro and T. Vale, *Use of a Generalized Energy Mover's Distance in the Search for Rare Phenomena at Colliders*, [2004.09360](#).
- [100] M. Romão Crispim, N. Castro, R. Pedro and T. Vale, *Transferability of Deep Learning Models in Searches for New Physics at Colliders*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 035042 [[1912.04220](#)].
- [101] J.A. Aguilar-Saavedra, J.H. Collins and R.K. Mishra, *A generic anti-QCD jet tagger*, *JHEP* **11** (2017) 163 [[1709.01087](#)].
- [102] B. Nachman and D. Shih, *Anomaly Detection with Density Estimation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 075042 [[2001.04990](#)].
- [103] B.M. Dillon, D.A. Faroughy and J.F. Kamenik, *Uncovering latent jet substructure*, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 056002 [[1904.04200](#)].
- [104] G.M. Alessandro Casa, *Nonparametric semisupervised classification for signal detection in high energy physics*, [1809.02977](#).
- [105] A. Mullin, H. Pacey, M. Parker, M. White and S. Williams, *Does SUSY have friends? A new approach for LHC event analysis*, [1912.10625](#).
- [106] A. De Simone and T. Jacques, *Guiding New Physics Searches with Unsupervised Learning*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) 289 [[1807.06038](#)].
- [107] J. Hajer, Y.-Y. Li, T. Liu and H. Wang, *Novelty Detection Meets Collider Physics*, [1807.10261](#).
- [108] A. Blance, M. Spannowsky and P. Waite, *Adversarially-trained autoencoders for robust unsupervised new physics searches*, *JHEP* **10** (2019) 047 [[1905.10384](#)].
- [109] O. Cerri, T.Q. Nguyen, M. Pierini, M. Spiropulu and J.-R. Vlimant, *Variational*

- Autoencoders for New Physics Mining at the Large Hadron Collider*, *JHEP* **05** (2019) 036 [[1811.10276](#)].
- [110] T.S. Roy and A.H. Vijay, *A robust anomaly finder based on autoencoder*, [1903.02032](#).
- [111] T. Heimel, G. Kasieczka, T. Plehn and J.M. Thompson, *QCD or What?*, *SciPost Phys.* **6** (2019) 030 [[1808.08979](#)].
- [112] M. Farina, Y. Nakai and D. Shih, *Searching for New Physics with Deep Autoencoders*, [1808.08992](#).
- [113] R.T. D’Agnolo, G. Grosso, M. Pierini, A. Wulzer and M. Zanetti, *Learning Multivariate New Physics*, [1912.12155](#).
- [114] J.H. Collins, K. Howe and B. Nachman, *Extending the search for new resonances with machine learning*, *Phys. Rev.* **D99** (2019) 014038 [[1902.02634](#)].
- [115] J.H. Collins, K. Howe and B. Nachman, *Anomaly Detection for Resonant New Physics with Machine Learning*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** (2018) 241803 [[1805.02664](#)].
- [116] R.T. D’Agnolo and A. Wulzer, *Learning New Physics from a Machine*, *Phys. Rev.* **D99** (2019) 015014 [[1806.02350](#)].
- [117] ATLAS Collaboration, *Dijet resonance search with weak supervision using 13 TeV pp collisions in the ATLAS detector*, [2005.02983](#).
- [118] A. Collaboration, *Weakly supervised anomaly detection for resonant new physics in the dijet final state using proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ tev with the atlas detector*, 2025.
- [119] CMS collaboration, *Model-agnostic search for dijet resonances with anomalous jet substructure in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, [2412.03747](#).
- [120] DARWIN Collaboration, *Model-independent searches of new physics in DARWIN with a semi-supervised deep learning pipeline*, [2410.00755](#).
- [121] M. Leigh, D. Sengupta, B. Nachman and T. Golling, *Accelerating template generation in resonant anomaly detection searches with optimal transport*, [2407.19818](#).
- [122] A. Hallin, G. Kasieczka, T. Quadfasel, D. Shih and M. Sommerhalder, *Resonant anomaly detection without background sculpting*, *Phys.Rev.D* **107** (2022) 114012 [[2210.14924](#)].
- [123] T. Cohen, M. Lisanti and H.K. Lou, *Semivisible Jets: Dark Matter Undercover at the LHC*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** (2015) 171804 [[1503.00009](#)].
- [124] P. Schwaller, D. Stolarski and A. Weiler, *Emerging Jets*, *JHEP* **05** (2015) 059 [[1502.05409](#)].
- [125] G. Kasieczka, B. Nachman, D. Shih, O. Amram, A. Andreassen, K. Benkendorfer et al., *The LHC olympics 2020 a community challenge for anomaly detection in high energy physics*, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **84** (2021) 124201 [[2101.08320](#)].
- [126] T. Sjöstrand, S. Ask, J.R. Christiansen, R. Corke, N. Desai, P. Ilten et al., *An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **191** (2015) 159 [[1410.3012](#)].
- [127] J. de Favereau, C. Delaere, P. Demin, A. Giammanco, V. Lemaître, A. Mertens et al., *DELPHES 3: a modular framework for fast simulation of a generic collider experiment*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2014** (2014) 026.
- [128] A. Mertens, *New features in delphes 3*, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **608** (2015) 012045.

- [129] M. Selvaggi, *Delphes 3: A modular framework for fast-simulation of generic collider experiments*, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **523** (2014) 012033.
- [130] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam and G. Soyez, *FastJet User Manual*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 1896 [[1111.6097](#)].
- [131] I.J. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair et al., *Generative Adversarial Networks*, [1406.2661](#).
- [132] G. Quétant, Y. Belousov, V. Kinakh and S. Voloshynovskiy, *Turbo: The swiss knife of auto-encoders*, *Entropy* **25** (2023) .
- [133] M. Ivanovska and V. Štruc, *Y-gan: Learning dual data representations for efficient anomaly detection*, 2022.