

# Heuristic algorithm for 1D and 2D unfolding.

Yordan Karadzhov  
University of Geneva, DPNC  
yordan.karadzhov@cern.ch

May 25, 2022

## Abstract

A very simple heuristic approach to the unfolding problem will be described. An iterative algorithm starts with an empty histogram and every iteration aims to add one entry to this histogram. The entry to be added is selected according to a criteria which includes a  $\chi^2$  test and a regularization. After a relatively small number of iterations (500 - 1000) the growing reconstructed distribution converges to the true distribution.

## 1 Introduction

The Linear Inverse Problem or Unfolding is a complex problem common for many experiments. Often the experimentalist has to reconstruct a true distribution  $T$  from a measured distribution  $M$ , where the two distributions are connected by

$$\int R(x, y)T(x)dx = M(y). \quad (1)$$

The function  $R(x, y)$  can represent the limited resolution and acceptance of the detector, or the presence of an intermediate process.

In the case of a 1-dimensional (1D) discrete approximation one can reformulate Eq.1 as

$$R_{ij}T_j = M_i. \quad (2)$$

Here the histograms  $T_j$  ( $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N_t - 1$ ) and  $M_i$  ( $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n_m - 1$ ) are connected by a matrix  $R_{ij}$  which gives the fraction of events from bin  $T_j$  of the true distribution that end up being measured in bin  $M_i$  of the measured distribution. Typically this matrix is determined by a model or by using a Monte Carlo simulation of the direct process.

When solving Eq.(2),  $T_j$  and  $M_i$  cannot be simply considered as vectors, because the number of entries in a given bin can only be a non-negative real number.

It is also important to remember that Eq.(2) is an approximation of Eq.(1). The matrix  $R_{ij}$  connects one particular true distribution  $T_j$  to one particular measured distribution  $M_i$ , therefore  $R_{ij}$  and  $T_j$  are not independent. A preliminary hypothesis about the true distribution is needed, in order to calculate the elements of  $R_{ij}$ . The usage of a wrong hypothesis about  $T$  will introduce certain systematic errors in the calculation of this matrix.

## 2 Description of the algorithm

In principal, if the matrix  $R_{ij}$  is already known, one can try to guess the number of entries in every bin of the true sample, and to use the connection matrix to create a measured sample corresponding to this guess.

$$R_{ij}T_j^g = M_i^g \quad (3)$$

Then the guess  $T^g$  can be validated by a comparison between the measured sample  $M$  and the sample  $M^g$ . A  $\chi^2$  test [2] can be used for a quantitative estimate of the quality of the guess. The minimum of  $\chi^2$  can also be used as a *selection criteria* for choosing the *best guess* between multiple candidates.

A direct brute-force attack[1] is not applicable for solving the unfolding problem, because of the unaffordable number of possible true samples  $T^g$ , which have to be tested against the measured sample  $M$ . Nevertheless, if we limit ourself to the case of guesses  $T^g$ , containing only one entry, the number of possible candidates is equal to the number of bins  $N_t$ , used to depict the true distribution  $T$ . In this case we can easily select the *best guess* and there is a good chance that the entry of this *best guess* will be placed in a bin  $T_j^g$  where the Probability Density Function of the true distribution ( $p.d.f._T$ ) has a relatively big value. Unfortunately, this single entry cannot be used to derive any useful information about  $T$ .

At this stage one can try adding another entry to the *best guess*. This will require a second iteration of the same procedure, which will include test of  $N_t$  new candidates. Again, there is a good chance that the second entry of the *best guess* will be added to a bin, where  $p.d.f._T$  has a relatively big value, but this time the decision will be influenced also by the choice made during the previous iteration. Every subsequent iteration of the procedure will add new entry to  $T^g$  in a way which gives the best possible match between  $M$

and  $M^g$ . After a sufficient number of iterations the growing distribution of the *best guess*  $T^g$  will start to converge to the true distribution  $T$ . This is illustrated in Fig. 1.

In this example the connection function  $R(x, y)$  corresponds to a gaussian smearing, systematic translation, and variable inefficiency. The matrix elements of  $R_{ij}$  are calculated with Monte Carlo by assuming a flat true distribution.

### 3 Regularization of the reconstructed distribution

The  $\chi^2$  test of the candidates is not sufficient to ensure a good reconstruction of the true distribution. This problem is well known and comes from the ill-posedness of the matrix  $R_{ij}$ . As a result, the presence of small statistical fluctuations in the measured sample has a very disproportional effect on the reconstructed distribution. This is illustrated on Fig. 2 - Top.

The problem can be mitigated by adding a regularization term to the *selection criteria* of the *best guess*:

$$\min(\chi^2 + \alpha C), \quad (4)$$

where  $C$  is the regularization term and  $\alpha$  is its relative weight in the *selection criteria*. The role of the regularization term is to add a penalty for guesses  $T_j^g$ , which give very good matching between the measured sample  $M_i$  and the projection of the guess  $M_i^g$ , but are nonsensical. The role of the coefficient  $\alpha$  is to ensure that the  $\chi^2$  test will dominate the selection criteria and that the regularization term will add only a weak preference to this criteria. One possible implementation of the regularization term is:

$$T_j^{g'} = 2 \frac{(T_j^g/B_j - T_{j-1}^g/B_{j-1})}{(B_j + B_{j-1})}$$

$$T_j^{g''} = T_{j+1}^{g'} - T_j^{g'}$$

$$C = \frac{R^4}{\left(\sum_{j=0}^{N_t-1} T_j^g\right)^2} \times \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_t-2} (T_j^{g''})^2}{N_t - 2} \quad (5)$$

Here  $T_j^g$  is the number of entries in bin  $j$  of the candidate,  $B_j$  is the size of the bin  $j$  and  $R$  is the range of the true sample (difference between the lower edge of the first bin and the upper edge of the last bin). This regularization term will prefer smooth distributions and will constrain all very complex distributions having large bin-to-bin fluctuations<sup>1</sup>. The effect of adding a regularization term in the *selection criteria* is illustrated on Fig. 2 - Bottom.

<sup>1</sup>The formulation of this regularization term is a bit complicated, because it tries to handle the case of non-uniform bin sizes.

<sup>2</sup>One may argue that the regularisation term used here is actually an initial assumption.

The requirement of having a smooth distribution is not the only possibility for the regularization term. Any additional information, known in advance, for the true distribution  $T$  can be used to define a regularization term. It is also possible to have multiple regularization terms, having different relative weights in the *selection criteria*.

## 4 2D unfolding

The implementation of the 2D unfolding requires only a minor modification of the procedure described so far. The 2D histogram of the true distribution  $T_{kl}$  ( $k = 0, 1, \dots, N_t - 1; l = 0, 1, \dots, M_t - 1$ ) can be treated as a 1D histogram  $T_j$  ( $j = 0, 1, \dots, N_t \times M_t - 1$ ). The same can be done for the measured distribution  $M_{mn}$ . The only considerable difference between 1D and 2D comes from the definition of the regularization term of the *selection criteria*.

Fig. 3 demonstrates the reconstruction of a complex 2D distribution. The regularization term used in this example is similar to (5), but the smoothness of the reconstructed distribution is checked independently in  $X$  and  $Y$  direction. As in the 1D example above, here the connection function corresponds to a gaussian smearing, systematic translation, and variable inefficiency. The elements of  $R_{ij}$  are calculated assuming a flat true distribution.

Keep in mind that the algorithm does not reconstruct directly the 2D true distribution  $T_{kl}$ . What is actually reconstructed is the 1D true distribution  $T_j$  (see Fig. 4). Notice, that this quite complex 1D distribution is reconstructed without any initial assumptions<sup>2</sup>.

## 5 Discussion of the method

The heuristic method described so far, can be classified as a Greedy[3] Genetic[4] algorithm. It does not apply any restrictions on the configuration of the bins used to describe the true and the measured distributions and on the dimensions of the connection matrix  $R_{ij}$ . The method itself does not require explicitly any knowledge about the true distribution, but if we have additional information known in advance, this can be used to define a regularization term and improve the quality of the solution.

Nevertheless, the method relies on the good knowledge of the matrix  $R_{ij}$  and any systematic or statistical errors in the calculation of the matrix elements will affect the quality of the solution.

The realization of the method has been implemented as a small C++ library available at

<https://launchpad.net/ggaunfold>

# References

unweighted histograms, arXiv:physics/0605123

- [1] [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brute-force\\_attack](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brute-force_attack)
- [2] N.D. Gagunashvili, Comparison of weighted and

- [3] [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greedy\\_algorithm](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greedy_algorithm)
- [4] [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genetic\\_algorithm](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genetic_algorithm)




Figure 1: The progress of the algorithm after 5, 20 and 100 iterations (top to bottom). Left: the true distribution  $T$  in blue and the reconstructed distribution  $T^g$  (*best guess*) in red. Right: the measured distribution  $M$  in blue and the projection of the reconstructed distribution  $M^g$  in red. The reconstructed distribution and its projection are scaled in order to be compatible with the measured distribution.




Figure 2: Illustration of the contribution of the regularization term in the *selection criteria*. The progress of the algorithm after 5000 iterations. Top:  $\chi^2$  test only, no regularization. Bottom:  $\chi^2$  test and regularization.




Figure 3: Reconstruction of a 2D distribution. Top left: the true distribution  $T_{kl}$ . Top right: the measured distribution  $M_{mn}$ . Bottom left: the reconstructed distribution  $T_{kl}^g$




Figure 4: Reconstruction of a 2D distribution. The true distribution  $T$  in blue and the reconstructed distribution  $T^g$  (*best guess*) in red, plotted as 1D histograms.