

FYST17 Lecture 8

Statistics and hypothesis testing

Thanks to T. Petersen, S. Maschiocci,
G. Cowan, L. Lyons

Suggested reading: statistics book chap 3 & 11

Plan for today:

- Introduction to concepts
 - The Gaussian distribution
- Likelihood functions
- Hypothesis testing
 - Including p-values and significance
- More examples

Interpretation of probability



1. Interpretation of probability as **RELATIVE FREQUENCY**
(frequentist approach):

A, B, ... are outcomes of a repeatable experiment:

$$P(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{times outcome is } A}{n}$$

See quantum mechanics, particle scattering, radioactive decays ...

2. **SUBJECTIVE PROBABILITY** (Bayesian approach)

A, B, ... are hypotheses (statements that are true or false)

$$P(A) = \text{degree of belief that } A \text{ is true}$$

In particle physics, frequency interpretation often most useful, but subjective probability can provide a more natural treatment of non-repeatable phenomena

(systematic uncertainties, probability that higgs exists ...)

PDF = probability density function

Suppose outcome of experiment is **continuous** value x :

$$P(x \text{ found in } [x, x+dx]) = f(x)dx$$

→ **$f(x)$ = probability density function (pdf)**

With:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)dx = 1$$

Normalization

(x must be somewhere)

Note:

- $f(x) \geq 0$
- $f(x)$ is NOT a probability ! It has dimension $1/x$!

Definitions

Mean or expectation value

$$E[x] = \int x f(x) dx = \mu$$

Variance:

$$V[x] = E[(x - E[x])^2] = E[x^2] - \mu^2 = \sigma^2$$

Standard deviation:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\sigma^2}$$

Covariance

$$\text{cov}[x, y] = E[(x - \mu_x)(y - \mu_y)]$$

Correlation coefficient

$$\rho_{xy} = \frac{\text{cov}[x, y]}{\sigma_x \sigma_y}, \quad -1 \leq \rho_{xy} \leq +1$$

PDF examples


Binomial: N trials with p chance of success, probability for n successes:

$$f(n; p, N) = \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!} p^n (1-p)^{N-n}$$

If $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $p \rightarrow 0$ but $Np \rightarrow \lambda$ then we have **Poisson:** (already $N > 50$, $p < 0.1$ works)

$$f(n; \lambda) = \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} e^{-\lambda}$$

And for large λ s can use **Gaussian**




The Gaussian distribution

The Gaussian pdf is defined by

$$f(x; \mu, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left(\frac{-(x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} E[x] &= \mu \\ V[x] &= \sigma^2 \end{aligned}$$



"standard Gaussian"

Special case: $\mu = 0, \sigma^2 = 1$


$$\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2},$$

If y is a Gaussian with μ, σ^2 , then
 $x = \frac{y - \mu}{\sigma}$ follows $\varphi(x)$


The Gaussian distribution

It is useful to know the most common Gaussian integrals:


Range	Inside	Outside
$\pm 1\sigma$	68 %	32 %
$\pm 2\sigma$	95 %	5 %
$\pm 3\sigma$	99.7 %	0.3 %
$\pm 5\sigma$	99.99995 %	0.00005 %



ATLAS examples of Gaussian distributions



Distribution of vertex z coordinate for tracks



Invariant mass for K^0_s peak fitted with a Gaussian (!)

Central limit theorem

What we used already in MC studies


Central Limit theorem:

The sum on N *independent* continuous random variables x_i with means μ_i and variances σ_i^2 becomes a Gaussian random variable with mean $\mu = \sum_i \mu_i$ and variance $\sigma^2 = \sum_i \sigma_i^2$ in the limit that N approaches infinity

Try for yourselves!

Example: sum of 10 uniform numbers = Gaussian!

Gaussian functions play
important role in applied statistics
Uncertainties tend to be Gaussian!



Quick exercise

Measurement of transverse momentum of a track from a fit

- Radius of helix given by $R=0.3Bp_T$
- Track fit returns a Gaussian uncertainty in the curvature, e.g. the pdf is Gaussian in $1/p_T$
- What is the error on p_T ?


$$\frac{\sigma_{p_T}}{p_T} = p_T \cdot \sigma_{1/p_T}$$

Error propagation in two variables

$$\sigma_a^2 = \left(\frac{df}{dx}\right)^2 \sigma_x^2 + \left(\frac{df}{dy}\right)^2 \sigma_y^2 + 2 \frac{df}{dx} \frac{df}{dy} \frac{\text{cov}[x, y]}{\sigma_x \sigma_y} \sigma_x \sigma_y$$

$$\frac{\text{cov}[x, y]}{\sigma_x \sigma_y} = \rho = \text{correlation coefficient}$$

- $-1 \leq \rho \leq +1$
- $\rho = 0$: variables are INDEPENDENT
- $\rho \neq 0$: variables are CORRELATED
 - $\rho > 0$: correlated
 - $\rho < 0$: anti-correlated




Parameter estimation

The parameters of a pdf are constants that characterize its shape, e.g.

$$f(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-x/\theta}$$

random variable parameter



Suppose we have a **sample** of observed values: $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$

We want to find some function of the data to **estimate** the parameter(s):


$\hat{\theta}(\vec{x})$

 ← estimator written with a hat

Sometimes we say ‘estimator’ for the function of x_1, \dots, x_n ;
‘estimate’ for the value of the estimator with a particular data set.

Estimators

If we were to repeat the entire measurement, the estimates from each would follow a pdf:



We want small (or zero) bias (systematic error): $b = E[\hat{\theta}] - \theta$

→ average of repeated measurements should tend to true value.

And we want a small variance (statistical error): $V[\hat{\theta}]$

→ small bias & variance are in general conflicting criteria

Likelihood functions

Given a PDF $f(x)$ with parameter(s) θ , what is the probability that with N observations, x_i falls in the intervals $[x_i; x_i + dx_i]$?

Described by the likelihood function:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \prod_i f(x_i, \theta) dx_i$$

Likelihood functions

Given a set of measurements x_i and parameter(s) θ , the likelihood function is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; \theta) = \prod_i f(x_i, \theta)$$

The **principle of maximum likelihood** for parameter estimation consists of maximizing the likelihood of parameter(s) (here θ) given some data (here x)

The likelihood function plays a central role in statistics, as it can shown to be:

- ✓ Consistent (converges to the right value!)
- ✓ Asymptotically normal (converges with Gaussian errors)

Efficient and "optimal" if it can be applied in practice

Computational: often easier to minimize log likelihood:

$$\left. \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\bar{\theta}} = 0$$

In problems with Gaussian errors boils down to a χ^2

Two versions, in practice:

- Binned likelihood
- Unbinned likelihood


Binned likelihood

Sum over bins in a histogram:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta)_{\text{binned}} = \prod_i^{N_{\text{bins}}} \text{Poisson}(N_i^{\text{expected}}, N_i^{\text{observed}})$$

Distribution of 25 unit Gaussian numbers

$$f(n, \lambda) = \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} e^{-\lambda}$$




Unbinned likelihood

Sum over single measurements:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta)_{\text{unbinned}} = \prod_i^{N_{\text{meas.}}} \text{PDF}(x_i^{\text{observed}})$$

Distribution of 25 unit Gaussian numbers



Hypothesis testing

Hypotheses and acceptance/rejection regions

Goal is to make some statement based on the observed data x , as to the validity of the possible hypotheses.

A test of hypothesis H_0 is defined by specifying a **critical region** W (also called **rejection** region) of the data space S , such that there is no more than some (small) probability α , assuming H_0 is correct, to observe the data there:

$$P(x \in W | H_0) \leq \alpha$$


If x is observed there, reject H_0 .

α is called the **size or significance level** of the test.

The complementary region is called **acceptance region**.

Test statistics

1. State hypothesis (null and alternative)
2. Set criteria for decision, select test statistics, select a significance level
3. Compute the value of the test statistics and from that the probability of observation under null-hypothesis (p-value)
4. Make the decision! Reject null hypothesis if p-value is below significance level



Test statistics

The decision boundary can be defined by an equation of the form:

$$t(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \text{constant} = t_{\text{cut}}$$


where $t(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a scalar **test statistic**

We can work out the pdf's:

$$g(t|H_0), g(t|H_1)$$


Decision boundary is now a single 'cut' on t , which divides the space into the critical (rejection region) and the acceptance region.

This defines a **TEST**: if the data fall in the critical region, we reject H_0



Example of hypothesis test

The spin of the newly discovered Higgs-like particle (spin 0 or 2?)



Selection

We have a data sample with two kinds of events, corresponding to hypotheses H_0 (background) and H_1 (signal).

We want to select those of type H_1 .


Each event is a point in \vec{X} space (n dimensions).

What 'decision boundary' should we use to accept/reject events as belonging to event types H_0 or H_1 ?

One possibility is to select events with several 'cuts':
e.g.

$$x_i < c_i$$


$$x_j < c_j$$




Other selection options

But we can also use some other sort of decision boundary !!

linear



or nonlinear




How can we formalize this to choose the boundary in an 'optimal' way?

ALICE example

Use the ALICE Time Projection Chamber to identify the particle species:
electron, muon, pion, kaon, proton, deuteron

“x” = particle momentum (p), specific energy loss in TPC (dE/dx) (and more)



Example:
I want to select electrons
(hypothesis H_1) from all
other particles
(hypothesis H_0)


In Bayesian approach:
Can add prior
hypotheses on the
relative particle
abundances (e.g. you
see that pions are many
more!)

ALICE example

Looking for electrons: null hypothesis H_0 is to be a hadron

Acceptance region here:

Rejection region here (for bkg = hadrons)



Type I / Type II errors:

Rejecting the hypothesis H_0 when it is true is a Type-I error.

The maximum probability for this is the **size of the test**:

$$P(x \in W | H_0) \leq \alpha$$

But we might also accept H_0 when it is false and an alternative H_1 is true.

This is called Type-II error, and occurs with probability:

$$P(x \in S - W | H_1) = \beta$$

One minus this is called the **power of the test with respect to the alternative hypothesis H_1** :

$$\text{Power} = 1 - \beta$$

Trying to select signal events:
(i.e. try to disprove the null-hypothesis stating it were "only" a background event)

accept as: truly is:	signal	back-ground
signal	☺	Type II error
back-ground	Type I error	☺


Signal/background efficiency

The probability to reject background hypothesis for a background event (background efficiency) is:

$$\epsilon_b = \int_{t_{\text{cut}}}^{\infty} g(t|b) dt = \alpha$$

The probability to accept a signal event as signal (signal efficiency) is:

$$\epsilon_s = \int_{t_{\text{cut}}}^{\infty} g(t|s) dt = 1 - \beta$$




Significance tests/goodness of fit

Suppose hypothesis H predicts pdf $f(\vec{x}|H)$ for a set of observations $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$

We observe a single point in this space: \vec{x}_{obs}

What can we say about the validity of H in light of the data?

Decide what part of the data space represents less compatibility with H than does the point \vec{x}_{obs}
(Not unique!)



p-values

Express 'goodness-of-fit' by giving the p-value for H:

p = probability, under assumption of H, to observe data with equal or lesser compatibility with H relative to the data we got

NOTE! This is NOT the probability that H is true!

In frequentist statistics we don't talk about $P(H)$ (unless H represents a repeatable observation).

In Bayesian statistics we do. Use Bayes' theorem to obtain

$$P(H|\vec{x}) = \frac{P(\vec{x}|H) \pi(H)}{\int P(\vec{x}|H) \pi(H) dH}$$

where $\pi(H)$ is the prior probability for H.

For now stick with the frequentist approach.

Significance of an observed signal

Suppose we observe n events. These can consist of:

n_b events from known processes (background)

n_s events from a new process (signal)

If n_s , n_b are Poisson random variables with means s , b , then $n=n_s+n_b$ is also Poisson, with mean $s+b$

$$P(n;s,b) = \frac{(s+b)^n}{n!} e^{-(s+b)}$$

Suppose $b=0.5$, and we observe $n_{obs}=5$. Should we claim evidence for a new discovery?

Significance of an observed signal

Suppose we observe n events. These can consist of:

n_b events from known processes (background)

n_s events from a new process (signal)

If n_s , n_b are Poisson random variables with means s , b , then $n=n_s+n_b$ is also Poisson, with mean $s+b$

$$P(n;s,b) = \frac{(s+b)^n}{n!} e^{-(s+b)}$$

Suppose $b=0.5$, and we observe $n_{obs}=5$. Should we claim evidence for a new discovery?


Give p-value for hypothesis $s=0$:

$$\text{p-value} = P(n \geq 5 ; b=0.5, s=0)$$

$$= 1.7 \times 10^{-4} \neq P(s=0) !!$$

Significance vs p-value

Often define significance Z as the number of standard deviations that a Gaussian variable would fluctuate in one direction to give the same p-value



Small p = unexpected

$$p = \int_Z^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} dx = 1 - \Phi(Z) \quad \text{1 - TMath::Freq}$$


$$Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p) \quad \text{TMath::NormQuantile}$$

$(x_0 - \mu)/\sigma$	1	2	3	4	5
p	16%	2.3%	0.13%	0.003%	$0.3 \cdot 10^{-6}$

Significance of a peak

Suppose we measure a value x for each event and find: \longrightarrow

Each bin (observed) is a Poisson r.v., means are given by the dashed line



In the two bins with the peak, 11 entries found with $b = 3.2$
The p-value for the $s=0$ hypothesis is:

$$P(n \geq 11; b=3.2, s=0) = 5.0 \times 10^{-4}$$

Significance of a peak

But ... did we know where to look for the peak?

→ give $P(n \geq 11)$ in any 2 adjacent bins

Is the observed width consistent with the expected x resolution?

→ take x window several times the expected resolution

How many bins x distributions have we looked at?

→ look at a thousand of them, you'll find a 10^{-3} effect

Did we adjust the cuts to “enhance” the peak?

→ freeze cuts, repeat analysis with new data

How about the bins to the sides of the peak ... (too low!)

Should we publish ??

How many σ 's?

HEP folklore is to claim discovery when $p = 2.9 \times 10^{-7}$, corresponding to a significance $Z=5$.

This is very subjective and really should depend on the prior probability of the phenomenon in question, e.g.

Phenomenon	Reasonable p-value for discovery
$D^0\bar{D}^0$ mixing	~ 0.05
Higgs	$\sim 10^{-7}$
Life on Mars	$\sim 10^{-10}$
Astrology	$\sim 10^{-20}$

One should also consider the degree to which the data are compatible with the new phenomenon, not only the level of disagreement with the null-hypothesis: p-value is only the first step !!!


Look-elsewhere-effect (LLE)

Example from CDF: **Is there a bump at 7.2 GeV ?** (*and even 7.75 GeV?!*)

Excess has significance but when we take into account that the bump(s) could have been anywhere in the spectrum (the look-elsewhere-effect) significance is reduced:


$p\text{-value}(\text{corr}) = p\text{-value} \times (\text{number of places it might have been spotted in spectrum})$

In this case \sim mass interval / width of bump




Results in low significance
Never saw these again

Remember the penta-quark ...





The ATLAS/CMS diphoton bump



(example 3.2)


Limit setting

CMS 2012 Higgs result




(example 3.2)

Confidence intervals



Upper limit on signal cross section/ SM Higgs cross section in $H \rightarrow WW$ channel



Summary/ outlook

- Gaussian distribution very useful
 - Errors tend to be gaussian
- To check a New Physics hypothesis against the Standard Model
 - Define test statistics
 - Define level of significance
 - Remember the look elsewhere effect
- P-values gives $P(\text{data} | \text{null hypothesis})$
 - It does not say whether the hypothesis is true!