• Tried some unfolding with PyUnfold



Unfolding matrix, iteration 30



• PyUnfold returns:

|   | unfolded  | stat_err   | sys_err   | num_iterations | unfolding_matrix                             | ts_iter  | ts_stopping      |
|---|---|--|---|----------------|--|----------|------------------|
| 0 | [1218.232532836397,<br>1234.6625135098056, 1058.1 | [7.696001794129402,<br>6.92093518151426, 6.724283    | [0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, | 1              | [[0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, 0.0, | 0.084544 | 1.000000e-<br>09 |
| 1 | [1228.1974196922615,<br>1243.6429697847236, 959.0 | [11.703983184421455,<br>9.48220859162182, 9.20765    | [0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, | 2              | [[0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, 0.0, | 0.066882 | 1.000000e-<br>09 |
| 2 | [1178.3509615608675,<br>1178.9590022673947, 846.5 | [15.868461241287548,<br>12.497441508648512, 11.84    | [0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, | 3              | [[0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, 0.0, | 0.042333 | 1.000000e-<br>09 |
| 3 | [1117.2439953474968,<br>1099.4230157304628, 749.9 | [19.62412857443053,<br>15.418507728940634, 14.023    | [0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, | 4              | [[0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, 0.0, | 0.025893 | 1.000000e-<br>09 |
| 4 | [1057.4211215470127,<br>1023.4812790766808, 670.6 | [22.933526582259,<br>18.162496958398275,<br>15.88832 | [0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, | 5              | [[0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0,<br>0.0, 0.0, 0.0, | 0.016563 | 1.000000e-<br>09 |
|   |   |  |   |                |  |          |                  |

 Generate 1000 toys by Poisson drawing from the reconstructed counts.



- Maybe bad way? I should probably Poisson drawn the true counts, and then applied the response matrix
- Generate the unfolding results by applying the unfolding matrix of each iteration.
- From 1000 toys, calculate bias and variance
  - Note with respect to the unchanged truth, hence I should have drawn from changed truth not reco.

- MSE is variance + bias^2
- Coverage underestimated
  - Likely poor calculation
- Uncertainties from PyUnfold >> calculated variances:





# Unfolding

- Less information from PyUnfold (i.e. errors of the unfolding matrix).
- Fewer methods available
  - I would like to be able to try a simpler method (i.e. SVD)
- Installed RooUnfold with python bindings
- It doesn't work with the current environment
- Need to export information, perform the unfolding in the ROOT env., then import back to original python env.

#### Iterative Bayesian Unfolding

- I do not believe we should accept any data input when constructing the unfolding:
- Result  $(\hat{n}(C_i))$ ñ is simply the unfolding matrix on the observed energies

$$\hat{u}(\mathbf{C}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_{\mathbf{E}}} M_{ij} n(\mathbf{E}_j),$$

$$M_{ij} = \frac{P(\mathbf{E}_j | \mathbf{C}_i) P_0(\mathbf{C}_i)}{\left[\sum_{l=1}^{n_{\mathbf{E}}} P(\mathbf{E}_l | \mathbf{C}_i)\right] \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n_{\mathbf{C}}} P(\mathbf{E}_j | \mathbf{C}_l) P_0(\mathbf{C}_l)\right]}.$$

 This is calculated from some prior  $P_0(C_i)$ 

 $M_{ii}$  can be seen as the terms of the unfolding matrix **M**, which is clearly not the mathematical inverse of the smearing matrix S. Let us examine the various contribu-D'Agostini

#### Iterative Bayesian Unfolding

- Prior indicates our *lack of knowledge* of the true values.
- If we run MC with the true energy dist. As the prior, prior is not where updated.

$$\hat{n}(\mathbf{C}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_{\mathbf{E}}} M_{ij} n(\mathbf{E}_j),$$

$$M_{ij} = \frac{P(\mathbf{E}_j | \mathbf{C}_i) P_0(\mathbf{C}_i)}{\left[\sum_{l=1}^{n_{\mathbf{E}}} P(\mathbf{E}_l | \mathbf{C}_i)\right] \left[\sum_{l=1}^{n_{\mathbf{C}}} P(\mathbf{E}_j | \mathbf{C}_l) P_0(\mathbf{C}_l)\right]}$$

 $M_{ji}$  can be seen as the terms of the unfolding matrix **M**, which is clearly not the mathematical inverse of the smearing matrix S. Let us examine the various contribuis good! D'Agostini

### Iterative Bayesian Unfolding

- Would like to try a prior in which the theoretical expected interaction energies is used based on:
  - Measured beam energy distribution
  - Current total LAr-Pion cross section knowledge
- In addition, explore the output vs. input priors