



Look-Everywhere Effects in Anomaly Detection

Marie Hein

With Ben Nachman and David Shih

ML4Jets 2026 Vienna

Anomaly Detection




Inclusive

Single cut

Model-specific


Anomaly detection

Look-Elsewhere Effect




- Scanning over multiple bins and selecting the largest excess enhances the probability of obtaining a large excess


Look-Elsewhere Effect




- Scanning over multiple bins and selecting the largest excess enhances the probability of obtaining a large excess
- Typically, report analysis results as a **significance** corresponding to a **p-value**



- Scanning over multiple bins and selecting the largest excess enhances the probability of obtaining a large excess
- Typically, report analysis results as a **significance** corresponding to a **p-value**
 - Probability of obtaining a deviation at least as large as the observed one under the null hypothesis (background-only test)




- Scanning over multiple bins and selecting the largest excess enhances the probability of obtaining a large excess
- Typically, report analysis results as a **significance** corresponding to a **p-value**
 - Probability of obtaining a deviation at least as large as the observed one under the null hypothesis (background-only test)
- Each bin has **local** p-value, whole analysis with multiple tests has global p-value



- Scanning over multiple bins and selecting the largest excess enhances the probability of obtaining a large excess
- Typically, report analysis results as a **significance** corresponding to a **p-value**
 - Probability of obtaining a deviation at least as large as the observed one under the null hypothesis (background-only test)
- Each bin has **local** p-value, whole analysis with multiple tests has global p-value
- Picking best of multiple tests leads to look-elsewhere effect
 - Reporting local p-value as global results in miscalibration of p-values


How does this affect ML analyses?

“Look everywhere effects in anomaly detection” [\[2512.13787\]](#), **MH**, B. Nachman, D. Shih




How does this affect ML analyses?

“Look everywhere effects in anomaly detection” [\[2512.13787\]](#), **MH**, B. Nachman, D. Shih




How does this affect ML analyses?

“Look everywhere effects in anomaly detection” [\[2512.13787\]](#), **MH**, B. Nachman, D. Shih




How does this affect ML analyses?

“Look everywhere effects in anomaly detection” [\[2512.13787\]](#), **MH**, B. Nachman, D. Shih




How does this affect ML analyses?

“Look everywhere effects in anomaly detection” [\[2512.13787\]](#), **MH**, B. Nachman, D. Shih




How does this affect ML analyses?

“Look everywhere effects in anomaly detection” [\[2512.13787\]](#), **MH**, B. Nachman, D. Shih




How does this affect ML analyses?

“Look everywhere effects in anomaly detection” [\[2512.13787\]](#), **MH**, B. Nachman, D. Shih




How does this affect ML analyses?

“Look everywhere effects in anomaly detection” [\[2512.13787\]](#), **MH**, B. Nachman, D. Shih




How does this affect ML analyses?

“Look everywhere effects in anomaly detection” [\[2512.13787\]](#), **MH**, B. Nachman, D. Shih



How does this affect ML analyses?

“Look everywhere effects in anomaly detection” [\[2512.13787\]](#), **MH**, B. Nachman, D. Shih




NNs look everywhere in the phase space during training, is this multiple testing?

Classification Problem

- Optimal classifier

$$R_{\text{optimal}}(x) = \frac{p_S(x)}{p_B(x)}$$



Weakly Supervised Classification


“Classification without labels: Learning from mixed samples in high energy physics” [\[1709.02949\]](#), E. Metodiev, B. Nachman, J. Thaler

- Optimal classifier

$$R_{\text{optimal}}(x) = \frac{p_S(x)}{p_B(x)}$$

- For mixed datasets with signal fractions f_i

$$R_{\text{mixed}}(x) = \frac{f_1 R_{\text{optimal}}(x) + (1 - f_1)}{f_2 R_{\text{optimal}}(x) + (1 - f_2)}$$



“Classification without labels: Learning from mixed samples in high energy physics” [\[1709.02949\]](#), E. Metodiev, B. Nachman, J. Thaler

- Optimal classifier


$$R_{\text{optimal}}(x) = \frac{p_S(x)}{p_B(x)}$$

- For mixed datasets with signal fractions f_i

$$R_{\text{mixed}}(x) = \frac{f_1 R_{\text{optimal}}(x) + (1 - f_1)}{f_2 R_{\text{optimal}}(x) + (1 - f_2)}$$

→ Monotonically increasing function of

$R_{\text{optimal}}(x)$ as long as $f_1 > f_2$



“Classification without labels: Learning from mixed samples in high energy physics” [\[1709.02949\]](#), E. Metodiev, B. Nachman, J. Thaler

- Optimal classifier

$$R_{\text{optimal}}(x) = \frac{p_S(x)}{p_B(x)}$$


- For mixed datasets with signal fractions f_i

$$R_{\text{mixed}}(x) = \frac{f_1 R_{\text{optimal}}(x) + (1 - f_1)}{f_2 R_{\text{optimal}}(x) + (1 - f_2)}$$


→ Monotonically increasing function of

$R_{\text{optimal}}(x)$ as long as $f_1 > f_2$


→ Same decision boundaries




Application to resonance searches



Recreated from [\[2109.00546\]](#)



Application to resonance searches




Recreated from [\[2109.00546\]](#)

Binned Anomaly Detection and Look-Elsewhere Effects


Binned Analysis Setup

1. Take a 2D Gaussian and sample SR and BT events for a training and evaluation set



Binned Analysis Setup


1. Take a 2D Gaussian and sample SR and BT events for a training and evaluation set
2. Bin both sets using 5 bins per dimension between -2 and 2



Binned Analysis Setup

1. Take a 2D Gaussian and sample SR and BT events for a training and evaluation set
2. Bin both sets using 5 bins per dimension between -2 and 2
3. Calculate binned likelihood ratio on training set for each bin i

$$R^i = \frac{N_{\text{SR}}^i}{N_{\text{BT}}^i}$$




Binned Analysis Setup

1. Take a 2D Gaussian and sample SR and BT events for a training and evaluation set
2. Bin both sets using 5 bins per dimension between -2 and 2
3. Calculate binned likelihood ratio on training set for each bin i

$$R^i = \frac{N_{\text{SR}}^i}{N_{\text{BT}}^i}$$

4. Select bin with largest R^i




Binned Analysis Setup

1. Take a 2D Gaussian and sample SR and BT events for a training and evaluation set
2. Bin both sets using 5 bins per dimension between -2 and 2
3. Calculate binned likelihood ratio on training set for each bin i

$$R^i = \frac{N_{\text{SR}}^i}{N_{\text{BT}}^i}$$

4. Select bin with largest R^i
5. Calculate p-value for this bin on evaluation set




Binned Analysis Setup

1. Take a 2D Gaussian and sample SR and BT events for a training and evaluation set
2. Bin both sets using 5 bins per dimension between -2 and 2
3. Calculate binned likelihood ratio on training set for each bin i

$$R^i = \frac{N_{\text{SR}}^i}{N_{\text{BT}}^i}$$

4. Select bin with largest R^i
5. Calculate p-value for this bin on evaluation set

Note: we do a little trick and use infinite background statistics (i.e., working with expectation values for BT)



How do we test p-value calibration?

- P-values are probabilities:
 - Probability of finding an **excess at least as large** as was observed in a background-only test

How do we test p-value calibration?

- P-values are probabilities:
 - Probability of finding an **excess at least as large** as was observed in a background-only test
- Probabilities can be estimated empirically by performing large number of N_{tests} tests and **counting occurrences**

How do we test p-value calibration?

- P-values are probabilities:
 - Probability of finding an **excess at least as large** as was observed in a background-only test
- Probabilities can be estimated empirically by performing large number of N_{tests} tests and **counting occurrences**
- For any calculated p-value p , empirical p-value given

$$p_{\text{empirical}} = \frac{\text{Number}(p_{\text{calculated},i} \leq p)}{N_{\text{tests}}}$$


How do we test p-value calibration?

- P-values are probabilities:
 - Probability of finding an **excess at least as large** as was observed in a background-only test
- Probabilities can be estimated empirically by performing large number of N_{tests} tests and **counting occurrences**
- For any calculated p-value p , empirical p-value given

$$p_{\text{empirical}} = \frac{\text{Number}(p_{\text{calculated},i} \leq p)}{N_{\text{tests}}}$$

- For calibrated p-values, within statistical uncertainties


$$p_{\text{empirical}} = p_{\text{calculated}}$$



Reporting the local p-value as global

Or: Evaluating on the training set


- Training and evaluation set are one and the same



Reporting the local p-value as global

Or: Evaluating on the training set

- Training and evaluation set are one and the same
- Results in miscalibrated p-values (look-elsewhere effect)



Reporting the local p-value as global


Or: Evaluating on the training set

- Training and evaluation set are one and the same
- Results in miscalibrated p-values (look-elsewhere effect)
- **Bonferroni correction:** Choosing best of N tests gives a trials factor of N , i.e.

$$p_{\text{calibrated}} = N \cdot p_{\text{uncalibrated}}$$


→ Conservative correction assuming uncorrelated tests

→ Works well for very low p-values



Doing a follow-up analysis


Or: Evaluating on an independent test set



Doing a follow-up analysis

Or: Evaluating on an independent test set


- Split data 50-50 into training and test set to use the independent test set as evaluation set



Doing a follow-up analysis

Or: Evaluating on an independent test set


- Split data 50-50 into training and test set to use the independent test set as evaluation set
- Results in calibrated p-values



Doing a follow-up analysis

Or: Evaluating on an independent test set

- Split data 50-50 into training and test set to use the independent test set as evaluation set
- Results in calibrated p-values
- Compared to evaluating on the training set, lose training and evaluation statistics




Evaluation using k-fold cross validation

Method to preserve training and evaluation statistics

1. Divide data in k folds ($k = 5$)



Data



Evaluation using k-fold cross validation

Method to preserve training and evaluation statistics



1. Divide data in k folds ($k = 5$)
2. Train model on $k - 1$ folds, evaluate on last fold



Evaluation using k-fold cross validation

Method to preserve training and evaluation statistics



1. Divide data in k folds ($k = 5$)
2. Train model on $k - 1$ folds, evaluate on last fold
3. Repeat until all folds have been used for evaluation



Evaluation using k-fold cross validation

Method to preserve training and evaluation statistics



1. Divide data in k folds ($k = 5$)
2. Train model on $k - 1$ folds, evaluate on last fold
3. Repeat until all folds have been used for evaluation



Evaluation using k-fold cross validation

Method to preserve training and evaluation statistics



1. Divide data in k folds ($k = 5$)
2. Train model on $k - 1$ folds, evaluate on last fold
3. Repeat until all folds have been used for evaluation



Evaluation using k-fold cross validation

Method to preserve training and evaluation statistics



1. Divide data in k folds ($k = 5$)
2. Train model on $k - 1$ folds, evaluate on last fold
3. Repeat until all folds have been used for evaluation





Evaluation using k-fold cross validation

Method to preserve training and evaluation statistics



1. Divide data in k folds ($k = 5$)
2. Train model on $k - 1$ folds, evaluate on last fold
3. Repeat until all folds have been used for evaluation
4. Combine results (We sum over counts)



Evaluation using k-fold cross validation



Evaluation using k-fold cross validation



Machine Learning and Look- Everywhere Effects


Machine learning procedure

Machine learning procedure

1. Get SR and BT events for both training and evaluation set


Machine learning procedure

1. Get SR and BT events for both training and evaluation set
2. Train ML classifier on SR versus BT classification on training set




Machine learning procedure

1. Get SR and BT events for both training and evaluation set
2. Train ML classifier on SR versus BT classification on training set
3. Obtain classifier scores for SR and BT events from evaluation set




Machine learning procedure

1. Get SR and BT events for both training and evaluation set
2. Train ML classifier on SR versus BT classification on training set
3. Obtain classifier scores for SR and BT events from evaluation set
4. Select cut based on BT to retain fixed fraction ϵ_{BT} of events




Machine learning procedure

1. Get SR and BT events for both training and evaluation set
2. Train ML classifier on SR versus BT classification on training set
3. Obtain classifier scores for SR and BT events from evaluation set
4. Select cut based on BT to retain fixed fraction ϵ_{BT} of events
5. Apply cut to SR




Machine learning procedure

1. Get SR and BT events for both training and evaluation set
2. Train ML classifier on SR versus BT classification on training set
3. Obtain classifier scores for SR and BT events from evaluation set
4. Select cut based on BT to retain fixed fraction ϵ_{BT} of events
5. Apply cut to SR
6. Obtain p-value by comparing event numbers N'_{SR} and N'_{BT} after cut




Results for ML analysis

- Generally observe the same trends seen for the binned analysis
 - Misalibrated when evaluating on training set or using k-folding
 - Calibrated when evaluating on an independent test set



Results for ML analysis




- Generally observe the same trends seen for the binned analysis
 - Misalibrated when evaluating on training set or using k-folding
 - Calibrated when evaluating on an independent test set
- Difference: k-folding not as miscalibrated as evaluation on the training set



Impacts on Signal Sensitivity


“The LHC Olympics 2020: A Community Challenge for Anomaly Detection in High Energy Physics” [\[2101.08320\]](#), G. Kasieczka, B. Nachman, D. Shih et. al.

- Benchmark dataset for anomaly detection
- 1 M QCD dijet background events
- 100k signal events produced via




P-values of analysis with signal

- Perform analysis with different signal amounts N_{sig} injected




P-values of analysis with signal

- Perform analysis with different signal amounts N_{sig} injected
- P-values without calibration




P-values of analysis with signal

- Perform analysis with different signal amounts N_{sig} injected
- P-values without calibration
 - Very low for evaluation on training set even for $N_{\text{sig}} = 0$




P-values of analysis with signal

- Perform analysis with different signal amounts N_{sig} injected
- P-values without calibration
 - Very low for evaluation on training set even for $N_{\text{sig}} = 0$
 - Below 1σ for $N_{\text{sig}} = 0$ for evaluation on test set and using k-folding




P-values of analysis with signal

- Perform analysis with different signal amounts N_{sig} injected
- P-values without calibration
 - Very low for evaluation on training set even for $N_{\text{sig}} = 0$
 - Below 1σ for $N_{\text{sig}} = 0$ for evaluation on test set and using k-folding
- Calibrate p-values (fit to calibration curves as seen earlier, cannot calibrate train set)




P-values of analysis with signal

- Perform analysis with different signal amounts N_{sig} injected
- P-values without calibration
 - Very low for evaluation on training set even for $N_{\text{sig}} = 0$
 - Below 1σ for $N_{\text{sig}} = 0$ for evaluation on test set and using k-folding
- Calibrate p-values (fit to calibration curves as seen earlier, cannot calibrate train set)



P-values of analysis with signal

- Perform analysis with different signal amounts N_{sig} injected
- P-values without calibration
 - Very low for evaluation on training set even for $N_{\text{sig}} = 0$
 - Below 1σ for $N_{\text{sig}} = 0$ for evaluation on test set and using k-folding
- Calibrate p-values (fit to calibration curves as seen earlier, cannot calibrate train set)
- Calibrated curves show performance loss through lower training and evaluation statistics for evaluation on test set
 - K-folding provides optimal trade-off



Conclusion

- Data-driven ML-based analyses experience
look elsewhere effect-like p-value
miscalibrations

- Data-driven ML-based analyses experience look elsewhere effect-like p-value miscalibrations
- Evaluating on an independent test set always leads to calibrated p-values

- Data-driven ML-based analyses experience look elsewhere effect-like p-value miscalibrations
- Evaluating on an **independent test set** always leads to calibrated p-values
- Evaluating **with k-fold cross validation** leads to the highest sensitivity but requires p-values calibration to be performed

- Data-driven ML-based analyses experience look elsewhere effect-like p-value miscalibrations
- Evaluating on an **independent test set** always leads to calibrated p-values
- Evaluating **with k-fold cross validation** leads to the highest sensitivity but requires p-values calibration to be performed

Lots of **additional tests** in the paper

- Relation between look-everywhere effects and overfitting
- Statistical behavior of BDTs


Look Everywhere Effects in Anomaly Detection

MH, B. Nachman, D. Shih




Backup

Look-Everywhere Effects in ML terms




Early stopping reduces miscalibration, eliminates almost entirely for k-folding


Results for BDT



Other values for k : Binned




Other values for k : NN




Calibration for signal analysis


- Use 10M background events to randomly sample data sets
- Fit calibration curves to obtain trials factor that allow us to calibrate obtained p-values




Max SIC curves




P-values with signal at $\epsilon_B = 10^{-2}$



P-values with signal at $\epsilon_B = 10^{-1}$



P-values with signal at $\epsilon_B = 10^{-3}$



In the background-only case,

$$N'_{\text{SR}}, N'_{\text{BT}} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$$

with the same expectation value λ . Measuring N'_{BT} can serve as a proxy for λ with

$$\lambda \sim \Gamma(\alpha = N'_{\text{BT}}, \beta = 1),$$

such that

$$\Pr(N'_{\text{SR}}|N'_{\text{BT}}) = \int_0^\infty \text{Poisson}(N'_{\text{SR}}|\lambda) \Gamma(\lambda|N'_{\text{BT}}, 1) d\lambda.$$

This integral resolves to a negative binomial distribution.