



Making HEP Data Publicly Available

http://quaero.fnal.gov/

Motivation Data Algorithm Examples

> Bruce Knuteson University of Chicago / CDF UC Berkeley / LBNL / DØ

Time

January 1999	February 1999	March 1999	January 2000	February 2000	March 2000
Su Mo Tu We Th Er Sa 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31
<u>April 1999</u>	<u>May 1999</u>	<u>June 1999</u>	April 2000	May 2000	June 2000
Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Su No Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
July 1999	August 1999	September 1999	July 2000	August 2000	September 2000
Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su No Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
October 1999	November 1999	December 1999	October 2000	November 2000	December 2000
Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su No Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31

Time



Bias



How does one choose a set of cuts without bias?

Bias



Public relations



Search for New Physics Using Quaero: A General Interface

to DØ Event Data

DØ makes a subset of Tevatron Run I data publicly available

hep-ex/0106039

Search for New Physics Using QUAERO: A General Interface to DØ Event Data

V.M. Abazov,²⁰ B. Abbott,²⁰ A. Abdesselam,²¹ M. Abolins,²⁴ V. Abramov,²⁰ B.S. Acharya,¹⁷ D.L. Adams,⁴⁰ M. Adams,⁵⁰ S.N. Ahmed,³¹ C.D. Alersev,³⁵ C.A. Alves,⁵ N. Amos,⁵⁰ F.W. Anderson,⁴⁵ Y. Arnoud,⁵ M.M. Baarmand,⁵⁵ V.V. Babintsev,³⁶ L. Babukhadis,⁵⁵ T.C. Baem,²⁶ A. Baden,⁴⁷ B. Baldin,⁵⁷ P.W. Balm,³⁰ S. Banserjes,³⁷ E. Barberis,³⁰ P. Baringer,⁴⁴ J. Barreto,³ J.F. Bartisti,³⁷ U. Barsler,¹³ D. Barser,³⁸ A. Bean,⁴⁴ M. Begel,²⁴ A. Belyaev,³⁴ S.B. Berl,²⁴ C. Bernardi,¹⁵ I. Bertram,³⁷ A. Beson,⁹ R. Benselinck,²⁶ V.A. Bezzubov,⁵⁰ P.C. Bhat,⁵⁷ Y. Bhatnagar,¹³ M. Bhattacharjee,³⁵ C. Blazoy,⁵⁶ S. Bleering,³⁵ A. Boehnlein,³⁷ N.I. Bojko,⁹⁶ F. Bercherding,⁵⁷ K. Bes,²⁶ A. Brandt,⁶⁰ R. Breedon,⁵¹ C. Briskin,⁵⁹ R. Brock,³⁴ C. Brotijmans,³⁷ A. Bross,³⁷ D. Buchhelz, ⁴⁰ M. Bushler, ³⁰ V. Busscher, ³⁴ V.S. Burtovni, ³⁶ J.M. Butler, ⁴⁵ F. Cansili, ³⁴ W. Carvalho, ⁷ D. Casey,³¹ Z. Carilum,³⁴ H. Castilla-Valdez,³⁹ D. Chakraberty,³⁹ K.M. Chan,⁴⁴ S.V. Chekulaev,³⁰ D.K. Cho,⁴⁴ S. Choi,⁵⁴ S. Chopra,⁵⁰ J.H. Christenson,⁵⁷ M. Chong,⁵⁶ D. Class,⁵⁰ A.R. Clark,⁵⁰ J. Cockran,⁵⁴ L. Coney,⁶⁵ B. Connolly,⁵⁵ W.E. Cooper,⁵⁷ D. Coppage,⁴⁴ S. Crépé-Renaudin,⁵ M.A.C. Cummings,⁵⁶ D. Cutts,¹⁵ C.A. Davis,¹⁴ K. Davis,⁵⁹ K. Da,⁴⁰ S.J. de Jong,³⁰ K. Del Signore,³⁰ M. Demartsan,³⁰ P. Demina,⁴⁰ P. Demina,⁹ D. Denizov,⁵⁷ S.P. Derizov²⁶ S. Dezai,⁴⁴ H.T. Diehl,⁴⁷ M. Diesburg³⁷ C. Di Loveto,⁴⁴ S. Doulas,⁴⁹ P. Draper,⁴⁰ Y. Dorron,¹⁸ L.V. Dodko,⁵⁴ S. Dosensing,³⁴ L. Duflet,⁵⁴ S.R. Dogad,⁵⁷ A. Dopertin,³⁰ A. Dyshkart,³⁹ D. Edmunds,³⁴ J. Ellison,³⁴ V.D. Elvira,³⁷ R. Engelmann,⁵⁶ S. Eno,⁴⁷ C. Eppley,⁴⁵ P. Ernolov,³⁶ O.V. Eroshin,³⁶ J. Estrada,²⁴ H. Erans,³⁶ V.N. Evdokimov,²⁶ T. Fahland,²⁶ S. Faher,³⁷ D. Fain,²⁹ T. Farbel,⁴⁴ F. Filthaut,²¹ H.E. Fisk,³⁷ Y. Fisyak,³⁶ E. Flattam,³⁷ F. Fleuret,³⁰ M. Foriner,³⁰ H. Fox,⁴⁰ K.C. Frane,³¹ S. Fu,⁴⁵ S. Fuses,³⁷ E. Caller,³⁷ A.N. Calyaev,³⁶ M. Cao,⁴⁵ V. Cavrilov,³⁶ R.J. Cenik II,³⁷ K. Censer,³⁷ C.E. Cerber,³⁶ Y. Cerebtein,³⁶ R. Climartin,³⁶ C. Cinther,⁴⁴ B. Cómez,² C. Cómez,⁴⁷ P.I. Concharov,³⁶ J.L. Conzález Solis,¹⁹ H. Cordon,³⁶ L.T. Coze,⁶¹ K. Counder,⁸⁷ A. Coussiou,²⁰ N. Craf,⁴⁰ C. Craham,⁴⁷ P.D. Cramis,⁴⁰ J.A. Creen,⁴⁰ H. Creenlee,³⁷ S. Crinstein,³ L. Creer,³⁰ S. Crünendahl,³⁷ A. Cupta,³⁷ S.N. Curshiev,²⁶ C. Cutierrez,³⁷ P. Cutierrez,⁴⁸ N.J. Hadley,⁴⁷ H. Haggerty,³⁷ S. Hagoplan,³² V. Hagoplan,³² R.E. Hall,³⁵ P. Hanlet,⁴⁵ S. Hansen,³⁷ J.M. Hauptman,⁴⁵ C. Hays,³⁶ C. Hebert,⁴⁴ D. Hedin, 55 J.M. Heinmiller, 53 A.P. Heinson, 54 U. Heintz, 57 T. Henring, 55 M.D. Hildreth, 57 R. Hirosky, 58 J.D. Hobbs,⁵⁵ B. Hoeneisen,⁸ Y. Huang,⁴⁰ R. Illingworth,²⁰ A.S. Ito,³⁷ M. Jaffré,¹¹ S. Jain,¹⁷ R. Janik,²⁰ K. Johns,²⁹ M. Johnson,²⁷ A. Jenekbeere,²⁷ M. Jones,²⁰ H. Jörtlein,²⁷ A. Juste,³⁷ W. Kahl,⁴⁴ S. Kahn,⁴⁵ E. Kajfazz,¹⁰ A.M. Kalinin,³³ D. Karmanov,²⁴ D. Karmgæd,⁴³ Z. Ke,⁴ R. Kehce,⁴⁴ A. Kharov,⁴⁴ A. Kharehilava,⁴⁵ S.K. Kim,¹⁹ B. Klims, ⁵⁷ B. Knubson, ⁵⁰ W. Ko,⁵¹ J.M. Kohli,¹⁵ A.Y. Kostritsky,²⁶ J. Kotoher,³⁶ B. Kotheri,³⁸ A.Y. Kotwal,³⁸ A.V. Konslov,²⁵ E.A. Konlovsky,²⁶ J. Krans,⁴⁵ M.R. Krishnawamy,¹⁷ P. Krivkova,⁶ S. Krzywdninski,³⁷ M. Kubantsev,⁴⁴ S. Kulesbov,³⁴ Y. Kulik,⁴⁴ S. Kunori,⁴⁷ A. Kupeo,⁷ V.E. Kumsterv,⁵⁴ G. Landsberg,³⁶ W.M. Lee,⁵⁵ A. Leflat,⁵⁶ C. Leggett,³⁰ F. Lehner,³⁷ J. Li,⁴⁰ Q.Z. Li,³⁷ X. Li,⁴ J.C.R. Lima,³ D. Linoch,³⁷
 S.L. Linn,⁵⁵ J. Linnernaun,³¹ R. Liptun,³⁷ A. Loretts,⁵ I. Losling,³⁷ C. Londustit,³² C. Lond⁴ A.K.A. Maziel,³⁵ R.J. Madaras,³⁵ V.L. Malyshev,³⁷ Y. Manankov,³³ H.S. Man,⁴ T. Marshall,⁴³ M.I. Martin,³⁹ R.D. Martin,³³ K.M. Mauritz,⁴⁷ B. May,⁴² A.A. Mayorov,⁴³ R. McCarthy,³⁵ T. McMahon,⁵⁷ H.L. Malazzen,⁵⁷ M. Markin,³⁵ K.W. Merritt.³⁷ C. Miao.⁴⁹ H. Miettinen.⁴² D. Mihalosa.³⁹ C.S. Mishra.³⁷ N. Mokhov.³⁷ N.K. Mondal.¹⁷ H.E. Montgomery,⁵⁷ R.W. Moere,²³ M. Mostala,¹ H. da Motta,⁵ E. Navy,³⁰ F. Navy,³⁹ M. Navain,⁴⁵ V.S. Narasimham,²⁷ H.A. Neal,⁴⁰ J.P. Negret,⁵ S. Negreni,⁴⁰ T. Nunnamann,⁴⁷ D. O'Nell,⁵⁵ Y. Oguri,⁵ B. Olivier,¹³ N. Oshima,⁵⁷ P. Padley,⁵⁶ L.J. Pan,⁴⁰ K. Papageergiou,⁵⁶ A. Para,⁵⁷ N. Parashar,⁴⁹ R. Partridge,⁵⁶ N. Parua,⁵⁵ M. Paterno," A. Patwa," B. Pawilk, 32 J. Perkins," M. Peters," O. Peters, 32 P. Pétroff, R. Pierala, 1 B.C. Pope,¹³ E. Poplov,⁴⁰ H.B. Prosper,⁵⁵ S. Protopopesen,⁵⁶ J. Qian,⁴⁰ R. Raja,⁵⁷ S. Rajagopalan,⁵⁶
 E. Ramberg,⁵⁷ P.A. Rapidis,⁵⁷ N.W. Reag,⁴⁵ S. Rameruft,⁴⁹ M. Ridal,³³ M. Rijsembask,⁴⁶ F. Riratdinova,⁴⁵
 T. Rockwell,⁴³ M. Roco,⁵⁷ P. Rubinov,⁵⁷ R. Ruchti,⁴⁵ J. Rutherford,⁵⁰ B.M. Sabirov,³⁶ C. Sajot,⁵ A. Santoro,⁵ L. Sawyer,⁴⁴ R.D. Schamberger,⁴⁶ H. Schellman,⁴⁵ A. Schwartzman,¹ N. Sen,⁴⁵ E. Shabalina,²⁶ R.K. Shivpuri,¹⁶ D. Shpakov,⁴⁹ M. Shupe,⁵⁹ R.A. Sidwell,⁴¹ V. Simsk,⁷ H. Singh,⁵⁴ J.B. Singh,¹⁵ V. Sirotenko,⁵⁷ P. Slattery,⁵⁴ E. Smith,⁵⁵ R.P. Smith,⁵⁷ R. Snihur,⁴⁰ C.R. Snow,⁵⁹ J. Snow,⁵⁷ S. Snyder,⁵⁶ J. Solomon,⁵⁰ V. Sorfn,¹ M. Sossies,⁶⁰ N. Scinikava,²⁵ K. Scostrumik,⁶ M. Scuna,² N.R. Stanten,⁴⁵ C. Steinbrück,³⁶ R.W. Stephens,⁶² F. Stichelbaut,⁴⁶ D. Stolser,²⁶ V. Stolin,³⁴ A. Stone,⁴⁶ D.A. Stoyanova,²⁰ M. Strauss,²⁸ M. Strovink,²⁰ L. Stutte,³⁷ A. Smajder,⁵ M. Talby,¹⁰ W. Taylor,¹⁰ S. Tentindo-Repord,⁵⁰ S.M. Tripathi,⁵⁰ T.C. Trippe,⁵⁰ A.S. Turent,³⁰ P.M. Tuts,³⁰ P. van Cemmeren,²⁵ V. Vaniev,²⁶ R. Van Kooten,⁴¹ N. Varelas,²⁶ L.S. Veringradov,²⁶ F. Villeneuve-Seguier,¹⁰ A.A. Volkov, 26 A.P. Vorobiev, 29 H.D. Wahl, 20 H. Wang, 47 Z.-M. Wang, 40 J. Warchol, 42 C. Watta, 44 M. Wayne, 42 H. Weerts, "A. White," J.T. White," D. Whitesm," J.A. Wightman," D.A. Wijngaarden," S. Willis," S.J. Wimpenny,⁵⁴ J. Womersley,⁵⁷ D.R. Wood,⁶⁹ R. Yamaka,⁵⁷ P. Yamin,⁵⁶ T. Yazuda,⁵⁷ Y.A. Yazuneslev,⁵⁶ K. Yip,⁵⁶ S. Youssef,⁵⁵ J. Yu,⁵⁶ Z. Yu,⁴⁰ M. Zambria,⁵ H. Zheng,⁴³ Z. Zhou,⁴⁵ M. Zielinski,⁵⁴ D. Zieminska,⁴⁵ A. Zieminski,⁴¹ V. Zutshi,³⁶ E.C. Zverev,²⁰ and A. Zylberstein¹³

(DØ Collaboration)







Run I detector (1992-1996)

- Multipurpose detector
 - central tracking
 - muon spectrometer
 - U-LAr sampling calorimeter
- No central magnetic field
- Excellent electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeters



We have chosen 3 well-understood final states:

Final State	Selection criteria	$\epsilon_{ m ID}$	$\int \mathcal{L} dt$
$e\mu$	$p_T^{e,\mu} > 15 \mathrm{GeV}$	0.30	$108 \pm 5 \text{ pb}^{-1}$
	$ \eta^{\mu}_{ m det} \!<1.7$		
$e \not\!$	$p_T^{e,j_{1,2}} > 20 { m GeV}$	0.61	$115 \pm 6 \text{ pb}^{-1}$
	$E_T > 30 \text{ GeV}$		
	$p_T^{e \not \!\!\! E_T} > 40 \mathrm{GeV}$		
ee2j	$p_T^{e_{1,2},j_{1,2}} > 20 { m GeV}$	0.70	$123 \pm 7 \text{ pb}^{-1}$

 ϵ_{ID} is the efficiency of identification requirements additional jets are identified if $p_{\text{T}}{}^{j}$ > 15 GeV and $|\eta|$ < 2.5

Our background estimates come from a mishmash of sources:

	S	Standard model backgrounds			
Final State	$\mathbf{multijets}$	W	Z	VV	$t \overline{t}$
eμ	data	data	ISAJET	PYTHIA	HERWIG
$e \not\!$	data	VECBOS	_	PYTHIA	HERWIG
ee2j	data	_	PYTHIA	PYTHIA	_

Systematic errors vary among the final states we consider, but roughly:

Systematic uncertainties

jet modeling	15%
trigger / lepton I D eff	10%
cross sections	10%
"faking" probabilities	10%
luminosity	5%

These uncertainties are incorporated into the cross section limit

Data

Comparison of data and backgrounds



Previous analyses

The data and background estimates have each been used in previous analyses:

- eµ
 - Top quark cross section PRL 79 1203 (1997)
 - Scalar top PRL in collab. review
 - Sleuth PRD 62 92004 (2000)
- e∉_⊤ 2j
 - Leptoquarks PRL 80 2051 (1998)
 - Sleuth PRL 86 3712 (2001) PRD 64 12004 (2001)
- ee 2j
 - Leptoquarks **PRL** 79 4321 (1997)
 - Sleuth PRL 86 3712 (2001) PRD 64 12004 (2001)

These data and backgrounds are well understood

Motivation Data Algorithm Examples

Quaero A General Interface to DØ Data

<u>PRL</u> <u>Manual</u> <u>Examples</u>

Signal
Final State: e mu (met) (nj) 💌 Smear?
○ <u>Pythia Input</u> :
C Signal File: Browse xsec: pb
○ <u>View</u> ○ <u>Search</u>
<u>Backgrounds:</u> \square (nj) \square <u>W(nj)</u> \square <u>Z(nj)</u> \square <u>VV(nj)</u> \square <u>tt(nj)</u>
Variables
Constraints:
<u>Variables</u> :
v1
v2
v3
Requestor
Name:
Institution:
Email:
Brief description of model:
Submit
Help! - Bug history - DØ - Fermilab - Author

1) The signal Monte Carlo is processed

- (events are generated using Pythia, if requested)
- events are smeared with a fast detector simulation
- selection criteria are applied for desired final state
- particle identification efficiencies are considered

This gives

- total number of expected signal events in final state
- Monte Carlo signal events as they would look in the detector

The parametrized detector simulation is simple but sufficient:

- Partons are clustered and merged into jets
- Energies are smeared according to measured resolutions

e/
$$\gamma$$
: $\delta E/E = 15\%/\sqrt{E} \oplus 0.3\%$
jets: $\delta E/E = 80\%/\sqrt{E}$
 μ : $\delta(1/p) = 0.18(p-2)/p^2 \oplus 0.003$

(Resolutions depend loosely on pseudorapidity)

Why do we believe the fast detector simulation?

PRL 75 1028 (1995) PRL 78 3640 (1997) PRD 57 3817 (1998) PRD 60 72002 (1999) PRL 75 1456 (1995) PRD 61 32004 (2000) PRD 58 12002 (1998) PRL 80 5498 (1998) PRL 81 524 (1998) PRL 75 1034 (1995) PRD 56 6742 (1997) PRD 58 051101 (1998) PRD 62 52005 (2000) PRD 60 52003 (1999) PRL 84 2792 (2000) PRL 80 3008 (1998) PRD 62 92006 (2000) PRL 86 1156 (2001) PRL 78 3634 (1997) PRL 79 1441 (1997) PRD 58 31102 (1998) PRD 62 71701 (2000) PRD 61 72001 (2000) PRL 77 3309 (1996) PRD 58 92003 (1998) PRL 84 222 (2000)

. . .

These publications cover a variety of analyses gauge boson couplings W/Z production searches for new physics Note also the difference between signal and background:



The region that we are interested in generally lies in the *tail* of the background, but in the *bulk* of the signal (Correct modeling of the background tails is relatively more important than correct modeling of the signal tails)

- 2) An optimal region is chosen in the variables provided
 - a) Estimate signal and background densities using kernels



1) place "bumps of probability" around each Monte Carlo point 2) sum these bumps into a continuous distribution

$$p(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \text{gauss}(x - x_i)$$

The multivariate generalization is immediate

b) Define a *discriminant*

$$D(x) = \frac{p(x \mid s)}{p(x \mid s) + p(x \mid b)}$$

and choose a cut on D(x) that minimizes

the 95% CL cross section limit you would expect to set assuming the data contains no signal.

We call 1/this quantity the "sensitivity"

Note that so far we have made no use of the data

3) Comparing number of observed events in the data to expected bkg, set 95% CL cross section limit on signal

4) Result is returned by email



Total elapsed time \approx 1 hour

Algorithm

Result

From: quaero@fnal.gov Subject: Quaero Request #29

 $W_R \rightarrow t\overline{b} \rightarrow e \not\!\!\! E_T 2j$

Result

Pythia cross section x branching ratio = 1.68 pb.

Upper limits on the cross section to this process at confidence levels of 50%, 90%, and 95% are found to be 0.8 pb, 1.8 pb, and 2.1 pb, respectively. Maximal sensitivity (0.73 pb⁻¹) is achieved in a region of variable space with 17.6 signal events expected, 32.7 +- 7.1 background events expected, and 36 events observed in the data.

Plots

Plots of the variables that you used are available for viewing at <u>http://quaero.fnal.gov/quaero/requests/plots/29.ps</u>. The red curve is the expected background; the green curve is your signal multiplied by a factor of 10; the black dots are D0 data.

Algorithm

Result



Policy

There are a number of ways Quaero could be implemented

↑Don't

Keep Quaero as an internal tool

Make data available with limited scope and internal review Restrict those who are allowed to use Quaero Review all Quaero results before releasing them

Make data available with general scope and more limited internal review



"Put the data out there" Make data available to all with no internal review

Many variations on these themes

We chose to make data available with general scope and limited internal review

Quaero Policy

• Any "interesting" Quaero result will be reviewed by a DØ Quaero Review Board.

- A Quaero result is "interesting" if an excess of data over background of more than 2.0 standard deviations is found.
- If an interesting result is found, the requestor is notified that his request is under review, and the result of the request is sent to the review board.
- If a fault is found the fault is rectified, the request is re-run, and the new result is sent to the requester (along with an explanation).
- If the "interestingness" is not deemed to be due to any fault, the result is sent to the requester.

• In all cases the requester is free to publish the Quaero result in his or her own paper, so long as Quaero is referenced. The appropriate citation, including the Quaero request log number and request date, is included in the email with Quaero's result.

Motivation Data Algorithm Examples

You're presumably thinking

"Surely this can't be as good as a <u>real</u> analysis . . ."



If so, think again! Using Quaero, you can analyze the following in a day:



Examples #2	$oldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{sig}$	12%
Standard Model ZZ→eejj	ĥ	19.7 ± 4.1
Variables		
<u>Constraints</u> : Variables:	N_{obs}	19
v1 mass(e1,e2)	$\sigma^{_{95\%}} imes \mathcal{B}$	0.8 pb

Background density

Signal density





These processes are currently at the edge of the Tevatron's sensitivity CDF, "Observation of W⁺W⁻ production" PRL 78 4536 (1997) 5 events observed on a background of 1.2±0.3 events in all dilepton final states (ee, eμ, μμ)

Examples #3	$oldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{sig}$	14%	
Standard Model tt $\rightarrow e\mu \not \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! \! $	\hat{b}	0.6 ± 0.2	
Variables Constraints: j2_pt>15 Variables:	N _{obs}	2	
$v1 e_pt$ $v2 j1_pt + j2_pt + j3_pt$	$\sigma imes \mathcal{B}$	0.14 ^{+0.15} _{-0.08} pb	
Background density Signal de	nsity Sel	ected regio	n
$\times 10^{-3}$ $\times 10^{-3}$ 0.4^{-1} 0.15^{-1} 0.15^{-1} 0.2^{-1} 0.05	50 		
∠P _T 150 ^{mm} 100 ∠P _T 150 ^{mm} 50 P _T ^e 50	100 • PT	50 100 P T)

Examples #4	\mathcal{E}_{sig}	13%	
Standard Model $t\bar{t} \rightarrow e \not{E}_T 4 j$	ĥ	3.1 ± 0.9	
Variables	U		
Constraints: j4_pt>15 Variables:	N_{obs}	8	
v1 j1_pt + j2_pt + j3_pt + j4_pt + j5_pt v2 aplanarity()	$\sigma { imes} {\mathcal B}$	0.39 ^{+0.21} _{-0.19} pb	
Background density Signal de	nsity Sel	ected region	
0.05 - 0.04 - 0.04 - 0.03 -	0.1		



DØ PRL (1997, 125 pb⁻¹) in dileptons (ee, eµ, and µµ): 2.1σ (5 events with 1.4 expected) in lepton+jets (e+jets and µ+jets): 2.6σ (19 events with 8.7 expected) w/o b-tag 3.6σ (11 events with 2.5 expected) w/ b-tag We have used

- $\frac{1}{2}$ of the dilepton sample (eµ) only
- ½ of the lepton+jets sample (e+jets) only
- no b-tagging

 $\sigma\times \mathcal{B}$ is consistent with previous measurements









m_{ee}

m_{ee}

 m_{ee}









W'/Z' comments

"Extended gauge model" [Altarelli et al., Z. Phys. C 45 109 (1989)]

mass(W')	$\sigma^{95\%} \times \mathcal{B}$	$\sigma^{95\%} imes \mathcal{B}$	$\mathbf{\sigma} imes \mathcal{B}$
	(Quaero)	(CDF)	(theory)
200	3.4 pb	6.6 pb	0.65 pb
350	0.7 pb	2.0 pb	0.13 pb
500	0.2 pb	0.5 pb	0.02 pb
		[CDF, hep-ex/0108004]

Standard Model (Z-like) couplings assumed

mass(Z')	$\sigma^{95\%} imes \mathcal{B}$	$\sigma^{95\%} imes \mathcal{B}$	
	(Quaero)	(CDF)	
350	1.1 pb	-	
450	0.9 pb	0.65 pb	
550	0.3 pb	0.45 pb	
	[CD	OF, PRL 85 2062 (200)0)]

Results are consistent with (and competitive with) previous measurements.







Previous 0.4±0.15 0.35 0.07 *pb*



(to be overlayed)

Quaero performs as expected in 11 of 11 sample analyses

Motivation Data Algorithm Examples

,	Qua A General Interfa	ETO ce to LEP	Data	
	eph 🗹 Delphi	☑ <u>L3</u>	☑ <u>Opal</u>	
	Sign	al		
• Pythia Input:				<u>~</u>
○ <u>Signal File</u> :		Bro	wse xsec:	pb
	Reque	stor		
Name:				
Institution:				
Email:				
	Brief descriptio	n of mode	l:	
				A.
	Subr	nit		
	<u>Help!</u> - <u>Bug hist</u>	ory - <u>CERN</u>		

Current challenges:

- 1) Archiving data
 - Can we archive HEP data in a meaningful way?
- 2) Combining results from various final states

What do the data *as a whole* say about a particular model?

3) Combining results from various experiments

Can we do this consistently and correctly, with minimal headache?

4) Precision measurements

Can Quaero do measurements, in addition to searches?

5) Systematic errors

Can we allow an arbitrarily sophisticated treatment of systematics?

Any experiment wishing to use Quaero needs to provide 4 things:

- Data
 - Object 4-vectors
- Backgrounds
 - **Object 4-vectors**
- Systematic errors

Sources of error & effect on 4-vectors

Detector simulation

(and reconstruction, if necessary)

Event format:

 $\mathsf{I}\mathsf{F}\mathsf{P}$

eventType
weight{err/mag,...} sqrt(s){err/mag,...}
e+ E{err/mag,...} $\cos(\theta) \phi$ e- E{err/mag,...} $\cos(\theta) \phi$ b E{err/mag,...} $\cos(\theta) \phi$ b E{err/mag,...} $\cos(\theta) \phi$ uncl m{err/mag,...} E{err/mag,...} $\cos(\theta) \phi$;

Data event:

LEP

data 1 190.0 e+ 45.2 +0.11 0.21 e- 47.3 -0.05 3.56 b 46.0 -0.16 1.71 b 48.2 -0.02 4.90 uncl 0.44 3.3 +0.07 3.97;

LEP

Background event:

ZZ $0.0041\{1/0,12/0.0002,0201/0.0001\}$ 190.0 e+ $45.2\{0221/1.4\}$ +0.11 0.21 e- $47.3\{0221/1.5\}$ -0.05 3.56 b $\{0211/j/0.001\}$ 46.0 $\{0222/3.6\}$ -0.16 1.71 b $\{0211/j/0.05\}$ 48.2 $\{0222/3.7\}$ -0.02 4.90 uncl $0.44\{0222/0.07\}$ 3.3 $\{0222/0.32\}$ +0.07 3.97; LEP

Instead of returning cross section limits, Quaero will return a single number:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) = \frac{p(\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{H})}{p(\mathcal{D}|SM)},$$

where \mathcal{H} is the hypothesis being tested.

(Further manipulation of this quantity is then straightforward)

Will this new algorithm actually work in practice?

We'll see . . .

Conclusions

- Quaero is a method for making HEP data publicly available
 - Perform the analysis automatically
 - Results within the hour
- Quaero has been used to publish
 DØ Run I data
 - hep-ex/0106039, submitted to PRL
 - http://quaero.fnal.gov/

