Re-weighting VS. re-fitting

Pía Zurita

(& AFTER)

University of Santiago de Compostela

AFTER@LHC 12-17 January 2014 - Les Houches

Outline



The re-weighting methods

Before AFTER

Summary



Fitting implies ...

making many, many choices

and it is ...

quite time consuming

Fitting implies ...

making many, many choices

and it is ...

quite time consuming

methods to quickly

assess the impact of

new data on (n)PDFS

Bayesian re-weighting

W.T. Giele and S. Keller, Phys. Rev. D58 (1998) 094923.

R. D. Ball et al. [NNPDF Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B 849 (2011) 112 [Erratum-ibid. B 854 (2012) 926] [Erratum-ibid. B 855 (2012) 927].

R. D. Ball et al. [NNPDF Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B 855 (2012) 608.

G. Watt and R. S. Thorne, JHEP (2012) 052.

N. Sato, J.F. Owens and H. Prosper, arXiv:1310.1089.

B.J.A. Watt, P. Motylinski and R.S. Thorne, arXiv:1311.5703.

N. Armesto, J. Rojo, C.A. Salgado, and P. Z., JHEP 1311 (2013) 015.

Hessian re-weighting

H. Paukkunen and C.A. Salgado, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 212301 (2013).

For any observable

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{N_{\text{rep}}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{rep}}} \mathcal{O}[f_k]$$

For any observable

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{N_{\text{rep}}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{rep}}} \mathcal{O}[f_k]$$

n new data points \Rightarrow

$\mathcal{P}_{new}(f) = \mathcal{N}_{\chi} \mathcal{P}(\chi|f) \mathcal{P}_{old}(f)$

For any observable

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{N_{\text{rep}}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{rep}}} \mathcal{O}[f_k]$$

n new data points \Rightarrow

$$\mathcal{P}_{new}(f) = \mathcal{N}_{\chi} \mathcal{P}(\chi|f) \mathcal{P}_{old}(f)$$

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{\text{new}} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{rep}}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{rep}}} w_k \mathcal{O}[f_k]$$

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

How to choose the likelihood?

 $\mathcal{P}(\chi|f) \propto (\chi^2)^{\frac{1}{2}(n-1)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi^2}$

NNPDF

$$\mathcal{P}(\vec{y}|f) \propto e^{-\frac{1}{2}\chi^2(y,f)}$$

Giele-Keller



$$w_k = \frac{(\chi_k^2)^{\frac{1}{2}(n-1)} e^{-\chi_k^2/2}}{\frac{1}{N_{\text{rep}}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{rep}}} (\chi_k^2)^{\frac{1}{2}(n-1)} e^{-\chi_k^2/2}}$$

Giele-Keller

$$w_k = \frac{e^{-\chi_k^2/2}}{\frac{1}{N_{\rm rep}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\rm rep}} e^{-\chi_k^2/2}}$$

$$\chi_k^2(y, f_k) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n (y_i - y_i[f_k]) \sigma_{ij}^{-1}(y_j - y_j[f_k])$$





To quantify the accuracy

$$N_{\text{eff}} \equiv \exp\left\{\frac{1}{N_{\text{rep}}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{rep}}} w_k \log(N_{\text{rep}}/w_k)\right\}$$
$$= N_{rep} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{N_{\text{rep}}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{rep}}} w_k \log(w_k)\right\}$$

what if Neff << Nrep?

Too much new information, (theory still valid)

Incompatible new data (theory no longer applies)

what if Neff << Nrep?

lew

Too much new information, (theory still valid)

Incompatible new data (theory no longer applies)

what if Neff << Nrep?

new

fit

Too much new information, (theory still valid) new (n)PDF set

Incompatible new data (theory no longer applies)

what if Neff << Nrep?

new

fit

Too much new information, (theory still valid) new (n)PDF set

Incompatible new data (theory no longer applies)

very exciting!

and now we put this

to test ...

 N_{eig} $f_k(x,Q^2) = f_0(x,Q^2) + \sum (f_i^{\pm}(x,Q^2) - f_0(x,Q^2))|r_{k,i}|$ random numbers hessian eigenvectors central value k=1,..., N_{rep} $N_{rep} = 1000$

Drell-Yan

MCFM + MSTW2008 + EPS09

J. M. Campbell and R. K. Ellis, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 114012.
A. D. Martin, W. J. Stirling, R. S. Thorne and G. Watt, Eur. Phys. J. C 63 (2009) 189.
K. J. Eskola, H. Paukkunen and C. A. Salgado, JHEP 0904 (2009) 065.

No p_T cuts

|η| < 4

8% systematic uncertainty

 $L_{int} = 30 \text{ nb}^{-1}$

Drell-Yan



n=16	X ² / n	< x ² > / n	N _{eff}
EPS09	0.64	2.68	_
NNPDF	0.59	0.96	539
G-K	0.48	0.62	196

No change in the valence

Modification of the sea





Modification of the gluon



Hadro-production

Code for $pPb \rightarrow h+X + MSTW2008 + EPS09 + DSS$

B. Jager, A. Schafer, M. Stratmann and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. D67 (2003) 054005.
R. Sassot and M. Stratmann and P.Z., Phys. Rev. D82 (2010) 074011.
D. de Florian, R. Sassot and M. Stratmann, Phys. Rev. D76 (2007) 074033.

DGLAP & CGC pseudo-data

J. L. Albacete, A. Dumitru, H. Fujii and Y. Nara, Nucl. Phys. A 897 (2013) 1.

5% systematic & 7% normalization uncertainties

 $L_{int} = 30 \text{ nb}^{-1}$

1000 MC replicas

two scenarios: $\eta = 0 \& \eta = 2$

DGLAP pseudo-data for n = 2



n=25	X ² / n	< x ² > / n	N _{eff}
Before	0.95	1.82	_
NNPDF	0.92	1.08	612
G-K	0.91	0.95	307



10 -3

1 10⁻⁴

10⁻²

Х

10⁻¹

10 -3

10⁻²

Х

10⁻¹

1 10⁻⁴

0

10⁻⁴

10⁻³

10⁻²

Х

10⁻¹

CGC pseudo-data for $\eta = 2$



CGC pseudo-data for $\eta = 2$



CGC for $\eta = 2$

Unfortunately, no, because

n=25	X ² / n	< x ² > / n	N _{eff}
Before	36.43	38.62	_
NNPDF	1.85	1.85	
G-K	1.85	1.85	

CGC for $\eta = 2$

Unfortunately, no, because

n=25	X ² / n	< x ² > / n	N _{eff}
Before	36.43	38.62	_
NNPDF	1.85	1.85	
G-K	1.85	1.85	

and the re-weighting methods are invalidated

What happens with the gluons?



Summary

- gluons unconstrained (basically at any-x)
- re-weighting methods are powerful tools: fittersindependent & time saving
- compatibility of the methods under study
- hints of new phenomena

http://igfae.usc.es/hotlhc/index.php/ software

AFTER



prompt photon



deuteron target



Drell-Yan



hadro-production

Deuteron

included but not included in nuclear fits

relevant for isospin separation

effect not small if precision required

more data would be useful

Drell-Yan

large positive y

large negative y

 $\mathbf{x_{1,2}} = \sqrt{\mathbf{M^2}/\mathbf{s}} \, \mathbf{e^{\pm y}}$





Single-inclusive hadro-production

constraints on gluon density

only RHIC data, $\eta=0$

final state dependent

problem with FFs at LHC energies