

The language of random variables




Support Material

G. Cowan, Statistical Data Analysis, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1998.
PDG

L. Lista Statistical methods for Data Analysis, 2nd Ed. Springer, 2018


G. Cowan PDG

<http://pdg.lbl.gov/2017/reviews/rpp2017-rev-statistics.pdf>



C. Bini, Lezioni di statistica per la fisica sperimentale, Edizioni Nuova Cultura
G. D'Agostini, Bayesian reasoning in data analysis, World Scientific
(<https://cds.cern.ch/record/395902/files/CERN-99-03.pdf>)

Data analysis in particle physics



Observe events of a certain type

Measure characteristics of each event (particle momenta, number of muons, energy of jets,...)

Theories (e.g. SM) predict distributions of these properties up to free parameters, e.g., α , G_F , M_Z , α_s , m_H , ...

Some tasks of data analysis:

Estimate (measure) the parameters;

Quantify the uncertainty of the parameter estimates;

Test the extent to which the predictions of a theory are in agreement with the data.

Dealing with uncertainty

In particle physics there are various elements of uncertainty:

theory is not deterministic

quantum mechanics

random measurement errors

present even without quantum effects

things we could know in principle but don't

e.g. from limitations of cost, time, ...



We can quantify the uncertainty using **PROBABILITY**

A definition of probability

Consider a set S with subsets A, B, \dots

For all $A \subset S, P(A) \geq 0$

$$P(S) = 1$$

If $A \cap B = \emptyset, P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B)$



Kolmogorov
axioms (1933)

From these axioms we can derive further properties, e.g.

$$P(\bar{A}) = 1 - P(A)$$

$$P(A \cup \bar{A}) = 1$$

$$P(\emptyset) = 0$$

if $A \subset B$, then $P(A) \leq P(B)$

$$P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B) - P(A \cap B)$$

Conditional probability, independence

Also define conditional probability of A given B (with $P(B) \neq 0$):

$$P(A|B) = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)}$$

E.g. rolling dice: $P(n < 3 | n \text{ even}) = \frac{P((n < 3) \cap n \text{ even})}{P(\text{even})} = \frac{1/6}{3/6} = \frac{1}{3}$

Subsets A, B independent if: $P(A \cap B) = P(A)P(B)$

If A, B independent, $P(A|B) = \frac{P(A)P(B)}{P(B)} = P(A)$

N.B. do not confuse with disjoint subsets, i.e., $A \cap B = \emptyset$

Interpretation of probability

I. Relative frequency

A, B, \dots are outcomes of a repeatable experiment

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

cf. quantum mechanics, particle scattering, radioactive decay...

II. Subjective probability

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

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

- Both interpretations consistent with Kolmogorov axioms.
- In particle physics frequency interpretation often most useful, but subjective probability can provide more natural treatment of non-repeatable phenomena:
systematic uncertainties, probability that Higgs boson exists,...

Bayes' theorem

From the definition of conditional probability we have,

$$P(A|B) = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)} \quad \text{and} \quad P(B|A) = \frac{P(B \cap A)}{P(A)}$$

but $P(A \cap B) = P(B \cap A)$, so

$$P(A|B) = \frac{P(B|A)P(A)}{P(B)}$$

Bayes' theorem




First published (posthumously) by the Reverend Thomas Bayes (1702–1761)

An essay towards solving a problem in the doctrine of chances, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. **53** (1763) 370; reprinted in Biometrika, **45** (1958) 293.

The law of total probability

Consider a subset B of the sample space S ,

divided into disjoint subsets A_i such that $\cup_i A_i = S$,



$$\rightarrow B = B \cap S = B \cap (\cup_i A_i) = \cup_i (B \cap A_i),$$

$$\rightarrow P(B) = P(\cup_i (B \cap A_i)) = \sum_i P(B \cap A_i)$$

$$\rightarrow P(B) = \sum_i P(B|A_i)P(A_i) \quad \text{law of total probability}$$

Bayes' theorem becomes

$$P(A|B) = \frac{P(B|A)P(A)}{\sum_i P(B|A_i)P(A_i)}$$

An example using Bayes' theorem

Suppose the probability (for anyone) to have a disease D is:

$$\begin{aligned}P(D) &= 0.001 \\P(\text{no } D) &= 0.999\end{aligned}$$

← prior probabilities, i.e.,
before any test carried out

Consider a test for the disease: result is + or -

$$\begin{aligned}P(+|D) &= 0.98 \\P(-|D) &= 0.02 \\P(+|\text{no } D) &= 0.03 \\P(-|\text{no } D) &= 0.97\end{aligned}$$

← probabilities to (in)correctly
identify a person with the disease

← probabilities to (in)correctly
identify a healthy person

Suppose your result is +. How worried should you be?

Bayes' theorem example (cont.)

The probability to have the disease given a + result is

$$\begin{aligned} p(D|+) &= \frac{P(+|D)P(D)}{P(+|D)P(D) + P(+|\text{no } D)P(\text{no } D)} \\ &= \frac{0.98 \times 0.001}{0.98 \times 0.001 + 0.03 \times 0.999} \\ &= 0.032 \quad \leftarrow \text{posterior probability} \end{aligned}$$

i.e. you're probably OK!

Your viewpoint: my degree of belief that I have the disease is 3.2%.

$P(D|+)$ and $P(+|D)$ can be very different (depends on the prior!)

Frequentist Statistics – general philosophy

In frequentist statistics, probabilities are associated only with the data, i.e., outcomes of repeatable observations (shorthand: \vec{x}).

Probability = limiting frequency

Probabilities such as

P (Higgs boson exists),

$P(0.117 < \alpha_s < 0.121)$,

etc. are either 0 or 1, but we don't know which.

The tools of frequentist statistics tell us what to expect, under the assumption of certain probabilities, about hypothetical repeated observations.

The preferred theories (models, hypotheses, ...) are those for which our observations would be considered 'usual'.

Probability definition (frequentist)

- A bit more formal definition of probability:
- Law of large numbers:

$$P(E) = p \quad \text{if} \quad \frac{N(E)}{N} \xrightarrow{P} p$$

- i.e.: $\forall \varepsilon \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\left| \frac{N(E)}{N} - p \right| < \varepsilon \right) = 1$

... isn't it a circular definition?

$$\langle x \rangle = \frac{1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6}{6} = 3.5 .$$




Fig. 1.10 An illustration of the law of large numbers using a computer simulation of die rolls. The average of the first N out of 1000 random extraction is reported as a function of N . 1000 extractions have been repeated twice (*red and blue lines*) with independent random extractions

Frequentist probability
definition:

$$P(E) = p \quad \text{if} \quad \forall \varepsilon \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\left| \frac{N(E)}{N} - p \right| < \varepsilon \right)$$

(somewhat a circular definition:
a probability in terms of another probability)

Bayesian Statistics – general philosophy

In Bayesian statistics, use subjective probability for hypotheses:

probability of the data assuming hypothesis H (the likelihood)

prior probability, i.e., before seeing the data

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

posterior probability, i.e., after seeing the data

normalization involves sum over all possible hypotheses

Bayes' theorem has an “if-then” character: **If** your prior probabilities were $\pi(H)$, **then** it says how these probabilities should change in the light of the data.

No general prescription for priors (subjective!)

Definition of probability

- There are two main different definitions of the concept of probability
- **Frequentist**
 - **Probability** is the ratio of the number of occurrences of an event to the total number of experiments, *in the limit of very large number of repeatable experiments*.
 - Can only be applied to a specific classes of events (repeatable experiments)
 - *Meaningless to state: “probability that the lightest SuSy particle’s mass is less tha 1 TeV”*
- **Bayesian**
 - **Probability** measures someone’s the degree of belief that something is or will be true: *would you bet?*
 - Can be applied to most of unknown events (past, present, future):
 - *“Probability that Velociraptors hunted in groups”*
 - *“Probability that S.S.C Naples will win next championship”*
or Rome, Juventus etc..

Problems with probability definitions



- **Frequentist probability is, to some extent, circularly defined**
 - A phenomenon can be proven to be random (i.e.: obeying laws of statistics) only if we observe infinite cases
 - F. James et al.: “*this definition is not very appealing to a mathematician, since it is based on experimentation, and, in fact, implies unrealizable experiments ($N \rightarrow \infty$)*”. But a physicist can take this with some pragmatism
 - A frequentist model can be justified by details of poorly predictable underlying physical phenomena
 - **Deterministic** dynamic with instability (chaos theory, ...)
 - **Quantum Mechanics is intrinsically probabilistic...!**
 - A school of statisticians state that **Bayesian** statistics is a more natural and fundamental concept, and frequentist statistic is just a special sub-case
- **On the other hand, Bayesian statistics is subjectivity by definition**, which is unpleasant for scientific applications.
 - Bayesian reply that it is actually **inter-subjective**, i.e.: the real essence of learning and knowing physical laws...
- **Frequentist approach is preferred by the large fraction of physicists** (probably the majority, but Bayesian statistics is getting more and more popular in many application, also thanks to its **easier application** in many cases

Frequentist vs Bayesian

- The Bayesian infers from the data using **priors**

posterior $P(H | x) \approx P(x | H) \cdot P(H)$


- Priors is a science on its own.
Are they objective? Are they subjective?
- The Frequentist calculates the probability of an hypothesis to be inferred from the data based on a large set of hypothetical experiments
Ideally, the frequentist does not need priors, or any degree of belief while the Bayesian posterior based inference is a "Degree of Belief".
- However, NPs (Systematic) inject a Bayesian flavour to any Frequentist analysis



Theory ↔ Statistics ↔ Experiment


Theory (model, hypothesis):

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + i\bar{\Psi}\not{D}\Psi + \dots$$




$$\sigma = \frac{G_F \alpha_S^2 m_H^2}{288 \sqrt{2\pi}} \times \text{wavy line}$$


+ simulation
of detector
and cuts



Experiment:



+ data
selection



Data analysis in particle physics

Observe events (e.g., pp collisions) and for each, measure a set of characteristics:

particle momenta, number of muons, energy of jets,...

Compare observed distributions of these characteristics to predictions of theory. From this, we want to:

Estimate the free parameters of the theory: $m_H = 125.4$

Quantify the uncertainty in the estimates: $\pm 0.4 \text{ GeV}$


Assess how well a given theory stands in agreement with the observed data:

0^+ good, 2^+ bad

To do this we need a clear definition of **PROBABILITY**

Data analysis in particle physics: testing hypotheses

Test the extent to which a given model agrees with the data:



spin-1/2 quark
model “good”

spin-0 quark
model “bad”

In general need tests
with well-defined properties
and quantitative results.

The Logic of an EPP experiment

Go back to Rutherford and the logical steps of his experiment
(slide 8)


Key elements in the Rutherford experiment – physical quantities

- **Energy of the collision** (driven by the kinetic energy of the α particles) the meaning of \sqrt{s}
- **Beam Intensity** (how many α particles /s)
- **Size and density of the target** (how many gold nuclei encountered by the α particles);
- **Deflection angle θ**
- **Probability/frequency of a given final state** (fraction of α particles scattered at an angle θ);
- **Detector efficiency** (are all scattered α particles detected?); includes acceptance (geometrical acceptance...).
- **Detector resolution** (how good θ angle is measured?)

MOREOVER: if I know masses and kinetic energies of each projectile and target
may I predict how each collision will happen ?

NO !

I can only predict the probability of each possible happening...



In every collision e^+e^- “*toss the dices*” and choose a possible final state

The theory allows to evaluate the probability of the final states

With the experiment one can only measure the frequency of the final states

and compare it to the predicted probability

Why random variables

- Intrinsic quantum nature of the phenomena we are considering
- Instrumental effects
- Example: the angular distribution in the Rutherford scattering → the variable is the deflection angle θ
 - → from “physics” you expect $f(\theta)$: this is the PDF of the quantity θ
 - → let’s include the instrumental effects: $\theta = \text{true}$; $\theta' = \text{measured}$
 - → efficiency $\varepsilon(\theta)$
 - → resolution $R(\theta - \theta')$
 - The measured “histogram” will be

$$g(\theta') = \int \varepsilon(\theta) R(\theta - \theta') f(\theta) d\theta$$


An example

The KLOE detector at the Frascati ϕ -factory DAFNE

DAFNE
collider




Integrated luminosity (KLOE)



Total KLOE $\int \mathcal{L} dt \sim 2.5 fb^{-1}$
 (2001 - 05) $\rightarrow \sim 2.5 \times 10^9 K_S K_L$ pairs

KLOE detector





Lead/scintillating fiber calorimeter

drift chamber

4 m diameter \times 3.3 m length

helium based gas mixture







KLOE event:
 $\phi \rightarrow K_S K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$

EPR correlations in entangled neutral kaon pairs from ϕ

$$|i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[|K^0\rangle |\bar{K}^0\rangle - |\bar{K}^0\rangle |K^0\rangle \right]$$



Same final state for both kaons: $f_1 = f_2 = \pi^+\pi^-$
 (this specific channel is suppressed by CP viol.
 $|\eta_{+-}|^2 = |\mathbf{A}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) / \mathbf{A}(K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)|^2 \sim |\epsilon|^2 \sim 10^{-6}$)



EPR correlation:


no simultaneous decays ($\Delta t=0$) in the same final state due to the fully destructive quantum interference

$$\Delta t = |t_1 - t_2|$$

$\phi \rightarrow K_S K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$: test of quantum coherence

$$|i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[|K^0\rangle |\bar{K}^0\rangle - |\bar{K}^0\rangle |K^0\rangle \right]$$

$$I(\pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^+ \pi^-; \Delta t) = \frac{N}{2} \left[\left| \langle \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^+ \pi^- | K^0 \bar{K}^0(\Delta t) \rangle \right|^2 + \left| \langle \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^+ \pi^- | \bar{K}^0 K^0(\Delta t) \rangle \right|^2 - (1 - \xi_{0\bar{0}}) \cdot 2 \Re \left(\langle \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^+ \pi^- | K^0 \bar{K}^0(\Delta t) \rangle \langle \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^+ \pi^- | \bar{K}^0 K^0(\Delta t) \rangle^* \right) \right]$$



Decoherence parameter:

$$\xi_{0\bar{0}} = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{QM}$$

$$\xi_{0\bar{0}} = 1 \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{total decoherence}$$



(also known as Furry's hypothesis or spontaneous factorization)

[W.Furry, PR 49 (1936) 393]



Bertlmann, Grimus, Hiesmayr PR D60 (1999) 114032

Bertlmann, Durstberger, Hiesmayr PRA 68 012111 (2003)

$$\Delta t = |t_1 - t_2|$$



$$\Delta t = |t_1 - t_2|$$



Violation of QM?