# Common representations for CSE

1.  $N_{pt}\times N_\lambda$  correlation matrix  $\beta_{k\alpha}$  for  $N_\lambda$  random nuisance parameters  $\lambda_\alpha$ 

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{e=\{\text{expt.}\}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N_{pt}} \frac{1}{s_k^2} \left( D_k - T_k(\{z\}) - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_\lambda} \lambda_\alpha \beta_{k\alpha} \right)^2 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_\lambda} \lambda_\alpha^2 \right]$$

▲  $D_k$  and  $T_k$  are data and theory values  $(k = 1, ..., N_{pt})$ ;

- ▲  $s_k$  is the stat.+syst. uncorrelated error;
- **A**  $\{z\}$  are PDF parameters;  $\{z = 0\}$  in the best fit
- **2.**  $N_{pt} \times N_{pt}$  covariance matrix C (not used by CTEQ):

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{k,k'} (D_k - T_k) C_{kk'}^{-1} (D_{k'} - T_{k'})$$

#### Algebraic solution for CSE parameters $\lambda_a$

 $\beta$  and C are related by algebraic minimization of  $\chi^2$  with respect to  $\lambda_{\alpha}$ . If  $d_i \equiv D_i - T_i$ ;  $d_i$ ,  $\beta_{i\alpha}$  are given in units of  $s_i$  for each  $i = 1, ..., N_{pt}$ ; and for Gaussian  $\lambda_{\alpha}$ :

$$\lambda_{\alpha}\left(\{z\}\right) = \sum_{\alpha'=1}^{N_{\lambda}} (\mathcal{A}^{-1})_{\alpha\alpha'} B_{\alpha'}(\{z\})$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\alpha\alpha'} = \delta_{\alpha\alpha'} + \sum_{i=1}^{N_{pt}} \beta_{\alpha i} \beta_{\alpha' i}; \qquad B_{\alpha}(\{z\}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{pt}} \beta_{\alpha i} (D_i - T_i)$$
$$\chi^2(z, \lambda(z)) = \sum_{k,k'} d_k \left[ I - \beta \mathcal{A}^{-1} \beta^T \right]_{kk'} d_{k'} \equiv d^T \left[ I - \beta \mathcal{A}^{-1} \beta^T \right] d$$
$$\therefore C = \left( I - \beta \mathcal{A}^{-1} \beta^T \right)^{-1} = I + \beta \beta^T$$

**Numerical** minimization of  $\chi^2(z, \lambda(z))$  establishes the region of acceptable  $\{z\}$ , which includes the largest possible variations of  $\{z\}$  allowed by the systematic effects

An estimate of missing higher-order corrections: basic idea See also Olness, Soper, arXiv:0907.5052; Cacciari, Houdeau, arXiv:1105.5152

For arbitrary  $\mu_{R,F},$  the NLO cross sections in the experimental bins i can be written as

$$\sigma_{bin}^{NLO}(\mu_F, \,\mu_R, \,i) = \sigma_{bin}^{NLO}(\mu_F^{(0)}, \,\mu_R^{(0)}, \,i) \Big\{ 1 + \sum_{j=1}^3 e_j(\mu_F^{(0)}, \,\mu_R^{(0)}, i) x_j + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3(\mu_R^{(0)})) \Big\}$$

with

$$x_{1} = \ln(\frac{\mu_{F}}{\mu_{F}^{(0)}}), \qquad x_{2} = \ln(\frac{\mu_{R}}{\mu_{R}^{(0)}}), \qquad x_{3} = \ln^{2}(\frac{\mu_{F}}{\mu_{F}^{(0)}}),$$
$$x_{4} = \ln^{2}(\frac{\mu_{R}}{\mu_{R}^{(0)}}), \qquad x_{5} = \ln(\frac{\mu_{F}}{\mu_{F}^{(0)}})\ln(\frac{\mu_{R}}{\mu_{R}^{(0)}}),$$

where  $\mu_F^{(0)}$  and  $\mu_R^{(0)}$  are the reference scales. P. Nadolsky (SMU) Corr. errors,THUTF meeting An estimate of missing higher-order corrections: basic idea See also Olness, Soper, arXiv:0907.5052; Cacciari, Houdeau, arXiv:1105.5152

For arbitrary  $\mu_{R,F},$  the NLO cross sections in the experimental bins i can be written as

$$\sigma_{bin}^{NLO}(\mu_F, \,\mu_R, \,i) = \sigma_{bin}^{NLO}(\mu_F^{(0)}, \,\mu_R^{(0)}, \,i) \Big\{ 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{5} e_j(\mu_F^{(0)}, \mu_R^{(0)}, i) x_j + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3(\mu_R^{(0)})) \Big\}$$

Treat  $x_i$  as independent corr. sources with quasi-Gaussian distributions (plausible, but not necessarily true). Assign your favorite confidence level (68% c.l.) to the range  $1/2 < \mu_{F,R}/\mu_{F,R}^{(0)} < 2$ . Evaluate the variation of  $\sigma_{bin}^{NLO}(\mu_F, \mu_R, i)$  in this scale range. Find  $e_j(i)$  numerically and use them to construct the correlation matrix. Reduce the number of principal components to eliminate  $x_i$  combinations that have vanishing effect on theory cross sections.

## Application of CEMA: correlated theoretical errors for jet cross sections at the Tevatron and LHC



### Fit with(out) jet data

Tevatron inclusive jet data does impose constraints on the CT10 gluon PDF. The 2010 ATLAS jet data does not strengthen the constraints yet because of large exp. errors.



## PRELIMINARY

#### Effects of theoretical errors of jet data

Gluon PDF uncertainties at 90% C.L. for the fits with and without theoretical errors. Scale dependence of jet cross sections increases the net gluon PDF uncertainty at x > 0.1 by about 20%.



## PRELIMINARY

The gluon PDFs in the moderate x region is also affected by the scale dependence errors, as a result of the anti-correlation with the gluon PDF at large x



## PRELIMINARY

## Conclusions

We explored a prescription for treating theoretical uncertainties in NLO jet cross sections caused by scale variations as correlated systematic errors. In this approach, scale dependence can increase the gluon PDF uncertainties in the large x region by about 20%, also in the moderate x region by about 10% indirectly.