

Statistical Methods for Physicists

Lecture 3: p -values, discovery limits

www.pp.rhul.ac.uk/~cowan/stat/granada20



UNIVERSIDAD
DE GRANADA

University of Granada
4,5 May 2020



Glen Cowan
Physics Department
Royal Holloway, University of London
g.cowan@rhul.ac.uk
www.pp.rhul.ac.uk/~cowan

Outline

Lecture 1: Introduction and review of fundamentals

Probability, random variables, pdfs

Parameter estimation, maximum likelihood

Introduction to statistical tests

Lecture 2: More on statistical tests

Multivariate methods

Neural networks

→ Lecture 3: Framework for full analysis

p -values, discovery, limits

Tests from likelihood ratio

Lecture 4: Further topics

Nuisance parameters and systematic uncertainties

More parameter estimation, Bayesian methods

(Experimental sensitivity)

Testing significance / goodness-of-fit


Suppose hypothesis H predicts pdf $f(\vec{x}|H)$ for a set of observations $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

We observe a single point in this space: \vec{x}_{obs}

What can we say about the validity of H in light of the data?

Decide what part of the data space represents less compatibility with H than does the point \vec{x}_{obs} .

This region therefore has greater compatibility with some alternative H' .



p-values

Express ‘goodness-of-fit’ by giving the *p*-value for *H*:

p = probability, under assumption of *H*, to observe data with equal or lesser compatibility with *H* relative to the data we got.



This is not the probability that *H* is true!

In frequentist statistics we don’t talk about $P(H)$ (unless *H* represents a repeatable observation). In Bayesian statistics we do; use Bayes’ theorem to obtain


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

where $\pi(H)$ is the prior probability for *H*.

For now stick with the frequentist approach; result is *p*-value, regrettably easy to misinterpret as $P(H)$.

Significance from p -value

Often define significance Z as the number of standard deviations that a Gaussian variable would fluctuate in one direction to give the same p -value.



$$p = \int_Z^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} dx = 1 - \Phi(Z) \quad \text{1 - TMath::Freq}$$

$$Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p) \quad \text{TMath::NormQuantile}$$


Critical region from p -value

Often formulate a test in terms of the p -value:

$$p_H = P(\mathbf{x} \in \text{region of equal or lesser compatibility} \mid H)$$

“Less compatible with H ” means “more compatible with alt. H' ”

Distribution $f(p_H|H)$ uniform on $[0,1]$, so can define critical region of a test as the region where the p -value is $\leq \alpha$.



Formally the p -value relates only to H but the resulting test will have a given power with respect to a given alternative H' .

Confidence interval from inversion of a test

Carry out a test of size α for all values of a parameter θ .

The values that are not rejected constitute a *confidence interval* for θ at confidence level $CL = 1 - \alpha$.

The confidence interval will by construction contain the true value of θ with probability of at least $1 - \alpha$.

The interval will cover the true value of θ with probability $\geq 1 - \alpha$.

Equivalently, the parameter values in the confidence interval have p -values of at least α .

To find edge of interval (the “limit”), set $p_\theta = \alpha$ and solve for θ .

The Poisson counting experiment

Suppose we do a counting experiment and observe n events.

Events could be from *signal* process or from *background* – we only count the total number.

Poisson model:

$$P(n|s, b) = \frac{(s + b)^n}{n!} e^{-(s+b)}$$

s = mean (i.e., expected) # of signal events

b = mean # of background events

Goal is to make inference about s , e.g.,

test $s = 0$ (rejecting $H_0 \approx$ “discovery of signal process”)

test all non-zero s (values not rejected = confidence interval)

In both cases need to ask what is relevant alternative hypothesis.


Poisson counting experiment: discovery p -value

Suppose $b = 0.5$ (known), and we observe $n_{\text{obs}} = 5$.

Should we claim evidence for a new discovery?

Take n itself as the test statistic, p -value for hypothesis $s = 0$ is


$$\begin{aligned} p\text{-value} &= P(n \geq 5; b = 0.5, s = 0) \\ &= 1.7 \times 10^{-4} \neq P(s = 0)! \end{aligned}$$



Poisson counting experiment: discovery significance

Equivalent significance for $p = 1.7 \times 10^{-4}$: $Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p) = 3.6$

Often claim discovery if $Z > 5$ ($p < 2.9 \times 10^{-7}$, i.e., a “5-sigma effect”)



In fact this tradition should be revisited: p -value intended to quantify probability of a signal-like fluctuation assuming background only; not intended to cover, e.g., hidden systematics, plausibility signal model, compatibility of data with signal, “look-elsewhere effect” (~multiple testing), etc.

Frequentist upper limit on Poisson parameter

Consider again the case of observing $n \sim \text{Poisson}(s + b)$.

Suppose $b = 4.5$, $n_{\text{obs}} = 5$. Find upper limit on s at 95% CL.

Relevant alternative is $s = 0$ (critical region at low n)

p -value of hypothesized s is $P(n \leq n_{\text{obs}}; s, b)$

Upper limit s_{up} at $\text{CL} = 1 - \alpha$ found by solving $p_s = \alpha$ for s :


$$\alpha = P(n \leq n_{\text{obs}}; s_{\text{up}}, b) = \sum_{n=0}^{n_{\text{obs}}} \frac{(s_{\text{up}} + b)^n}{n!} e^{-(s_{\text{up}} + b)}$$

$$s_{\text{up}} = \frac{1}{2} F_{\chi^2}^{-1}(1 - \alpha; 2(n_{\text{obs}} + 1)) - b$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} F_{\chi^2}^{-1}(0.95; 2(5 + 1)) - 4.5 = 6.0$$

Frequentist upper limit on Poisson parameter


Upper limit s_{up} at $\text{CL} = 1 - \alpha$ found from $p_s = \alpha$.



$$n_{\text{obs}} = 5,$$
$$b = 4.5$$

$n \sim \text{Poisson}(s+b)$: frequentist upper limit on s

For low fluctuation of n formula can give negative result for s_{up} ; i.e. confidence interval is empty.



Limits near a physical boundary

Suppose e.g. $b = 2.5$ and we observe $n = 0$.

If we choose $CL = 0.9$, we find from the formula for s_{up}

$$s_{\text{up}} = -0.197 \quad (CL = 0.90)$$

Physicist:

We already knew $s \geq 0$ before we started; can't use negative upper limit to report result of expensive experiment!

Statistician:

The interval is designed to cover the true value only 90% of the time — this was clearly not one of those times.

Not uncommon dilemma when testing parameter values for which one has very little experimental sensitivity, e.g., very small s .

Expected limit for $s = 0$


Physicist: I should have used $CL = 0.95$ — then $s_{\text{up}} = 0.496$

Even better: for $CL = 0.917923$ we get $s_{\text{up}} = 10^{-4}$!

Reality check: with $b = 2.5$, typical Poisson fluctuation in n is at least $\sqrt{2.5} = 1.6$. How can the limit be so low?

Look at the mean limit for the no-signal hypothesis ($s = 0$) (sensitivity).

Distribution of 95% CL limits with $b = 2.5$, $s = 0$.
Mean upper limit = 4.44



Approximate confidence intervals/regions from the likelihood function

Suppose we test parameter value(s) $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$ using the ratio


$$\lambda(\theta) = \frac{L(\theta)}{L(\hat{\theta})} \quad 0 \leq \lambda(\theta) \leq 1$$

Lower $\lambda(\theta)$ means worse agreement between data and hypothesized θ . Equivalently, usually define

$$t_{\theta} = -2 \ln \lambda(\theta)$$

so higher t_{θ} means worse agreement between θ and the data.

p -value of θ therefore $p_{\theta} = \int_{t_{\theta, \text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(t_{\theta} | \theta) dt_{\theta}$



Confidence region from Wilks' theorem

Wilks' theorem says (in large-sample limit and providing certain conditions hold...)

$$f(t_{\theta}|\theta) \sim \chi_n^2$$

chi-square dist. with # d.o.f. =
of components in $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$.

Assuming this holds, the p -value is

$$p_{\theta} = 1 - F_{\chi_n^2}(t_{\theta}) \quad \text{where} \quad F_{\chi_n^2}(t_{\theta}) \equiv \int_0^{t_{\theta}} f_{\chi_n^2}(t'_{\theta}) dt'_{\theta}$$

To find boundary of confidence region set $p_{\theta} = \alpha$ and solve for t_{θ} :

$$t_{\theta} = F_{\chi_n^2}^{-1}(1 - \alpha) = -2 \ln \frac{L(\theta)}{L(\hat{\theta})}$$

Confidence region from Wilks' theorem (cont.)

i.e., boundary of confidence region in θ space is where

$$\ln L(\theta) = \ln L(\hat{\theta}) - \frac{1}{2} F_{\chi_n^2}^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$$

For example, for $1 - \alpha = 68.3\%$ and $n = 1$ parameter,

$$F_{\chi_1^2}^{-1}(0.683) = 1$$

and so the 68.3% confidence level interval is determined by

$$\ln L(\theta) = \ln L(\hat{\theta}) - \frac{1}{2}$$


Same as recipe for finding the estimator's standard deviation, i.e.,

$[\hat{\theta} - \sigma_{\hat{\theta}}, \hat{\theta} + \sigma_{\hat{\theta}}]$ is a 68.3% CL confidence interval.

Example of interval from $\ln L$

For $n = 1$ parameter, $CL = 0.683$, $Q_\alpha = 1$.

Exponential example, now with only 5 events:



Parameter estimate and approximate 68.3% CL confidence interval:

$$\hat{\tau} = 0.85^{+0.52}_{-0.30}$$

Multiparameter case

For increasing number of parameters, $CL = 1 - \alpha$ decreases for confidence region determined by a given

$$Q_\alpha = F_{\chi_n^2}^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$$

Q_α	$1 - \alpha$				
	$n = 1$	$n = 2$	$n = 3$	$n = 4$	$n = 5$
1.0	0.683	0.393	0.199	0.090	0.037
2.0	0.843	0.632	0.428	0.264	0.151
4.0	0.954	0.865	0.739	0.594	0.451
9.0	0.997	0.989	0.971	0.939	0.891

Multiparameter case (cont.)

Equivalently, Q_α increases with n for a given $CL = 1 - \alpha$.

$1 - \alpha$	\bar{Q}_α				
	$n = 1$	$n = 2$	$n = 3$	$n = 4$	$n = 5$
0.683	1.00	2.30	3.53	4.72	5.89
0.90	2.71	4.61	6.25	7.78	9.24
0.95	3.84	5.99	7.82	9.49	11.1
0.99	6.63	9.21	11.3	13.3	15.1

Extra slides

The Bayesian approach to limits

In Bayesian statistics need to start with ‘prior pdf’ $\pi(\theta)$, this reflects degree of belief about θ before doing the experiment.

Bayes’ theorem tells how our beliefs should be updated in light of the data x :

$$p(\theta|x) = \frac{L(x|\theta)\pi(\theta)}{\int L(x|\theta')\pi(\theta') d\theta'} \propto L(x|\theta)\pi(\theta)$$

Integrate posterior pdf $p(\theta | x)$ to give interval with any desired probability content.

For e.g. $n \sim \text{Poisson}(s+b)$, 95% CL upper limit on s from

$$0.95 = \int_{-\infty}^{s_{\text{sup}}} p(s|n) ds$$

Bayesian prior for Poisson parameter

Include knowledge that $s \geq 0$ by setting prior $\pi(s) = 0$ for $s < 0$.

Could try to reflect ‘prior ignorance’ with e.g.

$$\pi(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & s \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Not normalized but this is OK as long as $L(s)$ dies off for large s .

Not invariant under change of parameter — if we had used instead a flat prior for, say, the mass of the Higgs boson, this would imply a non-flat prior for the expected number of Higgs events.

Doesn't really reflect a reasonable degree of belief, but often used as a point of reference;

or viewed as a recipe for producing an interval whose frequentist properties can be studied (coverage will depend on true s).

Bayesian interval with flat prior for s

Solve to find limit s_{up} :

$$s_{\text{up}} = \frac{1}{2} F_{\chi^2}^{-1} [p, 2(n+1)] - b$$

where


$$p = 1 - \alpha \left(1 - F_{\chi^2} [2b, 2(n+1)] \right)$$

For special case $b = 0$, Bayesian upper limit with flat prior numerically same as one-sided frequentist case ('coincidence').

Bayesian interval with flat prior for s

For $b > 0$ Bayesian limit is everywhere greater than the (one sided) frequentist upper limit.

Never goes negative. Doesn't depend on b if $n = 0$.



p -values in cases with nuisance parameters

Suppose we have a statistic q_θ that we use to test a hypothesized value of a parameter θ , such that the p -value of θ is

$$p_\theta = \int_{q_{\theta, \text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(q_\theta | \theta, \nu) dq_\theta$$

But what values of ν to use for $f(q_\theta | \theta, \nu)$?

Fundamentally we want to reject θ only if $p_\theta < \alpha$ for all ν .

→ “exact” confidence interval

But in general for finite data samples this is not true; one may be unable to reject some θ values if all values of ν must be considered (resulting interval for θ “overcovers”).

Profile construction (“hybrid resampling”)

K. Cranmer, PHYSTAT-LHC Workshop on Statistical Issues for LHC Physics, 2008.
oai:cds.cern.ch:1021125, cdsweb.cern.ch/record/1099969.

Approximate procedure is to reject θ if $p_\theta \leq \alpha$ where the p -value is computed assuming the value of the nuisance parameter that best fits the data for the specified θ :

$$\hat{\hat{\nu}}(\theta)$$

“double hat” notation means profiled value, i.e., parameter that maximizes likelihood for the given θ .

The resulting confidence interval will have the correct coverage for the points $(\theta, \hat{\hat{\nu}}(\theta))$.

Elsewhere it may under- or overcover, but this is usually as good as we can do (check with MC if crucial or small sample problem).

Large sample distribution of the profile likelihood ratio (Wilks' theorem, cont.)

Suppose problem has likelihood $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, with

$\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N)$ ← parameters of interest

$\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_M)$ ← nuisance parameters

Want to test point in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ -space. Define **profile likelihood ratio**:

$$\lambda(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{L(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}})}, \quad \text{where } \hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \underset{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\operatorname{argmax}} L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$$

and define $q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = -2 \ln \lambda(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.  “profiled” values of $\boldsymbol{\nu}$

Wilks' theorem says that distribution $f(q_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ approaches the chi-square pdf for N degrees of freedom for large sample (and regularity conditions), **independent of the nuisance parameters $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.**

Prototype search analysis

Search for signal in a region of phase space; result is histogram of some variable x giving numbers:

$$\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_N)$$

Assume the n_i are Poisson distributed with expectation values

$$E[n_i] = \mu s_i + b_i$$

strength parameter

where

$$s_i = s_{\text{tot}} \int_{\text{bin } i} f_s(x; \boldsymbol{\theta}_s) dx, \quad b_i = b_{\text{tot}} \int_{\text{bin } i} f_b(x; \boldsymbol{\theta}_b) dx.$$

signal

background

Prototype analysis (II)

Often also have a subsidiary measurement that constrains some of the background and/or shape parameters:

$$\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_M)$$

Assume the m_i are Poisson distributed with expectation values

$$E[m_i] = u_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

↑ nuisance parameters ($\boldsymbol{\theta}_s, \boldsymbol{\theta}_b, b_{\text{tot}}$)

Likelihood function is

$$L(\mu, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{j=1}^N \frac{(\mu s_j + b_j)^{n_j}}{n_j!} e^{-(\mu s_j + b_j)} \prod_{k=1}^M \frac{u_k^{m_k}}{m_k!} e^{-u_k}$$

The profile likelihood ratio

Base significance test on the profile likelihood ratio:

$$\lambda(\mu) = \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}$$

maximizes L for specified μ

maximize L

Define critical region of test of μ by the region of data space that gives the lowest values of $\lambda(\mu)$.

Important advantage of profile LR is that its distribution becomes **independent of nuisance parameters** in large sample limit.

Test statistic for discovery

Suppose relevant alternative to background-only ($\mu = 0$) is $\mu \geq 0$.

So take critical region for test of $\mu = 0$ corresponding to high q_0 and $\hat{\mu} > 0$ (data characteristic for $\mu \geq 0$).

That is, to test background-only hypothesis define statistic

$$q_0 = \begin{cases} -2 \ln \lambda(0) & \hat{\mu} \geq 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\mu} < 0 \end{cases}$$

i.e. here only large (positive) observed signal strength is evidence against the background-only hypothesis.

Note that even though here physically $\mu \geq 0$, we allow $\hat{\mu}$ to be negative. In large sample limit its distribution becomes Gaussian, and this will allow us to write down simple expressions for distributions of our test statistics.

Distribution of q_0 in large-sample limit

Assuming approximations valid in the large sample (asymptotic) limit, we can write down the full distribution of q_0 as

$$f(q_0|\mu') = \left(1 - \Phi\left(\frac{\mu'}{\sigma}\right)\right) \delta(q_0) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_0}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{q_0} - \frac{\mu'}{\sigma}\right)^2\right]$$

The special case $\mu' = 0$ is a “half chi-square” distribution:

$$f(q_0|0) = \frac{1}{2} \delta(q_0) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_0}} e^{-q_0/2}$$


In large sample limit, $f(q_0|0)$ independent of nuisance parameters; $f(q_0|\mu')$ depends on nuisance parameters through σ .

p -value for discovery

Large q_0 means increasing incompatibility between the data and hypothesis, therefore p -value for an observed $q_{0,\text{obs}}$ is

$$p_0 = \int_{q_{0,\text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(q_0|0) dq_0$$

use e.g. asymptotic formula



From p -value get equivalent significance,

$$Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p)$$

Cumulative distribution of q_0 , significance

From the pdf, the cumulative distribution of q_0 is found to be

$$F(q_0|\mu') = \Phi\left(\sqrt{q_0} - \frac{\mu'}{\sigma}\right)$$

The special case $\mu' = 0$ is

$$F(q_0|0) = \Phi(\sqrt{q_0})$$

The p -value of the $\mu = 0$ hypothesis is

$$p_0 = 1 - F(q_0|0)$$

Therefore the discovery significance Z is simply

$$Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p_0) = \sqrt{q_0}$$

Monte Carlo test of asymptotic formula

$$n \sim \text{Poisson}(\mu s + b)$$


$$m \sim \text{Poisson}(\tau b)$$

μ = param. of interest

b = nuisance parameter

Here take s known, $\tau = 1$.


Asymptotic formula is
good approximation to 5σ
level ($q_0 = 25$) already for
 $b \sim 20$.



How to read the p_0 plot

The “local” p_0 means the p -value of the background-only hypothesis obtained from the test of $\mu = 0$ at each individual m_H , without any correct for the Look-Elsewhere Effect.

The “Expected” (dashed) curve gives the median p_0 under assumption of the SM Higgs ($\mu = 1$) at each m_H .



The blue band gives the width of the distribution ($\pm 1\sigma$) of significances under assumption of the SM Higgs.

Test statistic for upper limits

For purposes of setting an upper limit on μ use

$$q_\mu = \begin{cases} -2 \ln \lambda(\mu) & \hat{\mu} \leq \mu \\ 0 & \hat{\mu} > \mu \end{cases} \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda(\mu) = \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}$$

I.e. when setting an upper limit, an upwards fluctuation of the data is not taken to mean incompatibility with the hypothesized μ :

From observed q_μ find p -value:
$$p_\mu = \int_{q_{\mu, \text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(q_\mu | \mu) dq_\mu$$

Large sample approximation:

$$p_\mu = 1 - \Phi(\sqrt{q_\mu})$$

95% CL upper limit on μ is highest value for which p -value is not less than 0.05.

Monte Carlo test of asymptotic formulae


Consider again $n \sim \text{Poisson}(\mu s + b)$, $m \sim \text{Poisson}(\tau b)$
 Use q_μ to find p -value of hypothesized μ values.

E.g. $f(q_1|1)$ for p -value of $\mu = 1$.

Typically interested in 95% CL, i.e.,
 p -value threshold = 0.05, i.e.,
 $q_1 = 2.69$ or $Z_1 = \sqrt{q_1} = 1.64$.

Median[$q_1 | 0$] gives “exclusion sensitivity”.

Here asymptotic formulae good
 for $s = 6$, $b = 9$.




How to read the green and yellow limit plots

For every value of m_H , find the upper limit on μ .

Also for each m_H , determine the distribution of upper limits μ_{up} one would obtain under the hypothesis of $\mu = 0$.


The dashed curve is the median μ_{up} , and the green (yellow) bands give the $\pm 1\sigma$ (2σ) regions of this distribution.



Low sensitivity to μ


It can be that the effect of a given hypothesized μ is very small relative to the background-only ($\mu = 0$) prediction.

This means that the distributions $f(q_\mu|\mu)$ and $f(q_\mu|0)$ will be almost the same:



Having sufficient sensitivity

In contrast, having sensitivity to μ means that the distributions $f(q_\mu|\mu)$ and $f(q_\mu|0)$ are more separated:




That is, the power (probability to reject μ if $\mu = 0$) is substantially higher than α . Use this power as a measure of the sensitivity.

Spurious exclusion

Consider again the case of low sensitivity. By construction the probability to reject μ if μ is true is α (e.g., 5%).

And the probability to reject μ if $\mu = 0$ (the power) is only slightly greater than α .



This means that with probability of around $\alpha = 5\%$ (slightly higher), one excludes hypotheses to which one has essentially no sensitivity (e.g., $m_H = 1000$ TeV).

“Spurious exclusion”

Ways of addressing spurious exclusion

The problem of excluding parameter values to which one has no sensitivity known for a long time; see e.g.,

Virgil L. Highland, *Estimation of Upper Limits from Experimental Data*, July 1986, Revised February 1987, Temple University Report C00-3539-38.

In the 1990s this was re-examined for the LEP Higgs search by Alex Read and others


T. Junk, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sec. A 434, 435 (1999); A.L. Read, J. Phys. G 28, 2693 (2002).

and led to the “ CL_s ” procedure for upper limits.

Unified intervals also effectively reduce spurious exclusion by the particular choice of critical region.


The CL_s procedure

In the usual formulation of CL_s , one tests both the $\mu = 0$ (b) and $\mu > 0$ ($\mu s+b$) hypotheses with the same statistic $Q = -2\ln L_{s+b}/L_b$:



The CL_s procedure (2)

As before, “low sensitivity” means the distributions of Q under b and $s+b$ are very close:



The CL_s procedure (3)

The CL_s solution (A. Read et al.) is to base the test not on the usual p -value (CL_{s+b}), but rather to divide this by CL_b (\sim one minus the p -value of the b -only hypothesis), i.e.,


Define:

$$CL_s = \frac{CL_{s+b}}{CL_b} = \frac{p_{s+b}}{1 - p_b}$$

Reject $s+b$ hypothesis if:

$$CL_s \leq \alpha$$

$$1 - CL_b = p_b$$




Increases “effective” p -value when the two distributions become close (prevents exclusion if sensitivity is low).

Setting upper limits on $\mu = \sigma/\sigma_{\text{SM}}$

Carry out the CLs procedure for the parameter $\mu = \sigma/\sigma_{\text{SM}}$, resulting in an upper limit μ_{up} .

In, e.g., a Higgs search, this is done for each value of m_{H} .

At a given value of m_{H} , we have an observed value of μ_{up} , and we can also find the distribution $f(\mu_{\text{up}}|0)$:



$\pm 1\sigma$ (green) and $\pm 2\sigma$ (yellow) bands from toy MC;
Vertical lines from asymptotic formulae.