arXiv:2001.10310v2 [physics.data-an] 13 Apr 2020

BLUE: combining correlated estimates of physics observables within ROOT using the Best Linear Unbiased Estimate method

Richard Nisius

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik (Werner-Heisenberg-Institut), Föhringer Ring 6, D-80805 München, Germany

Abstract

This software performs the combination of m correlated estimates of n physics observables ($m \geq n$) using the Best Linear Unbiased Estimate (BLUE) method. It is implemented as a `C++` class, to be used within the ROOT analysis package. It features easy disabling of specific estimates or uncertainty sources, the investigation of different correlation assumptions, and allows performing combinations according to the importance of the estimates. This enables systematic investigations of the combination on details of the measurements from within the software, without touching the input.

Keywords: combination, correlation, estimate, uncertainty

Code metadata

Current code version	2.4.0
Permanent link to code/repository used for this code version	https://github.com/ElsevierSoftwareX/SOFTX_2020_16
Code Ocean compute capsule	https://blue.hepforge.org
Legal Code License	LGPL
Code versioning system used	none
Software code languages, tools, and services used	`C++`
Compilation requirements, operating environments & dependencies	depends on https://root.cern.ch
If available Link to developer documentation/manual	https://blue.hepforge.org
Support email for questions	Richard.Nisius@mpp.mpg.de

1. Motivation and significance


The combination of a number of correlated estimates for a single observable is discussed in Ref. [1]. Here, the term estimate denotes a particular outcome (measurement) of an experiment based on an experimental estimator (an algorithm for a measurement) of the observable, which follows a probability density function (PDF). The particular estimate obtained by the experiment may be a likely or unlikely outcome for that PDF. Repeating the measurement numerous times under identical conditions, the estimates will follow the underlying PDF of the estimator.

The metadata for the BLUE software are listed in the Code metadata table. The software uses the Gaussian approximation for the uncertainties and performs a χ^2 minimization to obtain the combined value. In Ref. [1], this minimization is expressed using the mathematically equivalent BLUE ansatz. Provided the estimators are unbiased, when applying this formalism the **Best Linear Unbiased Estimate** of the observable is obtained with the following meaning: **Best:** the combined result for the observable obtained this way has the smallest variance; **Linear:** the result is constructed as a linear combination of the individual estimates; **Unbiased Estimate:** when the procedure is repeated for a large number of cases consistent with the underlying multi-dimensional PDF, the mean of all combined results equals the true value of the observable. The formulas for more than one observable [2] are implemented in the BLUE software, which is programmed as a separate class of the ROOT analysis framework [3].

The easiest case of two correlated estimates of the same observable is briefly illustrated here. Already for this case, the main features of the combination can easily be understood. For further information and the derivation of the formulas the reader is refereed to Ref. [4]. Let x_1 and x_2 with variances σ_1^2 and σ_2^2 be two estimates from two unbiased estimators X_1 and X_2 of the true value x_T of the observable and ρ the total correlation of the two estimators. Without loss of generality it is assumed that the estimate x_1 stems from an estimator X_1 of x_T that is at least as precise as the estimator X_2 yielding the estimate x_2, such that $z \equiv \sigma_2/\sigma_1 \geq 1$. In this situation the BLUE x of x_T is:

$$x \;=\; (1-\beta)\, x_1 + \beta\, x_2$$

where β is the weight of the less precise estimate and the sum of weights is unity by construction. The variable x is the combined result and σ_x^2 is its variance, i.e. the uncertainty assigned to the combined value is σ_x. For a number of z values the two quantities β and σ_x/σ_1 as functions of ρ are



(a) β as a function of ρ (b) σ_x/σ_1 as a function of ρ

Figure 1: The variables β (a) and σ_x/σ_1 (b) shown as functions of ρ for a number of z values.

shown in Fig. 1. Their functional forms are also written in the figures. The functions are valid for $-1 \leq \rho \leq 1$ and $z \geq 1$, except for $\rho = z = 1$.

Fig. 1 displays the strong dependence of the uncertainty in the combined value on z and ρ. For the special situation of $\rho = 1/z$ the uncertainty σ_x equals σ_1, i.e. the precision in the observable is not improved by adding the second measurement. For $\rho = \pm 1$ the uncertainty in the combined result vanishes, i.e. $\sigma_x = 0$, a mere consequence of the conditional probability for X_2 given the measured value of x_1, see Ref. [4] for details. It is worth noticing that in most regions of the (ρ, z)-plane the sensitivity of σ_x/σ_1 to ρ is stronger than to z. This means, reducing the correlation of the estimates in most cases gives a larger improvement in precision in the combined value than reducing z.

2. Software description

To use the BLUE combination software, a working installation of the ROOT package [3] is needed. The software allows repeated combinations interleaved with an arbitrary number of changes to various aspects of the input, achieved using `Set...()` functions. In addition, it gives access to many intermediate quantities used in the combination via `Get...()` and `Print...()` functions. Only at well-defined steps of the computation, will the returned quantities be meaningful. To enable the above flexibility, the BLUE object has several states like `IsFilledInp`, `IsFixed` or `IsSolved` that can be false or true. The various functions are only enabled, if the object has the appropriate state.




Figure 2: Flowchart of the BLUE software. The gray boxes display the steps to be performed for a single combination with unchanged inputs. The white boxes display the optional steps for further combinations with changed inputs and/or different solving methods. In each rectangular box, the first line indicates the performed action, while the following line(s) list the functions to use.

The mandatory inputs to the software are the measured values, their uncertainties for the various statistical and systematic effects relevant to the measurements, and the estimator correlations for each of those uncertainties. Those are inserted into the BLUE object by means of the filling functions `FillEst()` and `FillCor()`. The end of filling the mandatory inputs is automatically recognized by the software. At this point, the initial input is saved, auxiliary information is calculated, `IsFilledInp` is set to true and all filling functions are disabled. Consequently, the optional additional input like names, print formats and a logo, all have to be filled before the end of filling the mandatory input is reached.

The most important object states can be controlled by function calls. For example, a call to `FixInp()` initiates the calculation of various quantities and sets `IsFixed` to true, thereby enabling the use of a number of `Get...()` and `Print...()` functions. A subsequent call to any of the solving methods `Solve...()` performs the desired combination, and finally sets `IsSolved` to true. In this scheme, solving is only possible after a call to `FixInp()`, and changing the inputs only after a call to `ReleaseInp()` or `ResetInp()`. Internally, the combination is always performed on a temporary copy of the initial input, which can be successively altered using the sequence of calling `ReleaseInp()`, `Set...()` and `FixInp()`. Since the initial input was saved as described above, a call to `ResetInp()` allows to return to this situation.

2.1. Combination workflow

The flowchart of the software is shown in Fig. 2. After calling the constructor of the class (`Create` :), thereby defining the number of estimates, uncertainties and observables, the measurements together with their uncertainties and correlations are passed to the software (`Fill` :). If wanted, the inputs can be adapted (`Change` :). Combinations are performed following the loop of fixing (`Fix` :), combining (`Combine` :) and evaluating the result (`Digest` :). Before changing the inputs for the next combination, they have to be freed (`Free` :). For this step, two options are available, ReleaseInp() means the change proceeds from the status at the last fix, while `ResetInp()` reverts to the original inputs. If no further combinations are wanted, the object is deleted (`Delete` :).

2.2. Software Functionalities

One main quality of this software is the built-in flexibility for easy and thorough investigations of the impact of details of the input measurements and their correlation. With single function calls estimates or uncertainty sources can be removed from the combination, different uncertainty models (e.g. absolute or relative uncertainties) and correlation assumptions can


	Estimates			Correlations			Result
	M_0 [GeV]	M_1 [GeV]	M_2 [GeV]	ρ_{01}	ρ_{02}	ρ_{12}	M [GeV]
Value	174.86	172.63	173.25				173.92
Stat	0.35	0.54	0.24				0.20
Syst_1	0.26 ± 0.06	0.66 ± 0.04	0.43 ± 0.06	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	0.36
Syst_2	0.09 ± 0.05	0.64 ± 0.06	0.23 ± 0.08	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	0.17
Syst_3	0.12 ± 0.14	0.47 ± 0.09	0.23 ± 0.11	−1.00	−1.00	−1.00	0.09
Syst_4	0.18 ± 0.08	0.24 ± 0.05	0.10 ± 0.08	−1.00	−1.00	−1.00	0.02
Syst_5	0.48 ± 0.09	0.53 ± 0.08	0.12 ± 0.05	+0.50	+0.60	−0.30	0.25
Syst	0.59 ± 0.09	1.19 ± 0.06	0.56 ± 0.07				0.48
Total	0.69 ± 0.09	1.30 ± 0.06	0.61 ± 0.07	+0.29	+0.29	+0.35	0.52
χ^2				3.00	4.28	0.25	
Weight	0.42	-0.00	0.59				
Pull	2.07	-1.08	-2.07				

Table 1: Combination of one observable M from three correlated estimates M_0, M_1 and M_2 using the BLUE software. Counting from the left, columns 2-4 show the individual results, their uncertainties and the statistical precision in the systematic uncertainties. Columns 5-7 report the estimator correlations ρ_{ijk} for the pair of estimates (i, j) for all sources k of uncertainty. The line denoted by Total lists the total uncertainties σ_i and correlations ρ_{ij}. The rightmost column shows the combined result. The lower part of the table reports the estimator consistencies expressed as pairwise χ^2 values, the weights of the estimates within the combination and the pulls of the estimates. Details on the calculation of χ^2, the weights and pulls are given in Ref. [4].

be investigated. Another strength is the large number of different solving methods implemented, ranging from only using measurements with positive weights in the combination to a successive combination method in which the input measurements are included one at a time according to their importance, allowing an in-depth investigation of their impact on the combination.

3. Illustrative Example

A compact example of three estimates of a single observable is listed in Table 1. The code reproducing the content of this table and all following figures is given in Appendix A. It contains detailed documentation relating the various function calls to the steps described in Fig. 2, and the obtained results to Table 1 and the respective figures. After installing the package, the only two commands to be executed from the shell prompt are:



(a) M_0 vs. M_1 (b) M_0 vs. M_2


Figure 3: The sources of systematic uncertainties with estimator correlations of $\rho_{ijk} = +1$ (full red points) or $\rho_{ijk} = -1$ (open blue points). The points indicate the size of the uncertainties and the bars their statistical precision. In each of the figures, from right to left the points correspond to the sources Syst_1 to Syst_4 from Table 1.

```
root -b < B_SoftExample.inp > B_SoftExample.out
pdflatex  B_SoftExample.tex
```

Although for this example the values chosen are similar to what is obtained in measurements of the top quark mass, this example is purely artificial. The estimate M_0 deliberately was chosen such as to have large χ^2 values in the compatibility evaluations with the other two estimates. Since the three measurements should come from the same underlying x_T, this indicates either an unlikely outcome or a potential systematic problem with this result. Only after a careful investigation of this measurement, resulting in a low probability for the second possibility, should this measurement be included in the combination. The systematic uncertainties are shown together with the statistical precisions at which they are known. Those statistical precisions allow evaluating whether two estimators have a significantly different sensitivity for a source of uncertainty[1]. In addition, they indicate which systematic effect should be evaluated with higher statistical precision.

The sources of systematic uncertainties for which the estimator correlations are $\rho_{ijk} = \pm 1$ are shown in Fig. 3. The case $\rho_{ijk} = +1$ corresponds to the situation where simultaneously applying a systematic effect to both estimates (e.g. increasing a component l of the jet energy scale uncertainty by

[1]Two quantities $(x_1 \pm \sigma_1,\, x_2 \pm \sigma_2)$ are significantly different, if their difference $(\Delta = x_1 - x_2)$ with $\sigma_\Delta^2 = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 - 2\,\rho_{12}\sigma_1\sigma_2$ is significantly different from zero. In this case, the x_i correspond to the systematic uncertainties and the σ_i to their statistical precisions.




(a) Combined value (b) Uncertainty in the combined value

Figure 4: Results of the combination of the estimates M_0 and M_2 as functions of ρ, where the blue point corresponds to the actual correlation $\rho(M_0, M_2)$. The combined value is shown in (a), the uncertainty in the combined value in (b).

$+1\sigma_{\mathrm{JES,l}}$ as e.g. performed in Ref. [5]) leads to both measured values moving into the same direction, either both get larger or both get smaller than the original result. The case $\rho_{ijk} = -1$ means the two measurements move in opposite directions. See Ref. [5] for further details. The points for which the bars cross one of the coordinate axis indicate sources for which, within uncertainties, the correlation may be $\rho_{ijk} = +1$ or $\rho_{ijk} = -1$. For example, this is the case for Syst_3 of M_0 from Table 1, i.e. for the upper point in the left quadrant in both subfigures of Fig. 3. This will be exploited in the stability evaluation discussed below.

Without combining, the precision of the knowledge about the observable is defined by the most precise result, here M_2. The impact that an additional estimate has can be digested by performing pairwise combinations with the most precise result. An example of such a pairwise combination of M_0 and M_2 is shown in Fig. 4. Apart from the range $\rho > 0.8$, the combined value is almost independent of ρ. In contrast, the uncertainty in the combined value has a very strong dependence on ρ.

The combination of all estimates is shown in Fig. 5(a). The input measurements are listed in the first three lines, the combined result is listed in red in the last line. Fig. 5(b) reveals that not all results significantly contribute to the combined value. In this figure, the lines show the results of successive combinations, always adding the estimate listed, to the previous list of estimates. Also here, the suggested combined result is shown in red. At the quoted precision, the estimate M_1 does not improve the already accumulated result obtained from combining M_2 and M_0. This means M_1 merely serves



(a) Full combination

(b) Successive combination

Figure 5: The three estimates and the combined value of all estimates are shown in (a). In contrast, (b) shows the combined results obtained in successive combinations adding one estimate at a time, i.e. the second line is the result of combining M_2 and M_0, the third line the result of the combination of all three measurements.


as a cross-check measurement for the combination.

Fig. 6 shows the stability of the combination of all three results, taking into account the statistical precisions at which the systematic uncertainties are known, see Table 1. For this figure, all systematic uncertainties are altered within their statistical precisions. For sources with $\rho_{ijk} = \pm 1$ also the correlations are re-evaluated, i.e. they may change sign, see Fig. 3. The varied input measurements are combined. The resulting combined values and uncertainties in the combined values are shown in the histograms. For the statistical precision at which the uncertainties are known, the combined result is uncertain by 0.15 GeV and the related uncertainty by 0.04 GeV. These uncertainties exist on top of what is quoted in Table 1. Frequently those are not provided, or even not evaluated. This is only justified if they are much smaller than the quoted uncertainties. For the statistical uncertainty in the combined result of 0.20 GeV, see Table 1, the situation is at the border of being acceptable.

4. Impact

The software can be used for an in-depth analysis of the impact of various assumptions made in the combination. In case the relevant input is provided, it also allows assessing the stability of the combination.

Because of the large reduction in the uncertainty in the combined result obtained by lowering the estimator correlations, see Fig. 4, it is advisable to use this software already in the design stage of the various analyses performed



(a) Combined value (b) Uncertainty in combined value

Figure 6: The stability of the combined value (a) and the uncertainty in the combined value (b), obtained in 500 combinations, while varying the input uncertainties and correlations according to their statistical precision.

for obtaining the same observable within a single experiment. Usually, the uncertainties in the various systematic effects (e.g. the uncertainty in jet energy scales for experiments at hadron collider) are determined by the actual level of understanding of the detector and have to be taken into account at face value. In contrast, the sensitivity of the estimators to those effects can be influenced by the estimator design. This way their correlation can be reduced, thereby improving the gain obtained in the combination. Generally speaking, the strategy should not be to take over an aspect of the analysis that has worked for one estimator to another estimator. Instead, alternative approaches should be pursuit, such as to potentially lower the estimator correlations, even at the expense of a larger uncertainty. This is because achieving an anti-correlated pair of estimates with the same sensitivity to a specific source of uncertainty, renders this a significantly smaller uncertainty in the combined result. This can be seen for the sources Syst_3 and Syst_4, for which $\rho_{ij3} = \rho_{ij4} = -1$. Those sources exhibit the largest fractional gain in uncertainty when comparing M with M_0, e.g. $\sigma_{x4}/\sigma_{24} = 0.02/0.10 = 1/5$. An example of such an optimization is explained in Ref. [5]. This software can be of significant help in this process.

According to the knowledge of the author, by now the BLUE software was used in a number of combinations, mostly in the context of high energy physics, especially at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). Examples from the ALICE, ATLAS, CMS and LHCb collaborations are detailed in Refs. [6, 7,

8, 9]. The first world combination of the top quark mass [10] has also been performed with this software. In addition to the LHC collaborations, the software has been used by the PHENIX [11] and STAR [12] collaborations, and in a combination of the strong coupling constant α_s from many results in Ref. [13]. Further examples of the software usage are described in the manual listed in the Code metadata table. To assist the users in developing their own combination code, the corresponding `C++` routines to reproduce those published results are included in the software package. Although the above examples are all particle physics applications, the use of this software is not confined to a specific area of research. Any set of correlated measurements of one or more observables can be combined.

5. Conclusions

The software performs the combination of m correlated estimates of n physics observables ($m \geq n$) using the Best Linear Unbiased Estimate (BLUE) method. The large flexibility, together with the several implemented correlation models and combination methods makes it a useful tool to assess details on the combination in question. Exploring the combination of various estimators of the same observable within a single experiment allows a design of estimators with low correlation. This enhances the gain achieved in combinations of estimates obtained from those estimators.

Declaration of competing interest

The author declares that he has no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Appendix A. Example code

Listing 1: B_SoftExample.inp

```
// Load Blue library
gSystem->Load("libBlue.so");

// Compile and execute code. This will produce
// the below '.cxx' files and a '.tex' file
.L B_SoftExample.cxx++
   B_SoftExample()

// Figure 3a
.L B_SoftExample_x0_x1_CorPai.cxx++
   B_SoftExample_x0_x1_CorPai()

// Figure 3b
.L B_SoftExample_x0_x2_CorPai.cxx++
   B_SoftExample_x0_x2_CorPai()

// Figure 4a,b
.L B_SoftExample_x0_x2_DisPai.cxx++
   B_SoftExample_x0_x2_DisPai()

// Figure 5a
.L B_SoftExample_DisRes_Obs_0.cxx++
   B_SoftExample_DisRes_Obs_0()

// Figure 5b
.L B_SoftExample_AccImp_Obs_0.cxx++
   B_SoftExample_AccImp_Obs_0()
.q
```

Listing 2: B_SoftExample.cxx

```
#include "Blue.h"

void B_SoftExample(){

  //-- Start preparing the inputs for later use in BLUE
  // Numbers of estimates, uncertainties and observables
  static const Int_t NumEst = 3;
  static const Int_t NumUnc = 6;
  static const Int_t NumObs = 1;

  // Array of names of estimates (i,j = 0, 1, 2)
  static const TString NamEst[NumEst] = {"M_{0}", "M_{1}", "M_{2}"};

  // Array of names of uncertainties (k = 0, ..., 5)
  static const TString NamUnc[NumUnc] = {
    "Stat", "Syst_{1}", "Syst_{2}", "Syst_{3}", "Syst_{4}", "Syst_{5}"};

  // Array of names of observables (n = 0)
  static const TString NamObs[NumObs] = {"M"};

  // Array of estimates and uncertainties, copy to matrix
  static const Int_t LenXEst = NumEst * (NumUnc+1);
  static const Double_t XEst[LenXEst] = {
    //      Stat  Sys1  Sys2  Sys3  Sys4  Sys5
    174.86, 0.35, 0.26, 0.09, 0.12, 0.18, 0.48,
    172.63, 0.54, 0.66, 0.64, 0.47, 0.24, 0.53,
    173.25, 0.24, 0.43, 0.23, 0.23, 0.10, 0.12};
  TMatrixD* InpEst = new TMatrixD(NumEst, NumUnc+1, &XEst[0]);

  // Array of statistical precision in systematic uncertainties, copy to matrix
  static const Int_t LenSUnc = NumEst * NumUnc;
  static const Double_t SUnc[LenSUnc] = {
    //Stat  Sys1  Sys2  Sys3  Sys4  Sys5
    0.00,   0.06, 0.05, 0.14, 0.08, 0.09,
    0.00,   0.04, 0.05, 0.09, 0.05, 0.08,
    0.00,   0.06, 0.08, 0.11, 0.08, 0.05};
  TMatrixD* InpSta = new TMatrixD(NumEst, NumUnc, &SUnc[0]);

  // Array of rho_ijk == const correlations for k < 5
  static const Double_t RhoVal[NumUnc-1] = {
    0.0, 1.0, 1.0, -1.0, -1.0};

  // Array for correlation matrix for k == 5 with rho_ij5 != const
  static const Int_t LenInd = NumEst * (NumEst-1) / 2;
  static const Double_t RhoInd[LenInd] = {0.5, 0.6, -0.3};

  // Formats and file name for figures and Latex file
  static const TString ForVal = "%5.2f";
```

```
49  static const TString ForUnc = "%4.2f";
50  static const TString ForWei = ForUnc;
51  static const TString ForRho = "%+4.2f";
52  static const TString ForPul = ForUnc;
53  static const TString ForChi = ForUnc;
54  static const TString ForUni = "GeV";
55  static const TString FilBas = "B_SoftExample";
56
57  // Axis ranges for Figs.3ab and Fig.6ab
58  static const Double_t XvaMax = 0.34, YvaMin = -0.05, YvaMax = 0.72;
59  static const Double_t ValMin = 173.2, ValMax = 174.6;
60  static const Double_t UncMin =  0.34, UncMax =  0.76;
61  //-- End of preparation of inputs for BLUE
62
63  //-- Start using BLUE --- no inputs below this line ---
64  //-- Keywords: relate to the flowchart of the software
65  // Create: call constructor of BLUE object
66  Blue *myBlue = new Blue(NumEst, NumUnc);
67
68  // Fill: set display formats and define names
69  myBlue->SetFormat(ForVal, ForUnc, ForWei, ForRho, ForPul, ForChi, ForUni);
70  myBlue->FillNamEst(&NamEst[0]);
71  myBlue->FillNamUnc(&NamUnc[0]);
72  myBlue->FillNamObs(&NamObs[0]);
73
74  // Fill: insert estimates with their uncertainties
75  myBlue->FillEst(InpEst);
76
77  // Fill: insert statistical precision in systematic uncertainties
78  myBlue->FillSta(InpSta);
79
80  // Fill: insert the estimator correlations for all sources of uncertainty
81  for(Int_t k = 0; k<NumUnc; k++){
82    if(k != 5){myBlue->FillCor(k, RhoVal[k]);
83    }else{myBlue->FillCor(-k, &RhoInd[0]);}
84  }
85
86  // Change:
87  // ... alterations would go here
88
89  // Fix:
90  myBlue->FixInp();
91
92  // Combine:
93  myBlue->Solve();
94
95  // Digest: show some estimate quantities, prepare code for Figs. 3 and 4
96  myBlue->PrintEst();
97  myBlue->CorrelPair(0, 1, FilBas, -XvaMax, XvaMax, YvaMin, YvaMax);
```

```
98    myBlue->CorrelPair(0, 2, FilBas, -XvaMax, XvaMax, YvaMin, YvaMax);
99    myBlue->DisplayPair(0, 2, FilBas);
100
101   // Digest: show some observable quantities, prepare code for Fig. 5a
102   myBlue->PrintChiPro();
103   myBlue->DisplayResult(0, FilBas);
104
105   // Digest: write Latex file
106   myBlue->LatexResult(FilBas);
107
108   // Free:, Fix:, Combine: solve according to importance
109   myBlue->ReleaseInp();
110   myBlue->FixInp();
111   myBlue->SolveAccImp(0.1);
112
113   // Digest: prepare code for Fig. 5b
114   myBlue->DisplayAccImp(0, FilBas);
115
116   // Free:, Fix:, Combine: solve varying the systematic uncertainties
117   myBlue->ReleaseInp();
118   myBlue->FixInp();
119   myBlue->SolveScaSta();
120
121   // Digest: produce Fig. 6
122   myBlue->PrintScaSta(FilBas, ValMin, ValMax, UncMin, UncMax);
123
124   // Delete: delete object as well as local matrices and return
125   delete myBlue; myBlue = NULL;
126   InpEst->Delete(); InpEst = NULL;
127   InpSta->Delete(); InpSta = NULL;
128   return;
129 };
```

References

[1] L. Lyons, D. Gibaut and P. Clifford, How to combine correlated estimates of a single physical quantity, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A 270 (1988) 110. doi:10.1016/0168-9002(88)90018-6.

[2] A. Valassi, Combining correlated measurements of several different quantities, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A 500 (2003) 391. doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)00329-2.

[3] R. Brun and F. Rademakers, ROOT - An Object Oriented Data Analysis Framework, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A 389 (1997) 81, Proceedings of AIHENP'96 Workshop, Lausanne, Sep. 1996. doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(97)00048-X.

[4] R. Nisius, On the combination of correlated estimates of a physics observable, Eur. Phys. J. C 74 (2014) 3004. arXiv:1402.4016, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3004-2.

[5] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of the top quark mass in the $t\bar{t} \to$ lepton+jets and $t\bar{t} \to$ dilepton channels using $\sqrt{s} = 7\,\text{TeV}$ ATLAS data, Eur. Phys. J. C 75 (2015) 330. arXiv:1503.05427, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3544-0.

[6] ALICE Collaboration, Neutral pion and η meson production in p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02\,\text{TeV}$, Eur. Phys. J. C 78 (2018) 624. arXiv:1801.07051, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-6013-8.

[7] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of the top quark mass in the $t\bar{t} \to$ lepton+jets channel from $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$ ATLAS data and combination with previous results, Eur. Phys. J. C 79 (2019) 290. arXiv:1810.01772, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6757-9.

[8] CMS Collaboration, Measurements of the $pp \to W\gamma\gamma$ and $pp \to Z\gamma\gamma$ cross sections and limits on anomalous quartic gauge couplings at $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$, JHEP 10 (2017) 072. arXiv:1704.00366, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2017)072.

[9] LHCb Collaboration, Measurement of the branching fractions of the decays $D^+ \to K^-K^+K^+$, $D^+ \to \pi^-\pi^+K^+$ and $D_s^+ \to \pi^-K^+K^+$, JHEP 03 (2019) 176. arXiv:1810.03138, doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2019)176.

[10] ATLAS, CDF, CMS and DO Collaborations, First combination of Tevatron and LHC measurements of the top-quark mass (2014). arXiv:1403.4427.

[11] PHENIX Collaboration, Measurement of Φ-meson production at forward rapidity in $\text{p}+\text{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 510\,\text{GeV}$ and its energy dependence from $\sqrt{s} = 200\,\text{GeV}$ to 7 TeV, Phys. Rev. D 98 (2018) 092006. arXiv:1710.01656, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.092006.

[12] STAR Collaboration, Υ production in $\text{U}+\text{U}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 193\,\text{GeV}$ measured with the STAR experiment, Phys. Rev. C 94 (2016) 064904. arXiv:1608.06487, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.94.064904.

[13] D. d'Enterria and A. Poldaru, Strong coupling $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ extraction from a combined NNLO analysis of inclusive electroweak boson cross sections at hadron colliders, submitted to JHEP, arXiv:1912.11733.