

# Motivation for Two Detectors at a Particle Physics Collider

Paul D. Grannis\* and Hugh E. Montgomery†  
(Dated: March 27, 2023)

It is generally accepted that it is preferable to build two general purpose detectors at any given collider facility. We reinforce this point by discussing a number of aspects and particular instances in which this has been important. The examples are taken mainly, but not exclusively, from experience at the Tevatron collider.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Electron Ion Collider (EIC) [1] is a new facility being constructed at Brookhaven National Laboratory in collaboration with Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Laboratory and their domestic and international partners. In early 2022, the experimental program was discussed by a distinguished “blue Ribbon” panel of physicists. The committee was asked to adjudicate on the choice of a first detector based on the submission of different designs by three collaborations. While choosing one of the three, the committee also commented on the potential for improvement based on a substantial merging of the ideas, thus setting the path towards a strong single detector. The committee was also asked to consider the need for a second detector. It based its rather positive comments on the desire for complementarity between detector designs, the desire for the ability to confirm discoveries or results more generally, and eventually the potential to combine the results from the two experiments. The desirability of all these outcomes is based on reducing the risk associated with specific designs, allowing for different focus on physics questions, and providing a potential complementarity of the systematic and statistical uncertainties.

The funding perceived to be available for the construction of the accelerator and detectors is limited and thought to accommodate, with difficulty, a single intersection region and detector. Approval of a second detector has been deferred with the idea that the delay would facilitate the funding and the development of desired complementary technologies.

There is a strong counter argument that it is highly desirable that the two detectors, even if starting at different times, are operating concurrently for a substantial part of the lifetime of the collider.

Subsequent to the establishment of the first detector collaboration, Laboratory management, in conjunction with the EIC Users Group created a “2nd Detector Working Group” [2]. At a workshop [3] to kick-off the activities associated with the second detector, one of us (HEM) was invited to consolidate or amplify the case for the second detector based on recollections and specific experiences of similar situations in the past. This paper closely follows the discussion presented at that workshop but also contains some examples not included at that time. The two authors were members of the DØ collaboration which built and operated the “second” general purpose experiment at the Fermilab Tevatron.

In Section II, we briefly tabulate the evolution of collider facilities and detectors since 1980. In Section III, we provide a detailed discussion of examples from the two experiments, CDF and DØ, at the Tevatron. These cover instances where there were initial disagreements followed by confirmation, corrections of one experiment by the other, and eventual exploitation of the combined results of both to achieve enhanced sensitivity. In Section IV, we strengthen the interest in technological diversity and complementarity by looking at the two general purpose LHC experiments, ATLAS, and CMS. Some concluding remarks are given in Section V.

## II. THE HISTORICAL NORM

For most of the “fixed target” era of particle physics, and for collider facilities through the 1970’s, any particular experiment did not constitute a significant addition to the accelerator investment, so individual experiments competed and cross checked each other. For collider facilities after about 1980, the individual experiments became more costly. Nevertheless, the desire for competition and verification motivated two or more general purpose experiments at

---

\* Stony Brook University

† Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility

each facility. With variations to accommodate examples where two similar colliders were involved, the following is historically how the situation developed.

- Sp $\bar{p}$ S experiments: UA1, UA2
- $e^+e^-$  experiments: SLC (Mark II, SLD), LEP (ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, OPAL)
- Tevatron experiments: CDF, D $\bar{O}$
- SSC experiments: GEM, SDC
- HERA experiments: H1, ZEUS
- RHIC experiments: PHENIX, STAR
- B-Factory experiments: BaBar (at PEP-II), BELLE (at KEKB)
- LHC experiments: ATLAS, CMS

There are exceptions. BELLE II at Super-KEKB has no analogous direct competitor as had been provided by BaBar for BELLE. LHCb, the specialized  $B$ -physics detector at the LHC, has no direct competitor with comparable scope but there are partial overlaps in physics capabilities with ATLAS and CMS on the one hand and with BELLE II on the other.

### III. THE TEVATRON: CDF AND D $\bar{O}$

#### A. Run 1, through 1996

Both the Sp $\bar{p}$ S [4] and the Tevatron [5] were derived from pre-existing infrastructure. Colliding protons with anti-protons obviated the need for a second collider ring, and stochastic cooling enabled the creation of beams of antiprotons of meaningful intensity. Starting with the ISR, the Tevatron was the third hadron collider and benefited, as did UA1 and UA2 at the Sp $\bar{p}$ S collider, from lessons learned at the ISR, and from the electron-positron colliders, PETRA and PEP. In particular, the need for detectors with nearly  $4\pi$  coverage, so as to enable a measurement of the missing transverse momentum carried by non-interacting particles, was generally accepted.

CDF [6], the first Tevatron detector, was initiated by Fermilab in 1978 and was designed in 1980 – 1981. It detected a handful of collisions in 1985 and took its initial data between 1987 and 1989. Upgrades on a modest scale started even before the 1992 – 1996 Run 1, particularly a novel silicon vertex detector. A major upgrade took place in 1997 – 2001 before operation in Run 2.

D $\bar{O}$  [7] was the second general purpose detector at the Tevatron. Several precursor proposals were rejected before the FNAL Director invited one of us (PDG) to pull together a collaboration to design an experiment already given preliminary approval. The D $\bar{O}$  detector was conceived during the period 1983 – 1984, saw first collisions in 1992, and underwent a major upgrade in 1996 – 2001. Now in phase with CDF, D $\bar{O}$  was active through Run 2 until the Tevatron ceased operations in 2011.

The initial CDF detector (Fig. 1) was dominated by a large central superconducting solenoid containing a central tracker consisting initially of wire chambers that were soon supplemented by a vertex silicon detector. The barrel calorimeter, consisting of lead and iron/scintillator wedges, extended to  $|\eta|=1$ . Muon detection was accomplished by a number of separate systems. The silicon detector, installed before the 1992 running, consisted of three silicon barrel layers.

In contrast, the initial D $\bar{O}$  detector (Fig. 2) had no central magnetic field but employed a coherent liquid argon/uranium calorimeter in both barrel and end cap regions. The muon detection system also was moderately coherent and extended to very high  $\eta$ .

Both detectors endured the presence of the original Fermilab Main Ring, which was used to accelerate protons before injection in the Tevatron, and also to produce the anti-protons. In each intersection region an “overpass” was introduced into the Main Ring. In the case of CDF, it passed over the detector and was the source of background in the upper muon detectors. In the D $\bar{O}$  case it passed through the uranium/liquid argon calorimeter and necessitated stopping data collection while the Main Ring beam was present.

Neither CDF nor D $\bar{O}$  had been initially designed with discovery of the top quark in mind. However, by 1992, with operation of the UA1 and UA2 detectors at the Sp $\bar{p}$ S concluded, the search for the top quark became a primary goal. In early 1994, D $\bar{O}$  published the last lower mass limit of 131 GeV. In March, CDF announced evidence, limited by statistical precision, of a top quark with mass around 175 GeV. A year later both CDF [8] and D $\bar{O}$  [9] published




FIG. 1. The CDF detector layout, circa 1992.




FIG. 2. The D0 detector, circa 1992.

their observations of the top quark, its mass and its production cross-section. The two experiments were not in very significant disagreement, although the masses quoted differed by nearly 25 GeV and the cross-sections by a factor of two. In the first case,  $D\bar{O}$  was higher than the eventually accepted value and in the latter, CDF was too high. One might note that it is a general characteristic of first observations that they benefit from upward statistical fluctuations. Ultimately, the combination of measurements from each experiment with a wide variety of decay modes resulted in a determination of the top quark mass with an uncertainty of less than 1 GeV, or about 0.6%.

Following the clear observation of jets, first in electron positron collisions, then in hadron-hadron collisions, the single jet production cross-section was a determinative test of the ability of QCD to describe the interactions. Deviations at high transverse momentum were anticipated in the case that the interacting partons had internal structure. Thus, the observation of a rise of the jet cross-section by CDF [10] generated some excitement, which was muted by the contradiction and clarification of the situation by DØ [11] with higher statistical accuracy. This is illustrated in Fig. 3.




FIG. 3. Deviations of the jet production cross-sections from CDF and DØ relative to QCD prediction [11].

At the HERA Collider, both the H1 and ZEUS experiments observed excesses of events at the limits of their kinematic reach [12, 13]. Theoretical interpretations suggested the production of leptoquarks as a potential source. However, the Tevatron experiments had sensitivity to both first and second generation leptoquarks and quickly generated publications setting lower mass limits in excess of 200 GeV. They set an important precedent by combining their data to set a lower mass limit of 242 GeV [14] on first generation leptoquarks.

### B. Run 2, 1997 – 2011

The Tevatron Collider underwent substantial upgrades [15] starting in 1997 that replaced the Main Ring with the Main Injector as the pre-accelerator to the Tevatron. This was built in a separate tunnel, which removed the Main Ring accelerator from its complicating presence in the Tevatron infrastructure. The Main Injector tunnel was also used to house the antiproton Recycler ring, which enhanced the antiproton beam intensity beyond that from the Antiproton Accumulator. An increase in the number of bunches and hence the collision frequency was a corollary.

The two experiments underwent quite radical changes, several of which were enabled by improvements in detector technology. DØ [16] recognized the potential of introducing a solenoidal magnetic field and accompanied it with an innovative scintillating fiber tracker enclosing a silicon-strip tracker including both barrel and disk configurations. In addition, it enhanced its muon detection system and upgraded the LAr calorimeter electronics to accommodate the increased collision frequency. CDF [17] also completely replaced its tracking system with a new wire chamber enclosing a new multi-layer silicon tracker and vertex detection system. Improvements to the end cap calorimetry were introduced and the muon system coverage was improved. Both experiments made improvements to their multi-level trigger systems. One can note that the upgrades to each of the experiments were motivated both by strengthening their strong points but also by trying to address demonstrated weaknesses. Importantly, in each case, advances in detector technology from the time of the initial design, particularly electronics and data acquisition, were exploited. With these Run 2 upgrades, CDF and DØ became more similar.

At the time of the design of the detectors in the 1980's, ambitions to make substantial contributions to  $B$ -physics were limited to a few people. However, the success of the CDF vertex detector in the search for the top quark, and the extensively improved trackers opened the door to a broad  $B$ -physics program. The LEP and SLD detectors had ceased operations without observation of  $B_s$  mixing, which therefore became low-hanging fruit for the Tevatron experiments. CDF had a superior tracking and vertex system so was expected to win. However, before a publication from CDF, DØ recognized that its data gave a clear lower limit and indication of an upper limit [18] (see Fig. 4) on the mixing frequency thus limiting, albeit relatively weakly, the central value. Therefore, they published. In apparent surprise, CDF produced its own more precise determination [19], which it then followed with the improvement shown in Fig. 4 with essentially the same data set [20]. A plausible interpretation is that the emergence of DØ as a competitor motivated the CDF teams to complete and publish their results.

This  $B_s$  mixing episode was followed by a rich trove of  $B$ -physics results from both experiments. However, perfection




FIG. 4.  $B_s$  meson eigenstate mass difference: two sided limits from DØ on left, measurement by CDF on right.

was not always achieved. DØ published [21] an observation of the  $\Omega_b$  baryon in 2008, with a mass of 6165 MeV and uncertainty of less than 20 MeV. A year later CDF published [22] an observation of ostensibly the same particle but with a mass of 6054 MeV and precision less than 10 MeV. CDF subsequently updated its result [23] to  $m_{\Omega_b} = 6047.5 \pm 3.8$  MeV and LHCb found  $m_{\Omega_b} = 6046.2 \pm 2.2$  MeV [24]. After analyzing new data in which the signal was not significantly present, DØ produced a note [25] stating that while it had not found a mistake, it conceded that on the basis of the CDF and LHCb results its observation should be disregarded.

A CDF 2011 study of di-jet mass distributions in conjunction with a study of  $W$  boson plus jets seemed to show an enhancement corresponding to a mass of 144 GeV [26]. The significance corresponded to a little more than three standard-deviation fluctuation in the background, and a cross section of about 4 pb. The DØ study [27] closely followed the same analysis procedure and yielded no sign of a signal, giving a likelihood of less than  $10^{-5}$  for the resonance hypothesis. The relevant distributions are illustrated in Fig. 5.




FIG. 5. Putative dijet resonance with mass 144 GeV: Left-CDF, Right-DØ.

Another CDF analysis [28] indicated the presence of so-called “ghost muons”, which originated at more than 1.5 cm

from the interaction point. These constituted about 12% of the observed muons in the study. In this instance DØ observed [29] an essentially null result that such detached muons constituted  $0.4 \pm 0.6\%$  of the total sample. In each of these last three examples, the existence of a second experiment with the ability to perform a cross check, was invaluable.

In the instances of disagreement discussed above, a consensus within the field indicated implicit, if not explicit, resolution of the disagreement. However, sometimes such a consensus is not easily reached. An example of continuing tension concerns the observation by DØ of a new exotic meson containing two quarks and two antiquarks, all of different flavors. The resonance with a mass of 5568 MeV in  $B_s\pi$  final states was seen for both  $B_s$  decays to  $J/\psi\phi$  [30] and  $D_s^-\mu^+X$  [31] with a combined significance of  $6.7\sigma$  (see Fig. 6). Neither LHCb [32, 33], CMS [34], CDF [35] nor ATLAS [36] saw the signal and placed limits on the observation of such a state. The compatibility of the CDF and DØ measurements, both for  $p\bar{p}$  production at 1.96 TeV, was at the  $2\sigma$  level. It might be that the larger  $\eta$  acceptance of the DØ muon system could explain the difference if, as suggested in the DØ data, forward muons were favored in the resonance decay. The LHC experiments' null results might be due to the higher partonic densities in the LHC collisions that have been seen to disrupt the loosely bound exotic  $X(3872)$  state [37]. There are also theoretical speculations [38] about how the complexity of the state could lead to these variations in the observability of the state. Nevertheless the issue remains unresolved according to the Particle Data Group.




FIG. 6. DØ Observation of  $X(5568)$  decay to  $B_s\pi$  with  $B_s$  hadronic decay at left and semi-leptonic at right.

There can be cases where one experiment makes an unexpected measurement or an observation that relies on a particular feature of the apparatus which is not available to other experiments. An example is the DØ measurement [39] of the asymmetry between the rate for production of two  $B$  mesons with decays that include two positively charged muons and the rate for two negative muons. The like-sign final state arises when one meson in a  $B\bar{B}$  pair oscillates to the opposite flavor and both decay semi-leptonically. The ability to reverse the polarities of both the central solenoid magnet and the iron toroids of the muon detector was the key to controlling the false asymmetries related to detector effects. DØ's ability to check the estimates of the impact of backgrounds rested upon the measurement of the muon momentum in both the central and outer magnets. The measured asymmetry disagreed with the SM value at the  $3.9\sigma$  level. CDF did not have the capability for this suppression of false asymmetries, and the result remains in limbo awaiting future measurements.

A final example of an unresolved situation concerns the recent CDF measurement of the  $W$  boson mass. One of the apparent success stories for hadron colliders has been the determination of the  $W$  boson mass. UA2 demonstrated the potential and created an important legacy measurement from the Sp $\bar{p}$ S collider. The Tevatron experiments followed with a series of measurements with improving precision, which eclipsed the measurements from the electron-positron measurements at LEP. These measurements demonstrated compatibility and converged towards a combined precision of 16 MeV [40, 41]. The first LHC measurements from the ATLAS experiment [42], and then the LHCb experiment presented results [43] with precision comparable to those of the prior Tevatron measurements and in good agreement with them. However, in 2022, CDF completed an analysis of all its data from the Tevatron and presented a new result [44], halving the uncertainty with respect to the best previous measurement. The big surprise was not however the uncertainty but the central value. This measurement is incompatible at the level of several standard deviations with all the previous measurements of comparable precision (see Fig. 7) including the previous CDF measurement. The question is whether this is an example of a series of subsequent measurements falling on top of previous ones before the enlightened new measurement spoke the truth, or whether there is an elusive issue with the new measurement. The resolution of this puzzle will lie in new measurements.

The ability to combine results and give more incisive information is a further advantage of having two experiments. The top quark was initially observed through its pair production via the strong interaction. Single top production






FIG. 7. World measurements of the  $W$  boson mass [45].

can occur through the electroweak interaction, but the more favorable available phase space is offset by the weakness of the coupling, such that the sum of the  $s$ -channel and  $t$ -channel production cross sections is approximately half that of  $t\bar{t}$  production at 2 TeV. The simpler final state also means that the backgrounds to single top are larger. Further, the signal for single top production is less striking than that for a top-antitop pair. The analysis demands a sophisticated approach to suppression of the background and multiple layers of multivariate analysis were used by both experiments. The results were successful in that the  $t$ -channel production was observed separately by each experiment, but for the  $s$ -channel, neither experiment could claim observation. However, when the results of both experiments were combined, clear observation in both channels could be claimed [46] and the total cross-section was measured to be 3.3 pb, with a precision of about 0.7 pb. A very significant bonus from this measurement is the determination of the relevant CKM matrix element to be  $|V_{tb}| > 0.92$  with 95% CL.

Much of the Tevatron's operation in Run 2 was motivated by the desire to observe the standard model Higgs boson. It was understood from the outset that combination of the data from the two experiments would be required, given the expectations for integrated luminosity. The sensitivity to the associated  $VH$  production was greater than that for the gluon-gluon fusion process owing the presence of leptons in the final state that served to suppress the background and provide efficient triggers. Leaning heavily on techniques established in the search for single top production, CDF included 15 distinct channels while DØ included 13. The results [47] are illustrated in Fig. 8. The solid line represents the background  $p$ -value observed in the data as a function of mass. The blue dash-dotted lines and dashed curves indicate expectations from a Higgs particle with mass of 125 GeV and the anticipated cross section and 1.5 times that cross section respectively. An excess is indicated by a reduced  $p$ -value for the background hypothesis. Such an excess is observed in the region 110 to 140 GeV, which at 125 GeV is at the level of 3 standard deviations.

The results in the channel  $VH(b\bar{b})$  constituted evidence for the Higgs decay into fermions, in distinction with the initial observation at the LHC which was made using the bosonic decays  $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  and  $H \rightarrow ZZ^*$ . We reiterate that these results were only possible by combining the data and the analyses from the two experiments, which, in some ways, was the maximal return from operations at the Tevatron Collider.

#### IV. THE LHC: ATLAS AND CMS

While we are more than a decade into operations of the Large Hadron Collider, we expect that we have only had glimpses of its ultimate achievements. Nevertheless, we can draw some guidance from the experience so far. Sufficient




FIG. 8. Tevatron Higgs search results.

resources were available *ab initio* for the construction of two viable general-purpose detectors. A challenge for the detectors was the anticipated luminosity and bunch structure of the collider. The former was such that at design luminosity an average of 20 interactions per bunch crossing was anticipated with only 25 ns between each crossing. Such ferocious conditions had never been confronted in a collider environment and, at the time of LHC detector design, were not anticipated at the Tevatron. Detector design therefore contained significant reliance on simulation and resulted in quite different approaches for the two general purpose detectors, ATLAS) [48] (Fig. 9), and the CMS [49] (Fig. 10). In fact each of the emerging detectors followed the merging of two other competitive proposals.

ATLAS emphasized external large air-core toroids which provided the detection and high precision measurement of muons over a large range in rapidity. Because the calorimeter shields the muon system from hadronic interaction debris, it represents an approach to risk mitigation. The resulting tracking system is necessarily modest in volume and the solenoidal magnet which supports the hadron electron momentum measurement is quite thin. The tracking system emphasized the number of hits per track by using thin straw tube detectors, which also reduced the potential impact of broken wires by limiting the loss to the single wire. The tracking included the capability to require a signal consistent with transition radiation which is only generated by electrons. This was a further potential mitigation of the hadronic track pileup from the multiple interactions. The thin solenoid minimizes the degradation of the electron and photon components in the showers before their detection in high quality liquid argon calorimeters. Here one sees that despite the expected potential difficulties associated with multiple interactions in the inner detector, the need to detect photons from the decay of the Higgs boson played a seminal role in benchmarking the design. The electronics was such that, in principle, only those transition radiation hits could be used thus, again, suppressing hadronic track background. The innermost tracking, silicon strips and pixels served to identify the primary and secondary vertices.

In contrast to ATLAS, CMS chose a large high-field solenoid as the base component of the design. It is large enough to contain the calorimeter whose electromagnetic sections were constructed of lead tungstate crystals. Obtaining good electromagnetic energy resolution for one crystal is straightforward. For a system of thousands of crystals advanced control of temperature and humidity for the whole system is the challenge. The muon detection system consists of multilayers of detectors interspersed with the iron magnetic flux return and so is quite compact compared to the ATLAS air-core toroids. CMS chose to use silicon detectors for all of its tracker. This innovative choice had no precedent. This choice emphasizes hit precision rather than the numbers of hits on a track. It also depends on the precision of the track-hits to offset the significant multiple scattering in each detector layer. As with ATLAS, pixel detectors in the layers closest to the interaction point were key to the vertex measurements.

For both experiments, the limitations of the data acquisition capabilities relative to the numbers of interactions and the sizes of the data sets from each crossing necessitated strong constraints on the fraction of events accepted. In turn that capability suppression necessary dictated multiple levels within the trigger systems.

It is remarkable how, sub-system by sub-system, the two experiments made complementary choices. What is then further remarkable is that in terms of physics performance, the two experiments are largely matching each other.

Of course, the most prominent result from the LHC was the observation of the Higgs boson [50, 51] through its decay into two photons (as well as into four leptons from real and virtual  $Z$  bosons). As we discussed above, the projected






FIG. 9. The ATLAS detector [48].




FIG. 10. The CMS detector [49].

capability to make this measurement was a strong discriminator in the detector designs. The signal is an enhancement in the mass spectrum constructed for two photons. Of course, much of the spectrum results from backgrounds so that the signal is a modest enhancement visible but not dominant. The spectra from the two experiments are shown in Fig. 11. The similarity of the spectra in the two experiments and of the significances quoted demonstrate how the performances of the two detector designs are very similar.

## V. SUMMARY

The benefit of having two experiments arises in several different ways. If the specific technological character of a subsystem of the two detectors is different (for example crystal calorimetry with excellent energy resolution compared with a sampling calorimeter with lower resolution but higher segmentation) the systematic uncertainties of a measurement can be quite different rendering the combined result more robust. If the two experiments' subsystems have some orthogonality, the combined understanding of the physics can be amplified. For example, if one detector




FIG. 11. Higgs diphoton signals from ATLAS (left) and CMS (right).

has particle identification capability as opposed to precision timing measurements for its track or calorimetric signals or different orientations of magnetic fields, the sum of the physics that can be addressed by the two experiments is enlarged.

There is another axis along which the utility of two experiments can be realized. The simple existence of two independent sets of physicists allows for different solutions to common problems that may be more important even than specific hardware differences. The collaborations may invent different algorithms for such problems as pileup mitigation or jet substructure characterization or develop different methods for performing position or energy calibrations. Once such differences become public, they of course will enter the common toolkit used by the other experiment and subsequent experiments. But the cross fertilization of ideas from the competing groups of physicists can enhance the overall effectiveness of the program. This independent attack on major analysis techniques may well be the greatest benefit of having more than one experiment at the collider.

In this note we have discussed specific examples in which having two detectors made improvements to the physics results of a collider program.

Even within a collaboration that produces a new result, there are often those who express doubts about its validity. Thus, even with just one experiment, there are self-correcting forces in play. However, the tendency for modern collider collaborations to seek a common voice on their results means that this sort of regulation is not fully effective. We have seen several instances where one experiment announced a new discovery, but the other experiment performed a similar analysis that contradicted it and effectively nullified the discovery. There is a continuum of such cases, ranging from a putative new discovery outside the standard model paradigm to quantitative results on a cross section or kinematic parameter that are contradicted by the second measurement. In such cases, the reliability of the overall collider program is clearly enhanced.

We presented several cases in which one experiment presents a result with significant consequences for our understanding of particle physics where the second experiment did not have the capability to confirm a new result. Even though the new result is not negated, the inability to corroborate served to flag the measurement as tentative, in need of confirmation by some future experiment.

We have seen how the competition between two experiments explicitly accelerated the appearance of key results thus leading to a higher quality program.

There are extremely important cases in which neither experiment by itself is capable of measurement of some physical observable with convincing significance, but through combination of the two, the observable is definitively established. This coherent effect of combining the two experiment's results is routinely useful in improving the precision of an observable or in extending the kinematic range of a measurement. And in these confirmatory cases, the agreement of the measurements by the two experiments serves to validate both.

Although our argument has been drawn primarily from the experience at hadron colliders, an analysis for the International Linear Collider reached a similar conclusion [52], despite the fact that in this case the two detectors cannot take data simultaneously.

In all the cases we have examined, the benefit of mounting more than one experiment has been large. Given that any one experiment has been seen to make mistakes some fraction of the time, there is always the nagging possibility that, if there is but one experiment, any particular result is incorrect, and the impact of the whole collider program is compromised.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We express our appreciation to Dmitri Denisov for his comments during the development of the talk for the workshop and to Jim Brau for bringing the similar study for a linear collider to our attention. HEM would also like to thank the organizers of the workshop, in particular Pawel Nadal-Turonski, whose encouragement stimulated this work. This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics under contract DE-AC05-06OR23177.

- 
- [1] The Electron Ion Collider: <https://www.bnl.gov/eic/machine.php>.
  - [2] EIC 2nd Detector WG: [https://indico.bnl.gov/event/17693/contributions/70922/attachments/44976/75872/EICUG\\_2ndDetector\\_Incubator.pdf](https://indico.bnl.gov/event/17693/contributions/70922/attachments/44976/75872/EICUG_2ndDetector_Incubator.pdf).
  - [3] EIC Users Group 2nd Detector Meeting: <https://indico.bnl.gov/event/17693/>.
  - [4] The Super Proton-antiproton Collider: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Super\\_Proton-Antiproton\\_Synchrotron](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Super_Proton-Antiproton_Synchrotron).
  - [5] The Tevatron Collider: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tevatron>.
  - [6] The CDF Detector: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collider\\_Detector\\_at\\_Fermilab](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collider_Detector_at_Fermilab).
  - [7] The DØ Detector: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DØ\\_experiment](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DØ_experiment).
  - [8] F. Abe *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2626 (1995).
  - [9] S. Abachi *et al.* (DØ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2632 (1995).
  - [10] F. Abe *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 438 (1996).
  - [11] B. Abbott *et al.* (DØ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2451 (1999).
  - [12] C. Adloff *et al.* (H1 Collaboration), Zeitschrift für Physik C**74**, 191 (1997).
  - [13] J. Breitweg *et al.* (ZEUS Collaboration), Zeitschrift für Physik C**74**, 207 (1997).
  - [14] CDF and DØ Collaborations, arXiv:9810015 (hep-ex) (1998).
  - [15] Stephen D. Holmes and Vladimir D. Shiltsev, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **63**, 435 (2013).
  - [16] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (DØ Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **565**, 463 (2006).
  - [17] T. LeCompte and H. T. Diehl, The CDF & DØ Upgrades for Run II: Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **50**, 71 (2000).
  - [18] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (DØ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 021802 (2006).
  - [19] A. Abulencia *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 062003 (2006).
  - [20] A. Abulencia *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 242003 (2006).
  - [21] V.M. Abazov *et al.* (DØ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 232002 (2008).
  - [22] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D**80**, 072003 (2009).
  - [23] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D**89**, 072014 (2014).
  - [24] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Letters **110**, 182001 (2013).
  - [25] DØ Collaboration, “Update on observations using the full Run2 data set”, <https://d0.fnal.gov/Run2Physics/WWW/results/final/B/B08G/> (2015).
  - [26] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 171801 (2011).
  - [27] V.M. Abazov *et al.* (DØ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 011804 (2011).
  - [28] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), arXiv:0810.5357 [hep-ex] (2008).
  - [29] DØ Collaboration, DØ Note 5905-CONF (2009).
  - [30] V.M. Abazov *et al.* (DØ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 022003 (2016).
  - [31] V.M. Abazov *et al.* (DØ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **97**, 092504 (2018).
  - [32] R. Aaij, *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 152003 (2016).
  - [33] R. Aaij, *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 109904 (2017).
  - [34] M. Sirunyan, *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 202005 (2018).
  - [35] T. Aaltonen, *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 202006 (2018).
  - [36] M. Aaboud, *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 202007 (2018).
  - [37] V.M. Abazov *et al.* (DØ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D**102**, 072005 (2020).
  - [38] Hong-wei Ke and Xue-Qian Li, Phys. Lett. B**785**, 301 (2018).
  - [39] V.M. Abazov *et al.* (DØ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D**89**, 012002 (2014).
  - [40] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF & DØ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D**88**, 05218 (2013).
  - [41] Dmitri Denisov and Costas Vellidis, Rep. Prog. Phys. **85**, 116201 (2022).
  - [42] M. Aaboud *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), Eur. Phys. J. C**78**, 110 (2018).
  - [43] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), JHEP 01 036 (2022).

- [44] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Science* **376**, 170 (2022).
- [45] “World W Mass Measurements, <https://cerncourier.com/a/cdf-sets-w-mass-against-the-standard-model/> CERN Courier, April 2022.
- [46] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF & DØ Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 152003 (2015).
- [47] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF & DØ Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 052014 (2013) .
- [48] The ATLAS Experiment: <https://atlas.cern/Discover/Detector>, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ATLAS\\_experiment](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ATLAS_experiment).
- [49] The CMS Experiment: <https://cms.cern/>, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Compact\\_Muon\\_Solenoid](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Compact_Muon_Solenoid).
- [50] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012) 1.
- [51] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012) 30.
- [52] James Brau, Tsunehiko Omori and Ronald Settles, in *Proceedings of the 2005 International Collider Physics and Detector Workshop and 2nd ILC Accelerator Workshop*, SLAC R-798, ed. N. Graf (2006).