

# Hepdata: The ATLAS perspective

**Bill Murray**

**STFC-RAL / University of Warwick**

**bill.murray@stfc.ac.uk**

**12<sup>th</sup> November 2014**

- What works well?
- What could be better?

# HepData

- ATLAS is a big user
  - Exp ATLAS yields 164 entries, c/f CMS 85
- The reaction search (“p p  $\rightarrow$  Z + X”) is a very useful
  - But especially so for SM results
  - Harder to use for new physics searches



# Data entry

- Input has been not totally trivial
  - There seems to be an error report per month
  - This is typically theorists trying to reproduce our results
    - Especially SUSY searches
  - Thanks to those that catch them, but clearly minimising these is important.
- Flexibility for occasional 'special' requests is important and should be retained.

# SM measurements

- Overall happy with the way Hepdata works
- New data upload was just introduced
  - SM conveners assign paper to analyser; analyser does upload.
    - Maybe we miss a 'check' step here – ATLAS issue!
    - The test upload functionality is there and we should formalise our use of it.
  - First paper uploaded on Friday 7<sup>th</sup>
    - No detailed report yet
    - But looks OK at first sight.

# Searches

- At the previous (June/July) meeting, the ability to upload in ROOT format was discussed.
  - Some people are quite enthusiastic
  - But some caution about this, because the text files usually need a lot of editing before they're fully ready, i.e. it's difficult to get a ROOT file into a state where it can be converted completely automatically to the final output.
    - But this is personal opinion,
  - Does the HepData team have a more concrete proposal
    - And does it address this issue?
- The ability to test before upload is a must
- Does the limitation of the search query reduce hepdatas usefulness as a way for theorists to find data?
  - Is there anything we can do better?
  - The issue of signatures v models is important here