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## Motivation

- Independent evaluation of RRR and HE ranges may cause
- Mismatch between RRR and HE region evaluations
- Large uncertainties near RRR and HE boundary
- Absence of covariance between RRR and HE



## Guiding principles for a unified method

- Expressible in a general data fitting framework
- e.g. Generalized Least Squares (GLS)
- Away from the overlapping region the effect ought to be small
- Near the overlapping region the method would yield:
- Covariance data where previously there was none
- Parameter values that may differ from priors for a better overall fit
- Various limiting cases must yield the expected results, e.g.:
- Unified fit of independent data/models/parameters = independent fits
- Identical models treated as two distinct models = one model
- Fits ought to vary smoothly between the extreme cases, e.g.
- Between no-overlap and complete overlap of the data
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## Essential Generalized Least Squares

- Using Froehner's JEFF Report 18 notation:
$Q(P) \equiv\left(P_{0}-P\right)^{T} M_{0}^{-1}\left(P_{0}-P\right)+(D-T(P))^{T} V^{-1}(D-T(P))$

$$
=Q(\hat{P})+(P-\hat{P})^{T} M^{-1}(P-\hat{P})
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\nabla Q(P)=0 \text { at } P=\hat{P} \\
P_{n+1}=P_{n}-\frac{1}{\nabla \nabla^{T} Q\left(P_{n}\right)} \nabla Q\left(P_{n}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

## How to extend GLS to two models?

- An attempt:

$$
P \equiv\left\{p_{1}, p_{2}\right\}
$$

$$
T(P) \equiv\left\{t_{1}\left(p_{1}\right), t_{2}\left(p_{2}\right)\right\}
$$

$$
D \equiv\left\{d_{1}, d_{2}\right\}
$$

$$
M_{0}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
m_{0 ; 11} & 0 \\
0 & m_{0 ; 22}
\end{array}\right) \quad V=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
v_{11} & v_{12} \\
v_{21} & v_{22}
\end{array}\right)
$$

$$
M=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
m_{11} & m_{12} \\
m_{21} & m_{22}
\end{array}\right)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& v_{12}=0 \Longrightarrow m_{12}=0 \\
& v_{12} \neq 0 \Longrightarrow m_{12} \neq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

- Covariance: $\quad\langle\delta T(P) \delta T(P)\rangle=(\nabla T)^{T} M(\nabla T)$


## Graphic illustration:

- Two data sets with overlapping energy ranges; two models
- Data in the overlap energy range (at least) is correlated



## Simple example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{t}_{1}\left(\mathrm{n}_{1}\right)=\mathrm{n}_{1} \mathrm{x} \quad, \quad \mathrm{t}_{2}\left(\mathrm{n}_{2}\right)=\mathrm{n}_{2} \mathrm{x}^{2} \\
& \mathrm{x}_{1}=\{0.8,0.9,1.0\} \quad, \mathrm{x}_{2}=\{1.0,1.1,1.2\} \\
& \mathrm{d}_{1}=\{0.8,0.9,1.1\}, \mathrm{d}_{2}=\{1.0,1.21,1.44\} \\
& \mathrm{n}_{01}=1.0 \quad \mathrm{n}_{02}=1.0 \quad \text { (priors) } \\
& M_{0}=\left[\begin{array}{rr}
1 . \mathrm{E}+12 & 0.0 \\
0.0 & 1 . \mathrm{E}+12
\end{array}\right] \\
& V=\left[\begin{array}{rrrrrr}
0.1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0.1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0.1 & 0.08 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0.08 & 0.1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1 \\
\hline
\end{array}\right] \\
& \begin{array}{lll}
\mathrm{n}_{1}=1.05792 & \mathrm{n}_{2}=0.985193 & \text { (unified fit) } \\
\mathrm{n}_{1}=1.04082 & \mathrm{n}_{2}=1.0 & \text { (independent fits) }
\end{array} \\
& M=\underset{\substack{\text { Managed by UT-Batelle } \\
\text { for the U.S. Department of }}}{ }\left[\begin{array}{ll}
0.029 & 0.010 \\
0.010 & 0.019
\end{array}\right] \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text { cf. } \\
\text { Presentataion__nama }
\end{array}\left[\begin{array}{rr}
0.040 & 0 \\
0 & 0.022
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

## Simple Example cont'd.

| $(\nabla T)^{T} M(\nabla T)$ | 0.019 | 0.021 | 0.023 | 0.008 | 0.010 | 0.012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.021 | 0.024 | 0.026 | 0.009 | 0.011 | 0.013 |
|  | 0.023 | 0.026 | 0.029 | 0.010 | 0.012 | 0.015 |
|  | 0.008 | 0.009 | 0.010 | 0.019 | 0.024 | 0.028 |
|  | 0.010 | 0.011 | 0.012 | 0.024 | 0.028 | 0.034 |
|  | 0.012 | 0.013 | 0.015 | 0.028 | 0.034 | 0.040 |
| cf. $\mathrm{t}_{1}\left(\mathrm{n}_{1}\right)$ fit to $\mathrm{d}_{1}$ | 0.026 | 0.029 | 0.033 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.029 | 0.033 | 0.037 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.033 | 0.037 | 0.041 |  |  |  |
| cf. $\mathrm{t}_{2}\left(\mathrm{n}_{2}\right)$ fit to $\mathrm{d}_{2}$ |  |  |  | 0.022 | 0.027 | 0.032 |
|  |  |  |  | 0.027 | 0.032 | 0.038 |
|  |  |  |  | 0.032 | 0.038 | 0.046 |

- Off-diagonal covariance between ranges no longer zero
- and relatively smooth
- Covariance within ranges smaller than for independent fits


## Conclusions and Outlook

- A GLS method yields promising results in a simple test case
- Covariance of the data in the overlapping range is a key input
- Further study is required
- More complex cases may validate the method or lead to a better one
- Attempts to unify data evaluations might provide new perspectives and improvements of evaluations and methods.
- Your feedback will be appreciated.
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