

# Reinterpretation and preservation of data and analyses in HEP

Data from particle physics experiments are unique and are often the result of a very large investment of resources. Given the potential scientific impact of these data, which goes far beyond the immediate priorities of the experimental collaborations that obtain them, it is imperative that the collaborations and the wider particle physics community publish and preserve sufficient information to ensure that this impact can be realised, now and into the future. The information to be published and preserved includes the algorithms, statistical information, simulations and the recorded data. This publication and preservation requires significant resources, and should be a strategic priority with commensurate planning and resource allocation from the earliest stages of future facilities and experiments.

Document submitted to the European Strategy for Particle Physics Update 2026.

## **LHC Reinterpretation Forum:**

*Jonathan Butterworth*<sup>†1</sup>, *Sabine Kraml*<sup>†2</sup>, *Harrison B. Prosper*<sup>†3</sup>, *Andy Buckley*<sup>\*4</sup>, *Louie Corpe*<sup>\*5</sup>, *Cristinel Diaconu*<sup>\*6</sup>, *Mark Goodsell*<sup>\*7</sup>, *Philippe Gras*<sup>\*8</sup>, *Martin Habedank*<sup>\*4</sup>, *Clemens Lange*<sup>\*9</sup>, *Kati Lassila-Perini*<sup>\*10</sup>, *André Lessa*<sup>\*11</sup>, *Rakhi Mahubani*<sup>\*12</sup>, *Judita Mamučić*<sup>\*13,14</sup>, *Zach Marshall*<sup>\*15</sup>, *Thomas McCauley*<sup>\*16</sup>, *Humberto Reyes-Gonzalez*<sup>\*17</sup>, *Krzysztof Rolbiecki*<sup>\*18</sup>, *Sezen Sekmen*<sup>\*19</sup>, *Giordon Stark*<sup>\*20</sup>, *Graeme Watt*<sup>\*21</sup>, *Jonas Würzinger*<sup>\*22</sup>, *Shehu AbdusSalam*<sup>23</sup>, *Aytul Adiguzel*<sup>24</sup>, *Amine Ahriche*<sup>25</sup>, *Ben Allanach*<sup>26</sup>, *Mohammad M. Altakach*<sup>2</sup>, *Jack Y. Araz*<sup>27,28</sup>, *Alexandre Arbey*<sup>29</sup>, *Saiyad Ashanujjaman*<sup>30</sup>, *Volker Austrup*<sup>31</sup>, *Emanuele Bagnaschi*<sup>32</sup>, *Sumit Banik*<sup>33</sup>, *Csaba Balazs*<sup>34</sup>, *Daniele Barducci*<sup>35</sup>, *Philip Bechtle*<sup>36</sup>, *Samuel Bein*<sup>37</sup>, *Nicolas Berger*<sup>38</sup>, *Tisa Biswas*<sup>39</sup>, *Fawzi Boudjema*<sup>40</sup>, *Jamie Boyd*<sup>41</sup>, *Carsten Burgard*<sup>42</sup>, *Jackson Burzynski*<sup>43</sup>, *Jordan Byers*<sup>44</sup>, *Giacomo Cacciapaglia*<sup>7</sup>, *Cécile Caillol*<sup>41</sup>, *Orhan Cakir*<sup>45</sup>, *Christopher Chang*<sup>46</sup>, *Gang Chen*<sup>47</sup>, *Andrea Coccaro*<sup>48</sup>, *Yara do Amaral Coutinho*<sup>49</sup>, *Andreas Crivellin*<sup>33</sup>, *Leo Constantin*<sup>2</sup>, *Giovanna Cottin*<sup>50</sup>, *Hridoy Debnath*<sup>51</sup>, *Mehmet Demirci*<sup>52</sup>, *Juhi Dutta*<sup>53</sup>, *Joe Egan*<sup>1</sup>, *Carlos Erice Cid*<sup>54</sup>, *Farida Fassi*<sup>55</sup>, *Matthew Feickert*<sup>56</sup>, *Arnaud Ferrari*<sup>57</sup>, *Pavel Fileviez Perez*<sup>51</sup>, *Dillon S. Fitzgerald*<sup>58</sup>, *Roberto Franceschini*<sup>59</sup>, *Benjamin Fuks*<sup>7</sup>, *Lorenz Gärtner*<sup>60</sup>, *Kirtiman Ghosh*<sup>61,62</sup>, *Andrea Giammanco*<sup>37</sup>, *Alejandro Gomez Espinosa*<sup>63</sup>, *Leticia M. Guedes*<sup>64</sup>, *Giovanni Guerrieri*<sup>41</sup>, *Christian Gütschow*<sup>1</sup>, *Abdelhamid Haddad*<sup>5</sup>, *Mahsana Haleem*<sup>65</sup>, *Hassane Hamdaoui*<sup>57</sup>, *Sven Heinemeyer*<sup>66</sup>, *Lukas Heinrich*<sup>22</sup>, *Ben Hodgkinson*<sup>67</sup>, *Gabriela Hoff*<sup>64</sup>, *Cyril Hugonie*<sup>68</sup>, *Sihyun Jeon*<sup>54</sup>, *Adil Jueid*<sup>69</sup>, *Deepak Kar*<sup>70</sup>, *Anna Kaczmarska*<sup>71</sup>, *Venus Keus*<sup>10,72</sup>, *Michael Klasen*<sup>73</sup>, *Kyoungchul Kong*<sup>74</sup>, *Joachim Kopp*<sup>41,75</sup>, *Michael Krämer*<sup>17</sup>, *Manuel Kunkel*<sup>65</sup>, *Bertrand Laforge*<sup>76</sup>, *Theodota Lagouri*<sup>77</sup>, *Eric Lancon*<sup>78</sup>, *Peilian Li*<sup>79</sup>, *Gabriela Lima Lichtenstein*<sup>64</sup>, *Yang Liu*<sup>80</sup>, *Steven Lowette*<sup>81</sup>, *Jayita Lahiri*<sup>82</sup>, *Siddharth Prasad Maharathy*<sup>70</sup>, *Farvah Mahmoudi*<sup>29</sup>, *Vasiliki A. Mitsou*<sup>83</sup>, *Sanjoy Mandal*<sup>84</sup>, *Michelangelo Mangano*<sup>41</sup>, *Kentarou Mawatari*<sup>85</sup>, *Peter Meinzinger*<sup>33</sup>, *Manimala Mitra*<sup>61</sup>, *Mojtaba Mohammadi Najafabadi*<sup>86</sup>, *Sahana Narasimha*<sup>87</sup>, *Siavash Neshatpour*<sup>29</sup>, *Jacinto P. Neto*<sup>64</sup>, *Mark Neubauer*<sup>88</sup>, *Mohammad Nourbakhsh*<sup>86</sup>, *Giacomo Ortona*<sup>89</sup>, *Rojalin Padhan*<sup>90</sup>, *Orlando Panella*<sup>91</sup>, *Timothée Pascal*<sup>2</sup>, *Brian Petersen*<sup>41</sup>, *Werner Porod*<sup>65</sup>, *Farinaldo S. Queiroz*<sup>64</sup>, *Shakeel Ur Rahaman*<sup>21</sup>, *Are Raklev*<sup>46</sup>, *Hossein Rashidi*<sup>92</sup>, *Patricia Rebello Teles*<sup>93</sup>, *Federico L. Redi*<sup>94</sup>, *Jürgen Reuter*<sup>95</sup>, *Tania Robens*<sup>96</sup>, *Abhishek Roy*<sup>97</sup>, *Subham Saha*<sup>61</sup>, *Ahmetcan Sansar*<sup>24</sup>, *Kadir Saygin*<sup>98</sup>, *Nikita Schmal*<sup>99</sup>, *Jeffrey Shahinian*<sup>100</sup>, *Sukanya Sinha*<sup>31</sup>, *Ricardo C. Silva*<sup>64</sup>, *Tim Smith*<sup>41</sup>, *Tibor Šimko*<sup>41</sup>, *Andrzej Siodmok*<sup>101</sup>, *Ana M. Teixeira*<sup>5</sup>, *Tamara Vázquez Schröder*<sup>13</sup>, *Carlos Vázquez Sierra*<sup>102</sup>, *Yoxara Villamizar*<sup>7</sup>, *Wolfgang Waltenberger*<sup>87</sup>, *Peng Wang*<sup>1</sup>, *Martin White*<sup>103</sup>, *Kimiko Yamashita*<sup>104</sup>, *Ekin Yoruk*<sup>105</sup>, and *Xuai Zhuang*<sup>106</sup>

<sup>†</sup>editor

\*contributor

- <sup>1</sup>*University College London, UK*
- <sup>2</sup>*LPSC Grenoble, Université Grenoble-Alpes, CNRS/IN2P3, France*
- <sup>3</sup>*Florida State University, USA*
- <sup>4</sup>*University of Glasgow, UK*
- <sup>5</sup>*LPCA Clermont, Université Clermont-Auvergne, CNRS/IN2P3, France*
- <sup>6</sup>*CPPM, Aix Marseille Univ., CNRS/IN2P3, France*
- <sup>7</sup>*LPTHE, Sorbonne Université & CNRS, Paris, France*
- <sup>8</sup>*IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, France*
- <sup>4</sup>*University of Glasgow, UK*
- <sup>9</sup>*Paul Scherrer Institute, Switzerland*
- <sup>10</sup>*Helsinki Institute of Physics, Finland*
- <sup>11</sup>*UFABC, Santo Andre, Brazil*
- <sup>12</sup>*Rudjer Boskovic Institute, Zagreb, Croatia*
- <sup>13</sup>*IFAE, Barcelona, Spain*
- <sup>14</sup>*Institute Jožef Štefan, Ljubljana, Slovenia*
- <sup>15</sup>*Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, USA*
- <sup>16</sup>*University of Notre Dame, USA*
- <sup>17</sup>*RWTH Aachen University, Germany*
- <sup>18</sup>*University of Warsaw, Poland*
- <sup>19</sup>*Kyungpook National University, Daegu, South Korea*
- <sup>20</sup>*UC Santa Cruz, California, USA*
- <sup>21</sup>*IPPP, Durham University, UK*
- <sup>22</sup>*Technical University of Munich, Germany*
- <sup>23</sup>*Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran*
- <sup>24</sup>*Istanbul University, Turkey*
- <sup>25</sup>*University of Sharjah, Sharjah, UAE*
- <sup>26</sup>*University of Cambridge, UK*
- <sup>27</sup>*City St. George's, University of London, UK*
- <sup>28</sup>*Stony Brook University, USA*
- <sup>29</sup>*Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS/IN2P3, IP2I Lyon, France*
- <sup>30</sup>*Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany*
- <sup>31</sup>*University of Manchester, UK*
- <sup>32</sup>*INFN, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Italy*
- <sup>33</sup>*University of Zurich, Switzerland*
- <sup>34</sup>*Monash University, Australia*
- <sup>35</sup>*University of Pisa and INFN Pisa, Italy*
- <sup>36</sup>*University of Bonn, Germany*
- <sup>37</sup>*Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium*
- <sup>38</sup>*LAPP Annecy, France*
- <sup>39</sup>*Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, India*
- <sup>40</sup>*LAPTh, Annecy, France*
- <sup>41</sup>*CERN, Geneva, Switzerland*
- <sup>42</sup>*TU Dortmund University, Germany*
- <sup>43</sup>*Simon Fraser University, Canada*
- <sup>44</sup>*ARC, Durham University, UK*
- <sup>45</sup>*Ankara University, Türkiye*
- <sup>46</sup>*University of Oslo, Norway*
- <sup>47</sup>*Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China*
- <sup>48</sup>*INFN Genova, Italy*
- <sup>49</sup>*Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil*
- <sup>50</sup>*Pontificia Univ. Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile*
- <sup>51</sup>*Case Western Reserve University, USA*
- <sup>52</sup>*Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Türkiye*
- <sup>53</sup>*Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Chennai, India*
- <sup>54</sup>*Boston University, USA*
- <sup>55</sup>*Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco*

- <sup>56</sup> *University of Wisconsin–Madison, USA*  
<sup>57</sup> *Uppsala University, Sweden*  
<sup>58</sup> *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA*  
<sup>59</sup> *Roma Tre University and INFN, Italy*  
<sup>60</sup> *Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, Germany*  
<sup>61</sup> *Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India*  
<sup>62</sup> *HBNI, Mumbai, India*  
<sup>63</sup> *Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA*  
<sup>64</sup> *International Inst. of Physics, UFRN, Natal, Brazil*  
<sup>65</sup> *Julius-Maximilian-Universität Würzburg, Germany*  
<sup>66</sup> *IFT (UAM/CSIC), Madrid, Spain*  
<sup>67</sup> *University of Oxford, UK*  
<sup>68</sup> *LUPM, Univ. de Montpellier, CNRS/IN2P3, France*  
<sup>69</sup> *Institute for Basic Science, Daejeon, South Korea*  
<sup>70</sup> *Univ. of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa*  
<sup>71</sup> *Institute of Nuclear Physics PAN, Krakow, Poland*  
<sup>72</sup> *Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, Ireland*  
<sup>73</sup> *University of Münster, Germany*  
<sup>74</sup> *University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA*  
<sup>75</sup> *Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz, Germany*  
<sup>76</sup> *LPNHE, CNRS/IN2P3, Sorbonne Université, Université Paris Cité, France*  
<sup>77</sup> *Yale University, USA*  
<sup>78</sup> *Brookhaven National Laboratory, USA*  
<sup>79</sup> *Univ. of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China*  
<sup>80</sup> *Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen, China*  
<sup>81</sup> *Vrije Universiteit Brussel and Interuniversity Institute for High Energies, Brussels, Belgium*  
<sup>82</sup> *University of Hamburg, Germany*  
<sup>83</sup> *Instituto de Física Corpuscular (IFIC), CSIC - University of Valencia, Spain*  
<sup>84</sup> *Korea Institute for Advanced Study (KIAS), Seoul, South Korea*  
<sup>85</sup> *Iwate University, Morioka, Japan*  
<sup>86</sup> *Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences, Tehran, Iran*  
<sup>87</sup> *HEPHY, Austrian Academy of Sciences and University of Vienna, Austria*  
<sup>88</sup> *University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, USA*  
<sup>89</sup> *INFN Sezione di Torino, Italy*  
<sup>90</sup> *Chung-Ang University, Seoul, South Korea*  
<sup>91</sup> *INFN Sezione di Perugia, Italy*  
<sup>92</sup> *Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran*  
<sup>93</sup> *Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas - CBPF, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*  
<sup>94</sup> *U. of Bergamo and INFN Milano, Italy*  
<sup>95</sup> *Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Hamburg, Germany*  
<sup>96</sup> *Rudjer Boskovic Institute, Zagreb, Croatia*  
<sup>97</sup> *Sogang University, Seoul, South Korea*  
<sup>98</sup> *Duzce University, Duzce, Turkey*  
<sup>99</sup> *Universität Heidelberg, Germany*  
<sup>100</sup> *University of Pennsylvania, USA*  
<sup>101</sup> *Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland*  
<sup>102</sup> *Universidade da Coruña, Spain*  
<sup>103</sup> *University of Adelaide, Australia*  
<sup>104</sup> *Ibaraki University, Mito, Japan*  
<sup>105</sup> *Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey*  
<sup>106</sup> *IHEP, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China*

## 1 Introduction

Experimental results in particle physics are unique and of immense scientific value. They are obtained at enormous cost in terms of both financial and human resources, and their implications reach far beyond the sets of calculations, theories or parameter combinations with which they are confronted in the original experimental publications. Indeed, their implications may reach well beyond any theory brought forth so far and thus beyond anything that may directly be tested by the experimental collaborations themselves. It is thus crucial that their results can be used and interpreted by the whole physics community — now and for decades to come.

The products of scientific research are multiple and extend far beyond the traditional mode of journal-based results publication. We call for action to make the preservation and publication of these various outputs normative through suitable long-term public storage. Analysis-specific data products and related algorithms, software and workflows can only be preserved if the work is done at the time of active analysis. Supporting these practices and funding domain-specific services to make them available is hence crucial. These products have a potential for an immediate reuse and feedback to the experimental collaborations, as well for active exploitation beyond the lifetime of any given experiment.

While there is broad agreement on the importance of information preservation, and detailed recommendations have been worked out over the years [1–6], the situation nevertheless remains dire, with significant loss of information, and therefore of physics, already occurring in current experiments. Once an analysis has been published and the main analysers (typically Ph.D. students or postdocs) have moved on, it is often impossible to reproduce the analysis with high fidelity even within the collaboration that produced the work, or to retrieve any missing information for further studies, including reinterpretation. Restrictive collaboration policies on the release of information, including simulated data samples, analysis code or detector calibrations, can make the external use of such information even more challenging.

Current practice severely limits the shelf-life and scientific impact of many published analyses. The problem affects not only further studies by collaboration outsiders, often theorists, but even the experimental collaborations themselves. Indeed, the reproducibility of several LHC Run-1 and even Run-2 searches for new physics have already been lost within ATLAS and CMS [7]!

Therefore, it is crucial that *experimental collaborations integrate extensive data- and analysis-preservation efforts into their analysis and publication processes* from the beginning, facilitating communication of analyses and results in reusable form. *These initiatives need to be supported by the host laboratory, not only by acknowledging Open Science as one of its core missions but also by allocating sufficient resources for Open Science services and Open Data storage.*

In the rest of this contribution, we expand on what kinds of information are required and for what purposes and provide some evidence to support this *cri de cœur* in the form of examples of the scientific impact of the laudable but limited efforts so far made. We draw on previous efforts to make this case, and in particular on the relevant Snowmass white papers [4, 5].

## 2 What public, preserved information is needed?

To fully exploit and future-proof our experiments, the results and other materials that need to be preserved and made available to the whole community include:

- **Event-level data:** data recorded from experiments; outputs from passing those data through the experiment’s standard event reconstruction, and analogous simulated data samples. This may include data that have been passed through a data compression step that prunes information, but which might also add additional quantities to the data.
- **Generator-level data:** simulated events that have not been passed through detector simulations.
- **Analysis data products:** selections of derived data and synthesised information from the various stages of an analysis. These might include histograms of kinematic distributions, fiducial

cross-sections, cross-section limits, simplified model results, theoretical predictions used for interpretation of the data, correlation information, likelihoods, etc.

- **Analysis code and workflows:** the software infrastructure that implemented the original analysis. This encompasses the complete analysis workflow, including accessing, reformatting, and reducing data; executing the analysis physics logic; accessing and incorporating various external metadata (including theoretical input such as cross sections, weights, or experimental input such as resolutions, scale factors, etc.), and obtaining the analysis data products, packaged to enable the exact reproduction of the analysis.
- **Analysis logic:** the essential information required to understand and reproduce an analysis and associated analysis data products. This needs to be provided in sufficient detail for reproduction and future work, ideally in programmatic form, ensuring clarity, accessibility, and reproducibility.
- **Detector-performance data:** either the data need to be corrected for detector performance to within quantified uncertainties ('unfolded'), or sufficient information needs to be provided to emulate the impact of detector effects on the true observables.
- **Statistical models:** the full model describing the probabilistic dependence of the observable (and observed) data on the parameters of interest and the nuisance parameters. This is essential information for the accurate statistical evaluation of any new signal hypothesis in terms of parametric or kinematic reinterpretations. Moreover, it enables updates of an analysis when more precise theoretical predictions or improved experimental calibrations become available.

Although many physics applications can succeed with subsets of the above information, we argue that the aspiration should be to be as complete as possible in the information that is made publicly available and preserved, to maximize the openness and reproducibility of our science. Publicly released material should follow the data management principles of *Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable* (FAIR) as described in Ref. [8]. This will require concerted attention and resources throughout the end-to-end life cycle of data generation, processing, analysis, preservation, and distribution, and should be considered already in the design and commissioning phase of experiments. This is closely connected to the need for long-term software transparency and sustainability.<sup>1</sup>

### 3 Current practice and impact

#### 3.1 Event-level data


All LHC experiments are committed to releasing research-quality data — collision data and simulations — through the CERN Open Data portal [9]. The amount of data and release timeline varies from one experiment to another [10]. Experience from the pioneering CMS Open Data demonstrates that once data are available and their usage well documented, new original research is inspired as shown in Fig. 1.

CMS Open Data have been used in physics studies, benchmarking research software infrastructure, data-science applications, and as a proof of principle for scientific methods. Authors appreciate the authenticity of these data: e.g., the presence of experimental uncertainties and noise, as well as the availability of simulations, mandatory for research-level physics studies.

The event-level data thus far released by the experimental collaborations come with some limitations. For example, they typically do not include enough information to develop low-level reconstruction algorithms or to perform complex long-lived particle analyses. Bespoke, limited-statistics datasets can satisfy the former use case, and the collaborations should interact with and monitor the interests of the broader HEP community to identify necessary targeted datasets. For the latter use case, more work is needed to maximise the utility of the publicly released data formats to ensure maximal physics breadth in data analysis based on open data.

---

<sup>1</sup>Many large experiments have made their software codebase publicly available and version controlled, which is a welcome development towards being transparent. However, preserving the code alone does not satisfy the requirements mentioned so far and does not cover the whole analysis chain.



**Figure 1:** The number of publications citing CMS Open Data records, excluding CMS collaboration and CMS Open Data contributors (source: [11]).

When the LHC enters its High Luminosity phase, data volumes and resource challenges for open data initiatives will increase significantly. A common understanding that these open data represent the scientific heritage of the LHC and the only available high-energy hadron collision data for decades to come is essential to secure the necessary resources beyond Run-3 data. The amount of open data is approximately 5 PB at the moment, and it is expected to grow with increasing integrated luminosity, with a commensurate growth in simulated data. While the amount of open data at the petabyte scale is large, the associated cost of preserving it is minimal compared with the overall cost of LHC operations.<sup>2</sup>

### 3.2 Generator-level data


All LHC collaborations, as well as collider phenomenologists, simulate large Standard Model (SM) event samples using the same set of publicly available tools. Significant duplication of effort and resource consumption can be mitigated by the sharing of simulated events across the HEP community. Centralising the production of SM event samples to a core LHC team working in consultation with Monte Carlo experts should be prioritised as a strategic objective, resulting in substantial financial and environmental savings and collateral benefits in increased robustness, transparency, and equitable access. This will require agreement to align the event generation workflows between different experiments.

Effective curation of these data, and their release in a format that is compatible with a large set of downstream phenomenological tools is essential to ensure their uptake within the community. We note that the ATLAS collaboration has swiftly responded to this need by committing to a first release of HEPMC format [14]) events within a timeframe of order 1-2 months [15].

### 3.3 Analysis data products

The standard repository for digitised, reusable data products is HEPData [16, 17], which preserves more than 10,000 publication records containing (differential) cross-section measurements and limits, correlation information, associated theoretical predictions and other derived data from hundreds of past and current experiments. However, as shown in Fig. 2, only a fraction of the hundreds of publications from

<sup>2</sup>Note here that the open data effort comes on top of (internal) data preservation, which requires experts in charge of data integrity and stability, who are able to rerun the experimental original software and reproduce/reconstruct data as discussed in [12] and the corresponding contribution by the DPHEP collaboration to the ESPPU [13].



**Figure 2:** Number of publications by the four main LHC collaborations compared to publications with associated HEPData records (source: [18]).

LHC experiments provide reusable material on HEPData. This is extremely unfortunate, as it severely limits the scientific impact of the associated publications.

We also note that publication records submitted to HEPData need to be complete enough to be useful! In particular, all plots that document an analysis and its performance need to be preserved in digital form, not only a subset thereof. Likewise, providing details is important; for example, it is extremely useful if all components of a histogram (including, e.g., the detailed breakdown of SM expectations) are made available. Finally, additional auxiliary material is often needed to enable correct reuse, beyond the plots and tables presented in the paper.<sup>3</sup> Detailed recommendations are given in Ref. [2, 4]. As noted earlier, missing information is very difficult to retrieve, as often the analysis team has disbanded with analysts leaving the field, or the relevant files become lost. This problem could likely be ameliorated if the provision of (auxiliary) material on HEPData were part of the standard publication pipeline, with appropriate infrastructure support. The RAMP (“Reinterpretation: Auxiliary Material Presentation”) seminar series aims at providing more visibility and recognition for such efforts, but more work is needed to make the preservation of all necessary data products on HEPData standard practice.

Another aspect of the reuse problem is that data submitted to HEPData are primarily in tabular form. Material beyond digitised plots (like Monte Carlo run cards, input files for benchmark points, but also statistical or machine-learned models) are “additional resources”, often lumped together in compressed archives without any standard structure. To accommodate the increasingly rich and diverse data products produced in HEP, the HEPData infrastructure needs to be extended, so that all items are searchable, findable and interoperable in an automated manner.

### 3.4 Analysis code and workflows

Reproducing an analysis in its entirety requires more than just a description of its methodology, which might be given in a journal paper. It requires access to the software infrastructure that was used to perform the analysis. Analysis code and workflows encode every step of the process, from raw data access to

<sup>3</sup>The (re)use cases are manifold. For instance, besides the simulation-based reinterpretation tools mentioned in section 3.5, tools and efforts like SModelS [19–24], HiggsTools [25–31], Darkcast [32], SMEFit [33] and many others critically rely on the provided material.

the final extraction of physics results. Without access to the complete computational workflow—the analysis pipeline, precise understanding and reproduction of some results, whether within the original collaboration or by external researchers, is impossible.

Ensuring long-term usability of such analysis software requires structured preservation efforts. This includes documenting dependencies, packaging the code in a well-structured repository, and using version control to track changes. However, software evolves, and maintaining “executability” over time is a significant challenge. To address this, containerization technologies encapsulate the full analysis environment, including software versions, libraries, and dependencies. This approach allows analyses to be re-executed years after publication with identical computational conditions. Beyond containerization, workflow management systems such as REANA [34] provide a structured framework for organizing and executing analyses. By defining the entire workflow in a reproducible manner, these systems facilitate both internal validation and external reinterpretation studies. Integrating such tools into standard analysis pipelines will ensure that experimental results remain accessible, reusable, and verifiable long after their initial publication.

Internal collaboration initiatives such as those in Refs. [35–41] build on analyses that have successfully been preserved. However, key ingredients to many physics searches are missing, even to the collaborations, so not all searches can be included. We urge the collaborations to continue their ongoing efforts to improve the situation.


### 3.5 Analysis logic

The analysis logic for LHC event-level data remains complex. The data releases are typically accompanied by rich additional material, including tutorials and guides. Nevertheless it is to be expected that publication-level studies using open data require at least as much time as do analyses within the collaborations. From user feedback it is clear that actionable analysis examples – code, workflow, and environment – are by far the preferred learning material beyond the quick-start documentation. But extracting such examples from the internal work of collaborations has been challenging. Efforts within collaborations towards full analysis preservation that exploit containerisation technology will greatly benefit the usability of open data and the long-term preservation of analysis knowledge.

Moving away from event-level data analysis, some data products can be used without access to the exact and complete workflow described above. However, for the full exploitation of analysis data products it is crucial that the logic of analyses also be preserved accurately, and ideally in an executable form. This enables, for example, feedback from the theory community about the impact of experimental analyses beyond the models considered in the original collaboration paper, and the testing of new theoretical ideas against the data from several analyses and experiments in a global approach. It also permits new physics models (either beyond or within the Standard Model) to be tested years after the original analysis was performed. It is an essential feature of experimental science that the results from an experiment remain valid and meaningful for testing future theories, and particle physics is no exception despite the intrinsic complexity of the observables and models. Furthermore, preserving analysis logic is an important way to preserve a key part of the intellectual heritage of the field, which can serve to educate future generations of physicists about crucial scientific work done by predecessors.

In the spirit of open science, several public analysis software frameworks have arisen in recent years. The Rivet toolkit [42] is the clear choice for (differential) measurements, where detector effects have been unfolded to a fiducial phase-space by the experimental collaboration. The LHC collaborations have established Rivet-based measurement-preservation programs, and similar efforts are gaining traction at RHIC and are being planned at the EIC. In parallel, driven by the need of recasting Beyond-the-SM (BSM) searches, the community has been developing various simulation-based reinterpretation frameworks for reconstruction-level analyses. This includes CheckMATE [43, 44], MadAnalysis5 [45, 46],





**Figure 3:** Median number of citations (without self-citations) per year for all publications (blue), for publications with a HEPData entry (orange), and, in green, for publications where the analysis logic has been reimplemented in a dedicated tool (CheckMATE, MadAnalysis5, Rivet, or SModelS). Given are the numbers for all kinds of ATLAS and CMS analyses at  $\sqrt{s} \geq 13$  TeV (left) as well as only for the subset of searches for BSM physics (right). As “Publication year” we take the year the paper appeared on the arXiv. (Status 2025-03-13, source: [53].)

HackAnalysis [47] and GAMBIT’s ColliderBit [48], as well as detector smearing in Rivet [49].<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the ATLAS SimpleAnalysis [50] framework communicates analysis logic in the form of code snippets; currently covered are 56 search analyses, primarily searches for supersymmetry [51]. We also note ongoing efforts to develop domain specific languages for analysis logic preservation, concretely ADL (Analysis Description Language) [52], which is designed to encode analysis logic in a transparent and framework-independent way, and which has recently seen some traction within CMS.


Unfortunately, the coverage of analyses remains sparse. As noted above, not all LHC analyses provide HEPData records, and even fewer provide accompanying analysis code in the form of a public recasting module. A search on HEPData for “analysis:(rivet OR madanalysis OR checkmate)” gives 1,117 results as of March 27, 2025, of which more than 1,000 are Rivet-only.<sup>5</sup> Of the 1,117 records, 479 are from the four main LHC experiments (245 ATLAS, 142 CMS, 48 LHCb and 44 ALICE). This is just over 22% of the HEPData records from the LHC experiments, which as mentioned above is only a fraction of the published results. The numbers are lower again for non-LHC experiments, such as heavy-ion or neutrino physics facilities.

One way of quantifying the impact of good practice is to ask how much new research was enabled by making data products and analysis logic available in reusable form to the wider HEP community. While this is difficult to answer in full generality, the median number of times an experimental publication is cited gives a first indication. As shown in Fig. 3, publications providing a HEPData entry, in particular if it provides sufficient information for a (re)implementation of the analysis logic, get cited more, indicating a higher physics impact. Overall, publications for which the analysis logic is made accessible are cited 22 % (62 %) more in the period 2016–2022 (2016–2024). These values increase to 40 % (90 %) if searches for BSM physics only are considered, emphasising the fact that preserving the analysis logic is not only imperative for SM measurements.

Another way to illustrate the impact of making more, and better, information public is to trace the impact of the public reinterpretation frameworks that make use of the material provided. To that end, Fig. 4 shows the number of published papers since 2014 making use of or otherwise building upon

<sup>4</sup>A detailed overview of approaches and public frameworks is given in Ref. [2].

<sup>5</sup>SimpleAnalysis implementations cannot currently be searched for on HEPData, but do not change the overall picture.



**Figure 4:** Number of published papers over the last decade making use of or otherwise building upon public BSM reinterpretation tools [19–24, 32, 43–48, 54–61], Higgs-specific reinterpretation tools [25–31, 62, 63], and/or Rivet [42, 49, 64–66] (source: [127])

public BSM reinterpretation tools [19–24, 32, 43–49, 54–61], Higgs-specific reinterpretation tools [25–31, 62, 63], and/or Rivet [42, 49, 64–66]. It should be stressed that the enabled physics studies encompass a great diversity of new research, from phenomenological studies of models of new physics to new tool developments, from precision calculations to Monte Carlo tuning, and from improved fits of parton densities to novel experimental ideas. While an extensive review is beyond the scope of this contribution, Refs. [67–124] may serve as illustrative examples.<sup>6</sup> Finally, we point out that enabling reinterpretation helps i) identification of interesting benchmark models and signatures not yet covered by current searches, as in [111, 125] and ii) identifying possible BSM explanations for observed excesses, as in [72, 110, 126], which may impact the design and development of new search strategies.

Before concluding this subsection, a comment is in order regarding analysis logic based on machine learning (ML). ML models have a long history in particle physics, but the rapid rise in both relevant computing power and algorithms/architectures in association with wider-world “AI” applications has also produced a sea-change in their power and ubiquity in particle physics experiments. While experimentalists are understandably keen to maximally exploit the power of their datasets, trends towards both more complex algorithms and lower-level input features create challenges for preservation and reinterpretation, respectively. It is therefore important to keep reuse in mind in the analysis design and ensure that the learned model can be deployed in a robust, framework independent form (e.g. in ONNX format) [6]. Related to this it is important for ML-based analysis strategies to consider the appropriate balance between striving for absolutely maximum sensitivity to a specific model, and the use of more universal variables (e.g. features at the level of jets or tracks rather than clusters or hits) that enable long-term reuse and reinterpretation.

### 3.6 Detector performance data

Reproducibility of HEP analyses which are not unfolded to particle level critically depends on realistic detector-response modeling. The major LHC experiments already make their simulation and reconstruction software publicly available [128–131]. However, running these frameworks is computationally

<sup>6</sup>Note that this selection is a subset from 2023–2024 only.

intensive and requires significant expertise, making their direct use challenging for external researchers. Public fast simulation tools, such as DELPHES 3 [132], cited over 3,000 times in the past 12 years, play a key role in enabling phenomenologists and external researchers to explore new physics scenarios and reinterpret experimental results. However, the accuracy of such tools is inherently limited by the availability of reliable detector performance data. To improve public analysis reproduction, experiments should provide well-defined detector response information in a structured and systematic manner.

One approach is to release parameterized or tabulated object-level efficiencies and resolutions, including trigger, reconstruction, and identification efficiencies for key physics objects (e.g., electrons, muons, jets, b-tagged jets, tau leptons, boosted objects, etc.). Publishing these in an accessible format would allow fast simulation tools, or sometimes reinterpretation frameworks themselves, to incorporate them directly and more accurately reproduce detector effects. Another possibility is to provide selected data or Monte Carlo samples that allow the community to develop automated tuning procedures for public fast simulation frameworks, or to train surrogate machine learning models. This would enable data-driven adjustments to improve the fidelity of public packages.

Surrogate models — ML-based approximations of detector effects, trained to reproduce the output of full simulation and/or reconstruction algorithms using a simpler set of input attributes — offer a promising and computationally efficient alternative to full simulation while maintaining good accuracy. The provision of such models directly by the experiments as standalone, ready-to-use components would greatly facilitate reinterpretation efforts by external users. A pioneering step in this direction was done by the ATLAS search for displaced hadronic jets [133], which provided the reconstruction-level efficiencies for the full analysis in the form of a BDT surrogate model [134], see also [135]. In a similar spirit, the Parnassus (particle-flow neural-assisted simulations) project [136], aims at the automatic construction of surrogate models for combined detector simulation and reconstruction.

In parallel to the above mentioned options to enable fast and simplified simulation and reconstruction, experiments should continue improving access to their standard simulation and reconstruction software, for example, by using containers and cloud computing, to support more detailed studies when needed.

### 3.7 Statistical models

The statistical model is an appropriate starting point for any detailed interpretation of experimental results [3] as it provides a complete probabilistic description of the observable data associated with an experimental analysis. When the observed data are entered into the statistical model, the latter becomes the likelihood function of the analysis, which is the key ingredient in any non-trivial statistical inference.

Access to the full statistical model, that is, the model before profiling or marginalization, is of enormous benefit. The full model makes it possible to test new signal hypotheses, while correctly accounting for non-Gaussian effects and nuisance parameter-induced correlations. Through appropriate updates to the full statistical model, analyses can be updated if more precise theoretical calculations, updated parton distribution functions (PDFs) and/or improved experimental calibrations become available. Finally, detailed information about nuisance parameters facilitates the combination of analyses and global fits. Ideally, naming conventions of nuisance parameters should be standardised among analyses to this end.

The release of pyhf [137] and the first full HistFactory models by the ATLAS collaboration [138] in 2019 was met with enthusiasm by the phenomenology community. All major public reinterpretation tools quickly developed interfaces to pyhf. A recent search for statistical models on HEPData or on the ATLAS public results webpage [139] resulted in 41 hits, of which 16 are from searches for supersymmetry and 21 from top-quark analyses. The former statistical models are systematically integrated and used in BSM reinterpretation tools,<sup>7</sup> while the latter have been shown to be highly useful in the EFT context [140]. The

<sup>7</sup>A search on HEPData for, e.g., “analysis:(histfactory AND smodels)” or “analysis:(histfactory AND

CMS collaboration has recently followed suit by publishing their Combine software [141] together with the 2012 Higgs boson observation statistical model [142], and the collaboration plans to systematically release full statistical models [143].

Statistical models released in the pyhf [137] framework have led to it quickly becoming a top-cited paper. This is consistent with the expectation [3] that the release of full statistical models will have high impact in the short, medium and long term. We therefore strongly encourage experimental collaborations to make the publication of full statistical models their standard practice. The development and adoption of the HEP Statistics Serialization Standard (HS3) [144] will further facilitate deployment and reuse in the community.

## 4 Conclusion

The LHC data are a unique scientific resource, and their long-term reusability will be an important legacy of the current scientific community for the generations that follow. The public investment in experimental programs warrants a concerted community-wide effort to ensure that this investment continues to provide scientific value decades from now. At present, the work to preserve HEP results relies on the goodwill of a relatively small number of dedicated individuals. This model is not sustainable and a strategic European-wide approach is needed. Preserving scientific results in a manner that is *useful* does not come for free, however. Dedicated resources are needed, including well-defined career paths and reward structures to attract the highly talented scientific and engineering staff that will be needed. This requires strategic prioritisation by the European community and commensurate resource allocation. Without a strategic approach, the full impact of the public investment in experimental HEP will not be fully realized, to the detriment of the broader European scientific enterprise.

Services such as the CERN Open Data Portal, Zenodo, and HEPData (all European funded) are a good starting point and are having impact, and we note the efforts around HEP data preservation discussed in a related contribution [13]. A concentrated and coordinated effort across the field is needed to make preservation — with reuse in mind! — standard scientific practice. Finally, it should be noted that many of the arguments given in this paper, and the tools described, apply beyond the (HL-)LHC experiments, and that these data are a critical resource for the design and eventual exploitation of future experiments that are currently under discussion.

## Acknowledgements

We thank the LHC Physics Center at CERN and the CERN Theory Department for support in the organisation of workshops associated to this work.

The editors and contributors to this document acknowledge partial support by the CHIST-ERA project OpenMAPP under grants ANR-23-CHRO-0006, EP/Y036360/1 and 2022/04/Y/ST2/00186; STFC under the SwiftHEP grant ST/Y005678/1; the US Department of Energy under grant DE-SC0010102; the FAPESP grants no. 2018/25225-9 and 2021/01089-1; the SMASH COFUND project No. 101081355, co-funded by the Republic of Slovenia and the European Union from the European Regional Development Fund; the National Research Foundation of Korea, NRF, contracts NRF-2021R111A3048138, NRF-2018R1A6A1A06024970 and NRF-2008-00460; and the Excellence Cluster ORIGINS, funded by DFG under Germany’s Excellence Strategy – EXC 2094 – 390783311.

---

checkmate)” shows that 14 of the 16 searches that provide a HistFactory model are being reused by these tools.

## Bibliography

- [1] S. Kraml et al., *Searches for New Physics: Les Houches Recommendations for the Presentation of LHC Results*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 1976 [1203.2489].
- [2] LHC Reinterpretation Forum, *Reinterpretation of LHC Results for New Physics: Status and Recommendations after Run 2*, *SciPost Phys.* **9** (2020) 022 [2003.07868].
- [3] K. Cranmer et al., *Publishing statistical models: Getting the most out of particle physics experiments*, *SciPost Phys.* **12** (2022) 037 [2109.04981].
- [4] S. Bailey et al., *Data and Analysis Preservation, Recasting, and Reinterpretation (Snowmass 2021)*, 2203.10057.
- [5] S. Bailey, K.S. Cranmer, M. Feickert, R. Fine, S. Kraml and C. Lange, *Reinterpretation and Long-Term Preservation of Data and Code (Snowmass 2021)*, 2209.08054.
- [6] J.Y. Araz et al., *Les Houches guide to reusable ML models in LHC analyses*, 2312.14575.
- [7] ATLAS and CMS presentations at the workshops of the LHC Reinterpretation Forum, <https://indico.cern.ch/category/14156/>, 2016–2025.
- [8] M. Wilkinson et al., *The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship*, *Sci Data* **3** (2016) 160018.
- [9] CERN, “CERN Open Data Portal.” <https://opendata.cern.ch/>.
- [10] CERN, *CERN Open Data Policy for the LHC Experiments*, Tech. Rep. CERN-OPEN-2020-013, CERN, Geneva (2020), DOI.
- [11] T. McCauley, “cms-dpoa/data-usage: 24-03-2025.” 10.5281/zenodo.15078671, Mar., 2025.
- [12] DPHEP collaboration, *Data preservation in high energy physics*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 795 [2302.03583].
- [13] DPHEP collaboration, “Data Preservation in High Energy Physics.” document submitted to the ESPPU, March, 2025.
- [14] A. Buckley, P. Ilten, D. Konstantinov, L. Lönnblad, J. Monk, W. Pokorski et al., *The HepMC3 event record library for Monte Carlo event generators*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **260** (2021) 107310 [1912.08005].
- [15] R. Mahbubani and Z. Marshall, “Open event generation.” Invited contribution to 9th workshop Reinterpretation of the LHC results for New Physics, 2025.
- [16] E. Maguire, L. Heinrich and G. Watt, *HEPData: a repository for high energy physics data*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **898** (2017) 102006 [1704.05473].
- [17] A. Buckley and M. Whalley, *HepData reloaded: Reinventing the HEP data archive*, *PoS ACAT2010* (2010) 067 [1006.0517].
- [18] G. Watt. [https://github.com/HEPData/miscellaneous/blob/main/notebooks/count\\_inspire\\_records\\_with\\_hepdata.ipynb](https://github.com/HEPData/miscellaneous/blob/main/notebooks/count_inspire_records_with_hepdata.ipynb).
- [19] S. Kraml, S. Kulkarni, U. Laa, A. Lessa, W. Magerl, D. Proschofsky-Spindler et al., *SModelS: a tool for interpreting simplified-model results from the LHC and its application to supersymmetry*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 2868 [1312.4175].
- [20] F. Ambrogio, S. Kraml, S. Kulkarni, U. Laa, A. Lessa, V. Magerl et al., *SModelS v1.1 user manual: Improving simplified model constraints with efficiency maps*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **227** (2018) 72 [1701.06586].
- [21] F. Ambrogio et al., *SModelS v1.2: long-lived particles, combination of signal regions, and other novelties*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **251** (2020) 106848 [1811.10624].
- [22] G. Alguero, J. Heisig, C.K. Khosa, S. Kraml, S. Kulkarni, A. Lessa et al., *Constraining new physics with SModelS version 2*, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 068 [2112.00769].
- [23] M.M. Altakach, S. Kraml, A. Lessa, S. Narasimha, T. Pascal and W. Waltenberger, *SModelS*

- v2.3: *Enabling global likelihood analyses*, *SciPost Phys.* **15** (2023) 185 [2306.17676].
- [24] M.M. Altakach, S. Kraml, A. Lessa, S. Narasimha, T. Pascal, C. Ramos et al., *SModelS v3: going beyond  $Z_2$  topologies*, *JHEP* **11** (2024) 074 [2409.12942].
- [25] P. Bechtle, O. Brein, S. Heinemeyer, G. Weiglein and K.E. Williams, *HiggsBounds: Confronting Arbitrary Higgs Sectors with Exclusion Bounds from LEP and the Tevatron*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **181** (2010) 138 [0811.4169].
- [26] P. Bechtle, O. Brein, S. Heinemeyer, G. Weiglein and K.E. Williams, *HiggsBounds 2.0.0: Confronting Neutral and Charged Higgs Sector Predictions with Exclusion Bounds from LEP and the Tevatron*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **182** (2011) 2605 [1102.1898].
- [27] P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak and G. Weiglein, *HiggsSignals: Confronting arbitrary Higgs sectors with measurements at the Tevatron and the LHC*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 2711 [1305.1933].
- [28] P. Bechtle, O. Brein, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. Weiglein et al., *HiggsBounds – 4: Improved Tests of Extended Higgs Sectors against Exclusion Bounds from LEP, the Tevatron and the LHC*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 2693 [1311.0055].
- [29] P. Bechtle, D. Dercks, S. Heinemeyer, T. Klingl, T. Stefaniak, G. Weiglein et al., *HiggsBounds-5: Testing Higgs Sectors in the LHC 13 TeV Era*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 1211 [2006.06007].
- [30] P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, T. Klingl, T. Stefaniak, G. Weiglein and J. Wittbrodt, *HiggsSignals-2: Probing new physics with precision Higgs measurements in the LHC 13 TeV era*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 145 [2012.09197].
- [31] H. Bahl, T. Biekötter, S. Heinemeyer, C. Li, S. Paasch, G. Weiglein et al., *HiggsTools: BSM scalar phenomenology with new versions of HiggsBounds and HiggsSignals*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **291** (2023) 108803 [2210.09332].
- [32] P. Ilten, Y. Soreq, M. Williams and W. Xue, *Serendipity in dark photon searches*, *JHEP* **06** (2018) 004 [1801.04847].
- [33] T. Giani, G. Magni and J. Rojo, *SMEFiT: a flexible toolbox for global interpretations of particle physics data with effective field theories*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 393 [2302.06660].
- [34] T. Šimko, L. Heinrich, H. Hirvonsalo, D. Kousidis and D. Rodríguez, *REANA: A System for Reusable Research Data Analyses*, *EPJ Web Conf.* **214** (2019) 06034.
- [35] ATLAS collaboration, *Summary of the ATLAS experiment’s sensitivity to supersymmetry after LHC Run 1 — interpreted in the phenomenological MSSM*, *JHEP* **10** (2015) 134 [1508.06608].
- [36] ATLAS collaboration, *Dark matter interpretations of ATLAS searches for the electroweak production of supersymmetric particles in  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV proton-proton collisions*, *JHEP* **09** (2016) 175 [1608.00872].
- [37] ATLAS collaboration, *A re-interpretation of  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV ATLAS results on electroweak supersymmetry production to explore general gauge mediated models*, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2016-033 (7, 2016).
- [38] ATLAS collaboration, *RECAST framework reinterpretation of an ATLAS Dark Matter Search constraining a model of a dark Higgs boson decaying to two b-quarks*, Tech. Rep. ATL-PHYS-PUB-2019-032, CERN, Geneva (2019).
- [39] ATLAS collaboration, *Constraining the Dark Sector with the monojet signature in the ATLAS experiment*, Tech. Rep. ATL-PHYS-PUB-2021-020, CERN, Geneva (2021).
- [40] ATLAS collaboration, *Active Learning reinterpretation of an ATLAS Dark Matter search constraining a model of a dark Higgs boson decaying to two b-quarks*, Tech. Rep. ATL-PHYS-PUB-2022-045, CERN, Geneva (2022).
- [41] ATLAS collaboration, *ATLAS Run 2 searches for electroweak production of supersymmetric particles interpreted within the pMSSM*, *JHEP* **05** (2024) 106 [2402.01392].

- [42] C. Bierlich et al., *Robust Independent Validation of Experiment and Theory: Rivet version 3*, *SciPost Phys.* **8** (2020) 026 [1912.05451].
- [43] M. Drees, H. Dreiner, D. Schmeier, J. Tattersall and J.S. Kim, *CheckMATE: Confronting your Favourite New Physics Model with LHC Data*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **187** (2015) 227 [1312.2591].
- [44] D. Dercks, N. Desai, J.S. Kim, K. Rolbiecki, J. Tattersall and T. Weber, *CheckMATE 2: From the model to the limit*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **221** (2017) 383 [1611.09856].
- [45] B. Dumont, B. Fuks, S. Kraml, S. Bein, G. Chalons, E. Conte et al., *Toward a public analysis database for LHC new physics searches using MADANALYSIS 5*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 56 [1407.3278].
- [46] E. Conte and B. Fuks, *Confronting new physics theories to LHC data with MADANALYSIS 5*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **33** (2018) 1830027 [1808.00480].
- [47] M.D. Goodsell, *HackAnalysis 2: A powerful and hackable recasting tool*, 2406.10042.
- [48] GAMBIT collaboration, *ColliderBit: a GAMBIT module for the calculation of high-energy collider observables and likelihoods*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 795 [1705.07919].
- [49] A. Buckley, D. Kar and K. Nordström, *Fast simulation of detector effects in Rivet*, *SciPost Phys.* **8** (2020) 025 [1910.01637].
- [50] ATLAS collaboration, *SimpleAnalysis: Truth-level Analysis Framework*, Tech. Rep. ATL-PHYS-PUB-2022-017 (2022), DOI.
- [51] “SimpleAnalysis, v1.1.0.” <https://simpleanalysis.docs.cern.ch>.
- [52] H.B. Prosper, S. Sekmen and G. Unel, *Analysis Description Language: A DSL for HEP Analysis*, in *Snowmass 2021*, 3, 2022 [2203.09886].
- [53] M. Habedank, “Code "reinterpretation metadata analysis".” DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15076716, Mar., 2025.
- [54] E. Conte, B. Dumont, B. Fuks and C. Wymant, *Designing and recasting LHC analyses with MadAnalysis 5*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 3103 [1405.3982].
- [55] GAMBIT collaboration, *GAMBIT: The Global and Modular Beyond-the-Standard-Model Inference Tool*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 784 [1705.07908].
- [56] A. Kvellestad, P. Scott and M. White, *GAMBIT and its application in the search for physics Beyond the Standard Model*, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **113** (2020) 103769 [1912.04079].
- [57] E. Alvarez, M. Estévez and R.M. Sandá Seoane, *Z'-explorer: A simple tool to probe Z' models against LHC data*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **269** (2021) 108144 [2005.05194].
- [58] A. Buckley et al., *Testing new physics models with global comparisons to collider measurements: the Contur toolkit*, *SciPost Phys. Core* **4** (2021) 013 [2102.04377].
- [59] CHECKMATE collaboration, *Constraining electroweak and strongly charged long-lived particles with CheckMATE*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 968 [2104.04542].
- [60] V.M. Lozano, R.M.S. Seoane and J. Zurita, *Z'-explorer 2.0: Reconnoitering the dark matter landscape*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **288** (2023) 108729 [2109.13194].
- [61] J.Y. Araz, B. Fuks, M.D. Goodsell and M. Utsch, *Recasting LHC searches for long-lived particles with MadAnalysis 5*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 597 [2112.05163].
- [62] J. Bernon and B. Dumont, *Lilith: a tool for constraining new physics from Higgs measurements*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 440 [1502.04138].
- [63] S. Kraml, T.Q. Loc, D.T. Nhung and L.D. Ninh, *Constraining new physics from Higgs measurements with Lilith: update to LHC Run 2 results*, *SciPost Phys.* **7** (2019) 052 [1908.03952].
- [64] A. Buckley, J. Butterworth, D. Grellscheid, H. Hoeth, L. Lonnblad, J. Monk et al., *Rivet user manual*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **184** (2013) 2803 [1003.0694].

- [65] C. Bierlich et al., *Confronting experimental data with heavy-ion models: RIVET for heavy ions*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 485 [2001.10737].
- [66] C. Bierlich, A. Buckley, J.M. Butterworth, C. Gutschow, L. Lonnblad, T. Procter et al., *Robust independent validation of experiment and theory: Rivet version 4 release note*, *SciPost Phys. Codeb.* **36** (2024) 1 [2404.15984].
- [67] S. La Cagnina, K. Kröniger, S. Kluth and A. Verbytskyi, *A Bayesian tune of the Herwig Monte Carlo event generator*, *JINST* **18** (2023) P10033 [2302.01139].
- [68] S. Baum, M. Carena, T. Ou, D. Rocha, N.R. Shah and C.E.M. Wagner, *Lighting up the LHC with Dark Matter*, *JHEP* **11** (2023) 037 [2303.01523].
- [69] J.Y. Araz, A. Buckley and B. Fuks, *Searches for new physics with boosted top quarks in the MadAnalysis 5 and Rivet frameworks*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 664 [2303.03427].
- [70] A. Chakraborty, S. Dasmahapatra, H. Day-Hall, B. Ford, S. Jain and S. Moretti, *Fat b-jet analyses using old and new clustering algorithms in new Higgs boson searches at the LHC*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 347 [2303.05189].
- [71] C. Chang, P. Scott, T.E. Gonzalo, F. Kahlhoefer and M. White, *Global fits of simplified models for dark matter with GAMBIT: II. Vector dark matter with an s-channel vector mediator*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 692 [2303.08351].
- [72] GAMBIT collaboration, *Collider constraints on electroweakinos in the presence of a light gravitino*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 493 [2303.09082].
- [73] J.R. Andersen, A. Maier and D. Maître, *Efficient negative-weight elimination in large high-multiplicity Monte Carlo event samples*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 835 [2303.15246].
- [74] H.K. Dreiner, Y.S. Koay, D. Köhler, V.M. Lozano, J. Montejo Berlingen, S. Nangia et al., *The ABC of RPV: classification of R-parity violating signatures at the LHC for small couplings*, *JHEP* **07** (2023) 215 [2306.07317].
- [75] J. Carrasco and J. Zurita, *Emerging jet probes of strongly interacting dark sectors*, *JHEP* **01** (2024) 034 [2307.04847].
- [76] J.Y. Araz, *Spey: Smooth inference for reinterpretation studies*, *SciPost Phys.* **16** (2024) 032 [2307.06996].
- [77] H. Baer, V. Barger, J. Dutta, D. Sengupta and K. Zhang, *Top squarks from the landscape at high luminosity LHC*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 075027 [2307.08067].
- [78] C. Arina, B. Fuks, J. Heisig, M. Krämer, L. Mantani and L. Panizzi, *Comprehensive exploration of t-channel simplified models of dark matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 115007 [2307.10367].
- [79] H. Bahl, S. Koren and L.-T. Wang, *Topopportunities at the LHC: rare top decays with light singlets*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 1100 [2307.11154].
- [80] N. Brahma, S. Heeba and K. Schutz, *Resonant pseudo-Dirac dark matter as a sub-GeV thermal target*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 035006 [2308.01960].
- [81] FASER collaboration, *Search for dark photons with the FASER detector at the LHC*, *Phys. Lett. B* **848** (2024) 138378 [2308.05587].
- [82] S. K. A., A. Das, G. Lambiase, T. Nomura and Y. Orikasa, *Probing chiral and flavored  $Z'$  from cosmic bursts through neutrino interactions*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 1224 [2308.14483].
- [83] P. Coloma, J. Martín-Albo and S. Urrea, *Discovering long-lived particles at DUNE*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 035013 [2309.06492].
- [84] L.M. Carpenter, H. Gilmer, J. Kawamura and T. Murphy, *Taking aim at the wino-Higgsino plane with the LHC*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 015012 [2309.07213].
- [85] M. Fieg, F. Kling, H. Schulz and T. Sjöstrand, *Tuning pythia for forward physics experiments*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 016010 [2309.08604].
- [86] J. Butterworth, H. Debnath, P. Fileviez Perez and F. Mitchell, *Custodial symmetry breaking and*



- Higgs boson signatures at the LHC*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 095014 [2309.10027].
- [87] H. Acaroğlu, M. Blanke and M. Tabet, *Opening the Higgs portal to lepton-flavoured dark matter*, *JHEP* **11** (2023) 079 [2309.10700].
- [88] L. Buonocore, F. Kling, L. Rottoli and J. Sominka, *Predictions for neutrinos and new physics from forward heavy hadron production at the LHC*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 363 [2309.12793].
- [89] A. Dey, V. Keus, S. Moretti and C. Shepherd-Themistocleous, *A smoking gun signature of the 3HDM*, *JHEP* **07** (2024) 038 [2310.06593].
- [90] D. Agin, B. Fuks, M.D. Goodsell and T. Murphy, *Monojets reveal overlapping excesses for light compressed higgsinos*, *Phys. Lett. B* **853** (2024) 138597 [2311.17149].
- [91] H. Baer, V. Barger, J. Bolich, J. Dutta and D. Sengupta, *Natural anomaly mediation from the landscape with implications for LHC SUSY searches*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 035011 [2311.18120].
- [92] A. Banerjee, V. Ellajosyula and L. Panizzi, *Heavy vector-like quarks decaying to exotic scalars: a case study with triplets*, *JHEP* **01** (2024) 187 [2311.17877].
- [93] A. Lessa and V. Sanz, *Going beyond Top EFT*, *JHEP* **04** (2024) 107 [2312.00670].
- [94] M. Frank, B. Fuks, A. Jueid, S. Moretti and O. Ozdal, *A novel search strategy for right-handed charged gauge bosons at the Large Hadron Collider*, *JHEP* **02** (2024) 150 [2312.08521].
- [95] H. Acaroğlu, M. Blanke, J. Heisig, M. Krämer and L. Rathmann, *Flavoured Majorana Dark Matter then and now: from freeze-out scenarios to LHC signatures*, *JHEP* **06** (2024) 179 [2312.09274].
- [96] L.M. Carpenter, K. Schwind and T. Murphy, *Leptonic signatures of color-sextet scalars. II. Exploiting unique large- $ET_{\text{miss}}$  signals at the LHC*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 075010 [2312.09273].
- [97] E. Bagnaschi, G. Corcella, R. Franceschini and D. Sengupta, *Rise and Fall of Light Top Squarks in the LHC Top-Quark Sample*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133** (2024) 061801 [2312.09794].
- [98] D. Amram, K. Bouzoud, N. Chanon, H. Hansen, M.R. Ribeiro, Jr. and M. Schreck, *New Constraint for Isotropic Lorentz Violation from LHC Data*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132** (2024) 211801 [2312.11307].
- [99] M.M. Altakach, S. Kraml, A. Lessa, S. Narasimha, T. Pascal, T. Reymermier et al., *Global LHC constraints on electroweak-inos with SModelS v2.3*, *SciPost Phys.* **16** (2024) 101 [2312.16635].
- [100] V. De Romeri, D.K. Papoulias and C.A. Ternes, *Light vector mediators at direct detection experiments*, *JHEP* **05** (2024) 165 [2402.05506].
- [101] R.K. Barman, G. Bélanger, B. Bhattacharjee, R. Godbole and R. Sengupta, *Current status of the light neutralino thermal dark matter in the phenomenological MSSM*, *Phys. Rev. D* **111** (2025) 015014 [2402.07991].
- [102] L. Gärtner, N. Hartmann, L. Heinrich, M. Horstmann, T. Kuhr, M. Reboud et al., *Constructing model-agnostic likelihoods, a method for the reinterpretation of particle physics results*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 693 [2402.08417].
- [103] J. Kalinowski and W. Kotlarski, *Interpreting 95 GeV di-photon/ $b\bar{b}$  excesses as a lightest Higgs boson of the MRSSM*, *JHEP* **07** (2024) 037 [2403.08720].
- [104] P. Dehghani, M. Frank and B. Fuks, *Collider imprint of vector-like leptons in light of anomalous magnetic moment and neutrino data*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 1284 [2403.11862].
- [105] A. Feike, J. Fiaschi, B. Fuks, M. Klasen and A. Puck Neuwirth, *Combination and reinterpretation of LHC SUSY searches*, *JHEP* **07** (2024) 122 [2403.11715].
- [106] M. Chakraborti, S. Heinemeyer and I. Saha, *Consistent excesses in the search for  $\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ : wino/bino vs. Higgsino dark matter*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 812 [2403.14759].
- [107] G. Cacciapaglia, A. Deandrea, M. Kunkel and W. Porod, *Coloured spin-1 states in composite*

- Higgs models*, *JHEP* **06** (2024) 092 [2404.02198].
- [108] R. Baruah, S. Mondal, S.K. Patra and S. Roy, *Probing intractable beyond-standard-model parameter spaces armed with machine learning*, *Eur. Phys. J. ST* **233** (2024) 2597 [2404.02698].
- [109] S. Argyropoulos, U. Haisch and I. Kalaitzidou, *Novel collider signatures in the type-I 2HDM+a model*, *JHEP* **07** (2024) 263 [2404.05704].
- [110] D. Agin, B. Fuks, M.D. Goodsell and T. Murphy, *Seeking a coherent explanation of LHC excesses for compressed spectra*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 1218 [2404.12423].
- [111] J. Heisig, A. Lessa and L.M.D. Ramos, *Probing conversion-driven freeze-out at the LHC*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 015031 [2404.16086].
- [112] U. Ellwanger, C. Hugonie, S.F. King and S. Moretti, *NMSSM explanation for excesses in the search for neutralinos and charginos and a 95 GeV Higgs boson*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 788 [2404.19338].
- [113] J. Butterworth, H. Debnath, P. Fileviez Perez and Y. Yeh, *Dark matter from anomaly cancellation at the LHC*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 075001 [2405.03749].
- [114] S. Balan et al., *Resonant or asymmetric: the status of sub-GeV dark matter*, *JCAP* **01** (2025) 053 [2405.17548].
- [115] J. Cruz-Martinez, S. Forte, N. Laurenti, T.R. Rabemananjara and J. Rojo, *LO, NLO, and NNLO parton distributions for LHC event generators*, *JHEP* **09** (2024) 088 [2406.12961].
- [116] R. Boto, P.N. Figueiredo, J.C. Romão and J.a.P. Silva, *Novel two component dark matter features in the  $Z_2 \times Z_2$  3HDM*, *JHEP* **11** (2024) 108 [2407.15933].
- [117] L. Corpe, A. Goudelis, S. Jeannot and S.H. Jeon, *Probing exotic long-lived particles from the prompt side using the CONTUR method*, *JHEP* **02** (2025) 033 [2407.18710].
- [118] C. Arbeláez, G. Cottin, J.C. Helo, M. Hirsch and T.B. de Melo, *Long-lived particle phenomenology in one-loop neutrino mass models with dark matter*, *JHEP* **02** (2025) 049 [2408.03364].
- [119] J.M. Butterworth, I. Helenius, J.J.J. Castella, B. Pattengale, S. Sanjrani and M. Wing, *Modelling the underlying event in photon-initiated processes*, *SciPost Phys.* **17** (2024) 158 [2408.15842].
- [120] B. Fuks, M.D. Goodsell and T. Murphy, *Monojets from compressed weak frustrated dark matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **111** (2025) 055010 [2409.03014].
- [121] Y.-Z. Fan, Y.-Y. Li, C.-T. Lu, X.-Y. Luo, T.-P. Tang, V.Q. Tran et al., *Current status of inert Higgs dark matter with dark fermions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **111** (2025) 015046 [2410.00638].
- [122] P. Athron, A. Crivellin, T.E. Gonzalo, S. Iguro and C. Sierra, *Global fit to the 2HDM with generic sources of flavour violation using GAMBIT*, *JHEP* **11** (2024) 133 [2410.10493].
- [123] C.-T. Lu, X. Wang, X. Wei and Y. Wu, *Probing long-lived doubly charged scalar in the Georgi-Machacek model at the LHC and in far detectors*, *JHEP* **02** (2025) 149 [2410.19561].
- [124] A.S. Cornell, B. Fuks, M.D. Goodsell and A.M. Ncube, *Improving smuon searches with neural networks*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **85** (2025) 51 [2411.04526].
- [125] J.S. Kim, K. Rolbiecki, K. Sakurai and J. Tattersall, *'Stop' that ambulance! New physics at the LHC?*, *JHEP* **12** (2014) 010 [1406.0858].
- [126] G.F. Giudice, M. McCullough and D. Teresi, *dE/dx from boosted long-lived particles*, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 012 [2205.04473].
- [127] S. Kraml, "Citation counts for reinterpretation tools." jupyter notebook DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15084457, Mar., 2025.
- [128] ALICE collaboration. <https://github.com/Alice02Group/Alice02>.
- [129] ATLAS collaboration. <https://gitlab.cern.ch/atlas/athena>.
- [130] CMS collaboration. <https://github.com/cms-sw/cmssw>.

- [131] LHCb collaboration. <https://gitlab.cern.ch/lhcb/Gaudi>.
- [132] DELPHES 3 collaboration, *DELPHES 3, A modular framework for fast simulation of a generic collider experiment*, *JHEP* **02** (2014) 057 [1307.6346].
- [133] ATLAS collaboration, *Search for neutral long-lived particles that decay into displaced jets in the ATLAS calorimeter in association with leptons or jets using pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV*, *JHEP* **11** (2024) 036 [2407.09183].
- [134] L.D. Corpe and H. Abdelhamid, “Re-interpretation BDTs for ATLAS-EXOT-2022-04.” DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12957030, July, 2024.
- [135] A. Haddad, “ATLAS-EXOT-2022-04: Using a BDT to recast Displaced hadronic jets with leptons or extra jets.” RAMP seminar, 16 Oct 2024, <https://indico.cern.ch/event/1463907/>.
- [136] E. Dreyer, E. Gross, D. Kobylanski, V. Mikuni, B. Nachman and N. Soybelman, *Automated Approach to Accurate, Precise, and Fast Detector Simulation and Reconstruction*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133** (2024) 211902 [2406.01620].
- [137] L. Heinrich, M. Feickert, G. Stark and K. Cranmer, *pyhf: pure-Python implementation of HistFactory statistical models*, *J. Open Source Softw.* **6** (2021) 2823.
- [138] ATLAS collaboration, *Reproducing searches for new physics with the ATLAS experiment through publication of full statistical likelihoods*, Tech. Rep. ATL-PHYS-PUB-2019-029, CERN, Geneva (2019).
- [139] <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/AtlasPublic>.
- [140] N. Elmer, M. Madigan, T. Plehn and N. Schmal, *Staying on Top of SMEFT-Likelihood Analyses*, 2312.12502.
- [141] CMS collaboration, *The CMS Statistical Analysis and Combination Tool: Combine, Comput. Softw. Big Sci.* **8** (2024) 19 [2404.06614].
- [142] CMS Collaboration, “CMS Higgs boson observation statistical model.” DOI: 10.17181/c2948-e8875, Apr., 2024.
- [143] S. Sekmen, *Publishing full statistical models of CMS physics analyses*, *PoS ICHEP2024* (2025) 988.
- [144] HS3 collaboration. <https://github.com/hep-statistics-serialization-standard/hep-statistics-serialization-standard>.