

Comment on "Search for the Standard Model Higgs Boson in the Missing Energy and Acoplanar b-Jet Topology at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV"

E. Donth

Institut für Physik, Universität Halle,

D-06099 Halle (Saale), Germany

E-mail: donth@physik.uni-halle.de

A DO paper of 2008 is exemplarily commented to demonstrate the general risk that the development of a new paradigm for astroparticle physics can be hindered by the work of large collaborations. This paper allows sharp formulations because only the simplest Higgs variant is treated.

PACS numbers: 01.10 Hx, 13.85 Rm, 14.80 Bn

The research paper^[1] of a larger collaboration is exemplarily criticized with respect to consequences that often follow from the organization of communicability inside and between large collaborations, and from the publication in leading journals of the physical community for particle physics and cosmology. The paper from the DO collaboration has 519 authors from 82 groups in 35 large societies worldwide. The publication and readability necessarily requires the communicability between several 10^4 scientists. It is shown that the development of a new Kuhnian paradigm - which must not be excluded today - is quantitatively suppressed by such papers.

Suppose that a small-step method is necessary to maintain communicability: only one or a very few concepts are allowed to be changed. As a specific example, let there be a step succession: SM \rightarrow (y/n)Higgs \rightarrow (y/n) SUSY \rightarrow (y/n) independent quarks \rightarrow [For Higgs, y = yes means, according to Nambu^[2], that the "mass of a particle is a self-energy due to interaction", and n = no possibly means, alternatively, Pauli's vision that a quantum theory should also define its numerical parameters; e.g. via some kind of renormalization accompanying any experiment, as slightly suggested for charge and mass. SM = standard model, SUSY = supersymmetry, and independent quarks are related to a hypothetical quark gluon plasma without three-legged animals.] Assume that the new paradigm - right or wrong - contains 20 new concepts. Then 20 quite independent y/n decisions are hidden. The probability to arrive at the new paradigm would be of order $P = 2^{-20} \approx 10^{-6}$, i.e. practically zero.

Alternatively, a new paradigm may be arrived by a neural network method. The old paradigm is partitioned into 20 remainders that are connected anew by consistency. This method is suggestive of the connections between neurons in the human brain and is able to learn by iterations. An off-site model is invented if the iterations converge off the succession. To get the model, about 2000 trials seem to be sufficient. This number stems from the iterations of the 20 remainders, of the $20 \cdot 19/2 = 190$ connections, and of the many more new relations between them. One trial costs, by experience, about 10 working hours. Then the method requires communicability by the inventor over about 40 years. Nevertheless, the result is neither communicable nor able to be published in today's community.

The situation becomes even more serious by a sociological factor from the large and increasing number (N) of committed scientific participants. Psychologically, infinite fluctuations ($\alpha < 2$) or even infinite expectations ($\alpha < 1$) for a gain of reputation (fame) require the treatment of Lévy limit distributions. The hierarchical structure in a Lévy sum is described in^[3]. Call $(X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_N)/N^{1/\alpha}$ the scaled ordered Lévy sum, X_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, N$) their random variables for the gain, and α the Lévy exponent. The amplification factor $N^{1/\alpha}$ is necessary for scaling and for obtaining a nontrivial limit distribution. Assume the ratio of new to old numbers is $N'/N'' = 100$. Then, from hierarchy arguments, the ratio of powers of the corresponding communities is $1/P' = (N'/N'')^{1/\alpha} = 100^{1/\alpha}$. [The fame may be suggested to be larger and in their time, if there is no alternative.] Gauss ($\alpha = 2$) is not critical, $P' = 1/10$; Cauchy ($\alpha = 1$) at the borderline to infinite expectation is $P' = 1/100$, and greed for fame ($\alpha = 1/2$) is $P' = 1/10000$: large power, sharp hierarchies, and preponderant components in the communities.

The total probability to get a new paradigm amounts to $P(\text{tot}) = PP' = 10^{-10} \approx 0$ for $\alpha = 1/2$. This result excludes definitely that an off-site model - if existing - can be detected via communicability and can be published today or in the near future. [The^[1] experiments are very useful, but the parameter handling may be risky without Higgs.] This communication difficulty may leave physics in a trap, by overstretching and exhaustion of the old paradigm. The knowledge of a new paradigm, however, is necessary for a Kuhnian revolution: "Competition between segments of the scientific community is the only historical process that ever results in the ... [change of paradigms]"^[4]. The way out from the hard dilemma is recovery of liveliness. We need a method offering a fast way to the acceptance of competing segments. The task concerns two institutions: the publication journals and the scientific organizers of the collaborations. Serious alternative suggestions should become publishable, perhaps under the category of "paradigmatic off-site models", before belatedly a certain number of noes in the succession becomes obvious; and should not be forbidden in the collaborations, but at least partly be supported. The problem is the growing numbers:

of new concepts for a new paradigm and of committed scientists.

- ^[1] V.M. Abazov et al. (DO Collaboration), *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 101, 251802 (2008).
- ^[2] Y. Nambu, *Proc. Tenth Intern.Conf.High Energy Phys.*, Rochester (Studer, Geneva, 1960).
- ^[3] F. Bardou, J.-P. Bouchaud, A. Aspect, and C. Cohen-Tannoudij, *Lévy Statistics and Laser Cooling* (University, Cambridge, 2002), p.50.
- ^[4] T.S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (University, Chicago, Third Ed. 1996), pp.8, 150, 198.