

Blind analysis in Physics experiments: Is this trip necessary?

R. Golub

Physics Dept, North Carolina State University,
Raleigh, NC 26695

November 23, 2023

Abstract

Based on the work of Klein and Roodman [[2]] we present an alternate conclusion as to the charm of blind analysis in physics experiments.

1 Introduction

Blind analysis was introduced into scientific experimentation in order to avoid the problem that in experiments with human subjects subtle clues from the experimenter can influence the response of the subject, initiating the dreaded placebo effect. However even double blinding (where both the subject and the experimenter are unaware of the situation) has proved inadequate where big pharma is involved and it has been necessary to introduce pre-registration of clinical trials as described in [2]. It has now become almost conventional to employ these techniques in physic experiments. According to Richard Feynman [1]

”It’s a thing that scientists are ashamed of- this history- because it’s apparent that people did things like this: When they got a number that was too high above Millikan’s, they thought something must be wrong - and they would look for and find a reason why something might be wrong. When they got a number closer to Millikan’s they didn’t look so hard...

The first principle is that you should not fool yourself - and you are the easiest person to fool.” [1]

Peter Galison [3] has given several very interesting examples showing how the decision to end an experiment (i.e. stop searching for systematic errors) is influenced by previous known values of the quantity being measured. Blind analysis would evidently help to avoid such situations.

Klein and Roodman [2] have given a detailed argument in support of the need for blind analysis in nuclear and particle experiments and have analyzed several methods of carrying this out. The abstract of their paper summarizes the argument:

”During the past decade, blind analysis has become a widely used tool in nuclear and particle physics experiments. A blind analysis avoids the possibility of experimenters biasing their results toward their own preconceptions by preventing them from knowing the answer until the analysis is complete. There is at least circumstantial evidence that such a bias has affected past measurements, and as experiments become costlier and more difficult and hence harder to reproduce, the possibility of bias has become a more important issue than in the past. We describe here the motivations for performing a blind analysis, and give several modern examples of successful blind analysis strategies.”

The goal of this paper is to discuss some of the arguments in that paper

2 The case for blind analysis and some counter-arguments

Figure 2 of [2] shows historical plots of the measurements of 4 quantities. The circles are the results of individual measurements and the dashed lines show the 1σ limits of the published average of the quantity at the time of measurement. The dotted horizontal lines are the values accepted at the time of publication of [2]. The authors calculate that the χ^2 value for the hypothesis that the measurements are normally distributed around the previous averages are about 1/2 those associated with the hypothesis that they are normally distributed around the current accepted values. The dramatic shifts in value are seen to coincide with large improvements in accuracy, indicating a radical switch in measurement technique so that experimenter bias is not evident here. The authors themselves conclude:

”Although we cannot say conclusively whether bias has influenced measurements in nuclear and particle physics, the way to avoid even the possibilities is to follow Dunnington’s and Pfungst’s examples and perform measurements while staying blind to the value of our answer.”

However blind analysis has real costs in that it can severely inhibit the search for systematic errors and can preclude studies of unexpected events that occur in ‘blinded’ regions of the parameter space. To introduce these methods in an attempt to solve a problem that may be non-existent (“..avoid even the possibility ..”) seems to the present author to be overkill. The authors give an example of a case where blinding provided a serious obstacle to the performance of an experiment:

”While looking for the decay $\pi^+ \rightarrow e^+\nu$, we focused all our attention on reducing backgrounds, since a prior experiment had set a limit




Figure 2 The history of four measurements compared to published averages before each measurement was made (dashed curves) and the currently accepted value (dotted lines). The space between the dashed curves indicates the 1σ uncertainties on the published values at the time each measurement was made.

Figure 1:

at the level of 10^{-6} on the branching ratio. When we heard that an experiment at CERN had seen a signal around 10^{-4} I switched from delayed to prompt. The signal was right there, and could have been seen on the first day (B. Richter, private communication).”

In addition

”We note that none of the blind techniques we describe here—and perhaps no blind technique—can be applied to an analysis in which backgrounds are cut or signals identified by event-by-event human inspection”.

Again quoting from [2]

”...what to do if the analysis breaks down...It is not necessary in the blind analysis approach to insist that, because an analysis was done blindly, no additional selections may be applied....The blind analysis method does not require that data analysis stop after unblinding, nor does it ensure that the results of the analysis are correct. There is no reason to publish an analysis known to be wrong just because the analysis was done blindly.

Multiple independent analyses are occasionally suggested as a way to prevent experimenter’s bias.”

In describing a use of blinding in a measurement of the gravitational force:

”The Irvine group’s measurement relied on precise knowledge of many different detector parameters—the dimensions of the torsion balance and test masses, the positions of the test masses, and of course the masses of all test components. To prevent themselves from selecting data in a biased way, or from (in their words) “slackening of analysis effort” when their answer began to meet their expectations (what we have called a stopping bias), they kept the value of their near mass known only to 1%—the exact mass known only to someone outside their collaboration. They used the true value of the mass only when they had completed the analysis and were ready to report their initial results. Subsequent improvements to the analysis were made and later published, but they nevertheless published the measurement made before these improvements were made.”.

So that it appears that at least in this case ”an analysis known to be wrong” was published ”just because the analysis was done blindly”.

Further

”The next quandary may occur if there are more events in the signal box than expected from backgrounds, but the events are *very inconsistent with the expected signal properties.*” (emphasis added)

So it appears preconceived notions cannot be completely banished.

Klein and Roodman give another example of a case of blind analysis:

”KTeV used a hidden offset directly in its ε'/ε fit. Instead of fitting for the value of ε'/ε , the fit used

$$\varepsilon'/\varepsilon(\text{Hidden}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} + \\ - \end{array} \right\} 1 \times \varepsilon'/\varepsilon + C \quad (1)$$

where C was a hidden random constant, and the choice of 1 or -1 was also hidden and random.

The +1 or -1 in the hidden value served to hide the direction ε'/ε changed as different corrections or selections were applied (48). In practice, KTeV had to remove the sign choice at an earlier stage to permit a full evaluation of systematic errors. Nevertheless, the first KTeV ε'/ε result was unblinded only one week before the result was made public.

The addition of an unknown sign also hides the direction the result has moved with changes to the analysis.”

So it appears that overzealous blinding (of the sign) was incompatible with a proper consideration of systematic errors.

3 Discussion

Based on the paper by Klein and Roodman [2] written in support of the use of blind analysis in physics experiments we have attempted to show that the method, introduced into science by medical researchers to solve a real problem, has little place in physics research, since, as the authors admit there is surprisingly little evidence for experimenter bias in physics research even taking into account the cases cited by Feynman [1] and Galison [3]. and the introduction of the technique has real costs in both the ability to study systematic errors that are often unknown at the planning stage of the experiment and come to light during the measurement and analysis and the ability to follow up unexpected results which may only show up after opening the box.

The experience in medical research has shown that even double blind analysis is not sufficient to avoid experimental bias when the experimenter's are really determined. Physicists on the other hand still have the ability to follow the advice of my mentor, Prof Gerrold R. Zacharias who often repeated the statement that experimental physics was really all about Character.

References

- [1] Feynman, R. 'Surely You're joking Mr. Feynman' , Norton (1985) as quoted in ([2])
- [2] Klein, J. and Roodman, A. 'Blind analysis in nuclear and particle physics' Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **55**, 141-63, (2005)
- [3] Gallison, Peter, 'How experiments end', Univ. Chicago Press (1987)