In order to study the uncertainty in a measured asymmetry and how to combine independent measurements of the same asymmetry; first consider an asymmetry, $A$, determined from:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{N^{+}-N^{-}}{N^{+}+N^{-}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For simplicity define $N=N^{+}+N^{-}$, then:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{N^{+}-N^{-}}{N} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

To clarify the derivation of uncertainty in a measured asymmetry define a probability, $q$, for a given event to be within the set of $N^{+}$events as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
q=\frac{N^{+}}{N} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since an event is either in the set $N^{+}$or the set $N^{-}$; the probability for a given event to be within the set $N^{-}$is then $1-q$ and the asymmetry can be written as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=q-(1-q)=2 q-1 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The variance of $A, \sigma_{A}^{2}$, is then simply related to the variance of $q$ by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{A}^{2}=4 \sigma_{q}^{2} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

And the variance of $q$ is simply related to the variance in $N^{+}$by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{q}^{2}=\frac{\sigma_{N^{+}}^{2}}{N^{2}} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The statistics for $N^{+}$is binomial since an event is either in $N^{+}$, with probability $q$, or it isn't, with probability $1-q$; thus the variance for $N^{+}$is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{N^{+}}^{2}=N q(1-q) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore the variance for the measured asymmetry is ${ }^{1}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{A}^{2}=\frac{4 q(1-q)}{N}=\frac{4 N^{+} N^{-}}{N^{3}} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]Now, if there are two independent measurements of $A$, namely $A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$ given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{1}=\frac{N_{1}^{+}-N_{1}^{-}}{N_{1}}=2 q_{1}-1 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{2}=\frac{N_{2}^{+}-N_{2}^{-}}{N_{2}}=2 q_{2}-1 \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

then the variance weighted average is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{\frac{A_{1}}{\sigma_{A_{1}}^{2}}+\frac{A_{2}}{\sigma_{A_{2}}^{2}}}{\frac{1}{\sigma_{A_{1}}^{2}}+\frac{1}{\sigma_{A_{2}}^{2}}} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting for the variances in terms of $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$ and simplifying yields:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{A_{1} N_{1} q_{2}\left(1-q_{2}\right)+A_{2} N_{2} q_{1}\left(1-q_{1}\right)}{N_{1} q_{2}\left(1-q_{2}\right)+N_{2} q_{1}\left(1-q_{1}\right)} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{\left(N_{1}^{+}-N_{1}^{-}\right) q_{2}\left(1-q_{2}\right)+\left(N_{2}^{+}-N_{2}^{-}\right) q_{1}\left(1-q_{1}\right)}{N_{1} q_{2}\left(1-q_{2}\right)+N_{2} q_{1}\left(1-q_{1}\right)} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the variance of the weighted average is simply:

$$
\begin{align*}
\sigma_{A}^{2} & =\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\sigma_{A_{1}}^{2}}+\frac{1}{\sigma_{A_{2}}^{2}}}  \tag{14}\\
& =\frac{4 q_{1}\left(1-q_{1}\right) q_{2}\left(1-q_{2}\right)}{N_{1} q_{2}\left(1-q_{2}\right)+N_{2} q_{1}\left(1-q_{1}\right)} \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

While we have two independent measures of the probability for an event to be in the "+" category, namely $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$; in principle these should be the same quantity and, assuming all measures are equally good, we can replace $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$ with simply $q$ yielding the much more manageable equations:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{A_{1} N_{1}+A_{2} N_{2}}{N_{1}+N_{2}} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{\left(N_{1}^{+}-N_{1}^{-}\right)+\left(N_{2}^{+}-N_{2}^{-}\right)}{N_{1}+N_{2}} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{A}^{2}=\frac{4 q(1-q)}{N_{1}+N_{2}} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we should use:

$$
\begin{equation*}
q=\frac{N_{1}^{+}+N_{2}^{+}}{N_{1}+N_{2}} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is the variance weighted average of $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$.
The above of course extends to multiple independent measurements in an obvious manner:

$$
\begin{align*}
A & =\frac{\sum A_{i} N_{i}}{\sum N_{i}}  \tag{20}\\
& =\frac{\sum\left(N_{i}^{+}-N_{i}^{-}\right)}{\sum N_{i}}  \tag{21}\\
\sigma_{A}^{2} & =\frac{4 q(1-q)}{\sum N_{i}}  \tag{22}\\
q & =\frac{\sum N_{i}^{+}}{\sum N_{i}} \tag{23}
\end{align*}
$$

The situation is slightly more complicated when the asymmetry to be determined is not measured directly but depends on a polarisation used in the experiment. Then:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{N^{+}-N^{-}}{N}=P A^{\text {true }} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{\text {true }}=\frac{A}{P}=\frac{N^{+}-N^{-}}{N P}=\frac{2 q-1}{P} \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A$ is the measured asymmetry as before, $P$ is the polarisation used in the experiment, and $A^{\text {true }}$ is the "true" asymmetry to be determined.

Note that $P$ and $A$ are correlated since $A^{\text {true }}$ is presumably a constant. However, if the measurement of $P$ is independent of $A$ then it is possible that their variances are not correlated provided the variations are statistical and not due to an underlying change in polarisation during the course of the measurement. (i.e. the polarisation doesn't actually change during the measurement but the observed polarisation fluctuates statistically due to the limitations in the measurement of the polarisation).

Assuming the variances of $P$ and $A$ are independent then the variance in $A^{\text {true }}$ is given by:

$$
\begin{align*}
\sigma_{A^{\text {true }}}^{2} & =\frac{1}{P^{2}} \sigma_{A}^{2}+\frac{A^{2}}{P^{4}} \sigma_{P}^{2}  \tag{26}\\
& =\frac{4 N^{+} N^{-}}{N^{3} P^{2}}+\frac{\left(N^{+}-N^{-}\right)^{2}}{N^{2} P^{4}} \sigma_{P}^{2}  \tag{27}\\
& =\frac{4 q(1-q)}{N P^{2}}+\frac{(2 q-1)^{2}}{P^{4}} \sigma_{P}^{2} \tag{28}
\end{align*}
$$

Now, re-examine the case where there are two or more independent measurements, this time possibly with different polarisations. Consider first the case of just two independent measurements and form the variance weighted average.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{A_{1}^{\text {true }} N_{1} P_{1}^{4}\left[4 q(1-q) P_{2}^{2}+(2 q-1)^{2} N_{2} \sigma_{P_{2}}^{2}\right]+A_{2}^{\text {true }} N_{2} P_{2}^{4}\left[4 q(1-q) P_{1}^{2}+(2 q-1)^{2} N_{1} \sigma_{P_{1}}^{2}\right]}{N_{1} P_{1}^{4}\left[4 q(1-q) P_{2}^{2}+(2 q-1)^{2} N_{2} \sigma_{P_{2}}^{2}\right]+N_{2} P_{2}^{4}\left[4 q(1-q) P_{1}^{2}+(2 q-1)^{2} N_{1} \sigma_{P_{1}}^{2}\right]} \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is of course the proper calculation but is quite unwieldy and does not immediately lend itself to further simplification or improved insight.

A slight simplification is possible with the assumption that $\sigma_{P_{i}}^{2}=k P_{i}^{2}$ for some constant $k$. Then the variance weighted average can be written as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{A_{1}^{\text {true }} N_{1} P_{1}^{2}\left[4 q(1-q)+(2 q-1)^{2} N_{2} k\right]+A_{2}^{\text {true }} N_{2} P_{2}^{2}\left[4 q(1-q)+(2 q-1)^{2} N_{1} k\right]}{N_{1} P_{1}^{2}\left[4 q(1-q)+(2 q-1)^{2} N_{2} k\right]+N_{2} P_{2}^{2}\left[4 q(1-q)+(2 q-1)^{2} N_{1} k\right]} \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

but the terms within the brackets still can not be factored out because of the $N_{i}$ within each which varies for each measurement and which dominates unless $k$ is very small. (If the $N_{i}$ were the same for all measurements then this could be simplified and used but this is an unrealistic limitation for experiments.)

The only useful simplifications are the cases when $\frac{1}{P^{2}} \sigma_{A}^{2}$ or $\frac{A}{P^{4}} \sigma_{P}^{2}$ can be ignored (i.e. when the uncertainty is dominated by the polarisation measurement or the asymmetry measurement).

As an example consider the magnitude of the two terms in the expression for $\sigma_{A^{\text {true }}}^{2}$ for an asymmetry measured with a polarisation $P=0.7$ and data $N^{+}=6000$ and $N^{-}=4000$. The calculated quantities are:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=0.2 \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
q & =0.6  \tag{32}\\
\sigma_{A}^{2} & =0.000096  \tag{33}\\
\sigma_{A^{t r u e}}^{2} & =0.000196+0.167 \sigma_{P}^{2} \tag{34}
\end{align*}
$$

In this example the measured asymmetry is known to better than $1 \%$ and the determination of the "true" asymmetry is dominated by the polarisation measurement unless it is better than $\sim 3 \%$ or $\sigma_{P}^{2}=0.0009$. If the statistics for the asymmetry measurement were $N=100$ instead of $N=10,000$ then the asymmetry measurement would dominate so long as the polarisation measurement was better than $\sim 20 \%$.

Conclusion: ignoring the terms in the variance of asymmetry or polarisation must be evaluated on a case by case basis and applied with caution. Also, using the full form is always right.

Nevertheless, with the above mentioned caveats, consider the case where $\frac{A}{P^{4}} \sigma_{P}^{2}$ is negligible (i.e. asymmetry uncertainties dominate). Then the variance weighted average can be simplified and generalised as:

$$
\begin{align*}
A^{\text {true }} & =\frac{\sum A_{i}^{\text {true }} N_{i} P_{i}^{2}}{\sum N_{i} P_{i}^{2}}  \tag{35}\\
& =\frac{\sum\left(N_{i}^{+}-N_{i}^{-}\right) P_{i}}{\sum N_{i} P_{i}^{2}} \tag{36}
\end{align*}
$$

Note the weights when summing the intermediate $A_{i}^{\text {true }}$ 's are $N_{i} P_{i}^{2}$ but if you sum directly from the data, $N_{i}^{+}$and $N_{i}^{-}$, the weights are just $P_{i}$. The variance for the final result is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{A^{\text {true }}}^{2}=\frac{4 q(1-q)}{\sum N_{i} P_{i}^{2}} \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

In summary, the correct equations to use for combining several independent measurements to determine $A^{\text {true }}$ and its variance are:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{\text {true }}=\frac{\sum \frac{A_{i}^{\text {true }}}{\sigma_{A_{i}^{\text {true }}}}}{\sum \frac{1}{\sigma_{A_{i}^{\text {true }}}^{2}}} \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{A^{\text {true }}}=\frac{1}{\sum \frac{1}{\sigma_{A_{i}^{\text {true }}}^{2}}} \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i}^{\text {true }}=\frac{A_{i}}{P_{i}}=\frac{N_{i}^{+}-N_{i}^{-}}{N_{i} P_{i}}=\frac{2 q_{i}-1}{P_{i}} \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
\sigma_{A_{i}^{t r u e}}^{2} & =\frac{1}{P_{i}^{2}} \sigma_{A_{i}}^{2}+\frac{A_{i}^{2}}{P_{i}^{4}} \sigma_{P_{i}}^{2}  \tag{41}\\
& =\frac{4 N_{i}^{+} N_{i}^{-}}{N_{i}^{3} P_{i}^{2}}+\frac{\left(N_{i}^{+}-N_{i}^{-}\right)^{2}}{N_{i}^{2} P_{i}^{4}} \sigma_{P_{i}}^{2}  \tag{42}\\
& =\frac{4 q_{i}\left(1-q_{i}\right)}{N_{i} P_{i}^{2}}+\frac{\left(2 q_{i}-1\right)^{2}}{P_{i}^{4}} \sigma_{P_{i}}^{2} \tag{43}
\end{align*}
$$


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Note that the variance of $A$ is not $\sigma_{A}^{2}=\left(\frac{\delta A}{\delta N^{+}}\right)^{2} \sigma_{N^{+}}^{2}+\left(\frac{\delta A}{\delta N^{-}}\right)^{2} \sigma_{N^{-}}^{2}$ as this ingnores the correlation between $N^{+}$and $N^{-}$. And in particular $\sigma_{N^{+}}^{2} \neq N^{+}$as the statistics for $N^{+}$are binomial, not normal or gaussian.

