

Approval Procedure for DØ Analyses

(December 14, 2007)

The following procedures apply to all DØ physics analyses intended for public dissemination, but the Spokespersons can suspend or alter these rules in special circumstances. The approvals and formal sign-offs required from the Spokespersons and the Physics Coordinators (see below) are to be understood as requiring acquiescence by any one of the four. The first six steps below are required for submissions to conferences:

1. Upon request from a Convener of any physics group, the Physics Coordinators, in consultation with the Spokespersons, form an Editorial Board (EB), or assign an already existing one to review an ongoing analysis that is in an advanced stage. EB membership is reviewed by the Physics Coordinators yearly.
2. A primary author distributes a paper draft (or in exceptional circumstances a conference note) and supplementary material in the form of an analysis note, containing details of the analysis, within the physics group. The paper should be drafted using the template of the intended journal. The conference note, coauthored by the whole Collaboration, should be written using recommended templates for text and macros for plots, and thus be suitable for distribution outside of the Collaboration, and generally should be the first draft of a publication. The analysis note should be posted as DØ note. The physics group reviews the analysis generally for no less than one week after distribution, and when satisfied with the analysis and documentation approves the analysis.
3. The Physics Group Conveners forward the group-approved paper draft or conference note and the analysis note to the EB and to the Physics Coordinators, who form a link to the analysis on an internal web page set aside for analyses under review. The paper draft or conference note has to be made available to the EB within one week after the start of review. Adequate documentation for the analysis shall exist for the evaluation at the time of EB review initiation. The responsibility for establishing this adequacy rests with the Physics Group Conveners. If this is not the case the review should be suspended until proper documentation is available.
4. The EB reviews the paper draft or conference note, which defines the scope of the approval, as well as the analysis note (see EB guidelines). The EB should not concern itself with the cosmetic details of the analysis note, but rather focus on the scientific validity of the result as well as the adequacy of the documentation. It is recommended that a primary author give a detailed presentation of the analysis to the EB at the beginning of the review. The EB should provide first comments on the analysis within one week of starting the review. For the analysis to be presented at a conference, the EB must give provisional approval to the conference note intended for submission to the conference. For analyses proposed for publication, the EB approve paper draft, and the review proceeds directly to step 7 below. The analysis note may require updates as a result of the EB review. The EB should require that the analysis note be updated to reflect the approved paper draft/conference note.
5. The Physics Coordinators announce to the Collaboration a one-week review of the conference note. The EB grants full approval to the conference note after the comments from the EB and the Collaboration are properly addressed. The EB chair subsequently notifies the Spokespersons, the Physics Coordinators, and appropriate Conveners of the approval.

6. With approval by the Spokespersons and the Physics Coordinators, the result can be submitted to conferences as a preliminary measurement. The Physics Coordinators post the note and all its figures on a public DØ web page. This generally should happen at least one week before the start of the intended conference.

The following additional steps apply to publication in journals:

7. Directly before or during the collaboration review a primary author presents the analysis to the collaboration at an All-DØ Meeting or in any similar forum as judged appropriate by the Physics Coordinators.
8. The EB chair, or a Physics Group Convener, or a primary author requests a review of the paper draft by the Style Council.
9. On a recommendation by the EB chair, the Physics Coordinators announces a Collaboration review of the paper draft for a period of seven working days. The EB approves the paper draft for publication after the comments from the Collaboration are properly addressed. The EB chair notifies the Spokespersons and the Physics Coordinators of the approval.
10. Upon a positive recommendation by the EB chair and the Physics Group Conveners, final sign-off rests with the Spokespersons and the Physics Coordinators after verifying that all outstanding issues are resolved and the most recent author list and acknowledgement paragraph are used. A primary author submits the paper (see EB guidelines). The Physics Coordinators post the final version of the paper and all its figures on a public DØ web page.

It is understood that, should the analysis change significantly anywhere along the path to publication, it will be re-examined to assure its veracity.

Before an analysis can be made public, it must be presented at an All-DØ Meeting, or a plenary session of a Collaboration Meeting, or any similar forum, as judged appropriate by the Physics Coordinators.

Upon recommendation from appropriate Conveners, supporting material such as plots or event displays can be presented at conferences after approval by the Spokespersons or the Physics Coordinators.

If possible results should go directly to publication. It is our plan to present not more than one preliminary and one final result per analysis. Updating a preliminary result for conferences will be permitted only if there are significant improvements in the analysis, as determined by the Physics Coordinators, in consultation with appropriate Conveners. Clearly, approval for updates can be expedited by reducing the review time within the physics group and/or EB prior to review by the full collaboration.

Finally, it is our duty to communicate our results to the public and our funding agencies. If, as judged by the Spokespersons or the Physics Coordinators, a plain English summary is appropriate for the results, a primary author or an appointee should draft such a summary if one

does not yet exist. This should be done as soon as the results are approved for conferences, but certainly before the paper is submitted for publication.