

## Procedures for Analysis Approval

The following procedures apply to all DØ physics analyses intended for public dissemination. These procedures are to be followed for all public results. **To maintain flexibility in exceptional cases, the Spokespersons can suspend or alter these rules when special circumstances arise.**

The notice of approvals and formal sign-offs required from the Spokespersons and the Physics Coordinators (see below) is to be understood as requiring email confirmation by any one of the four.

### **The first six steps below are required for submission of results to conferences and journals:**

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.

#### **Group Review**

2. A primary author distributes a paper draft (or in exceptional circumstances a preliminary conference note may be prepared) 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. A 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. A PRL template is also provided and can be used for any journal submission.

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.

#### **EB Review**

3. The *Physics Group Conveners or their designee* forward the group-approved the analysis note and paper draft (or conference note) to the EB and to the Physics Coordinators, who will record analyses under 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. The paper draft or conference note has to be made available to the EB within *one week after the start of review*.

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 approves the

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.

Include line numbers on all paper/note drafts to facilitate editing. For final sign-off, please provide one version with line numbers for comments and one without to check the formatting of the paper.

**After approval each analysis note should also be posted as D0 note.**

**The following additional steps apply to conference notes:**

**Collaboration Review**

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.

**Sign-off for Conference Notes**

6. With approval by the Spokespersons *or* the Physics Coordinators (usual case), 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:**

**Comment on manuscript revisions**

Papers may go through several rounds of editorial corrections while in sign-off at EB and PC/Spokesmen level. To facilitate this process authors should prepare a difference documents using the latexdiff (<http://www.ctan.org/tex-archive/support/latexdiff>) package for final sign-off in the EB and for submission of the paper. On clued0 this is very simple:

eg:

```
~hirosky/bin/latexdiff old_version.tex new_version.tex > diffs.tex ; latex diff.tex
```

7. Directly before or during the collaboration review a primary author presents the analysis to the collaboration at an All-D0 Meeting or in any similar forum as judged appropriate by the Physics Coordinators. *Before an analysis can be made public, it must be presented at an All-DØ Meeting, or physics workshop.*

**Style Review**

8. The EB chair, or a Physics Group Convener, or a primary author requests a review of the paper draft by the Style Council. Papers for style review are to be prepared in single-column, double-spaced format.

**Collaboration Review**

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.

### **Sign-off for Submissions**

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 acknowledgment paragraph are used. Sign-off is typically completed within three working days, after which one of the primary authors should be prepared to submit the paper without delay.

It is understood that, should the analysis change significantly anywhere along the path to publication, it will be re-examined to assure its veracity. This may include an additional collaboration review period and a repetition of step (10).

**Include line numbers on all paper/note drafts to facilitate editing. For final sign-off, please provide one version with line numbers for comments and one without to check the formatting of the paper.**

### **Paper Submission (Post Sign-off)**

**Make sure to do a final spelling check on your manuscript before proceeding!**

11. A primary author submits the paper. The Physics Coordinators post the final version of the paper and all its figures on a public DØ web page. This begins the process of external publication. Refer to the guideline on [paper submission steps](#) for technical details and requirements.

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.

### Additional comments:

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.

Finally, it is our duty to communicate our results to the public and our funding agencies. If the Spokespersons or the Physics Coordinators determine that 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.