

## Approval Procedure for DØ Analyses

(June 28, 2006)

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 Coordinator (see below) are to be understood as requiring acquiescence by any one of the three. The first six steps below are required for submissions to conferences:

1. Upon request from a Convener of any physics group, the Physics Coordinator, in consultation with the Spokespersons, forms an Editorial Board (EB), or assigns an already existing one to review an ongoing analysis that is in an advanced stage.
2. A primary author distributes a document (analysis note) containing details of the analysis within the physics group. The physics group reviews the note, and when satisfied with the analysis and documentation, approves the analysis generally no less than one week after distribution.
3. Physics group Conveners, or primary authors, forward the group-approved analysis note to the EB and to the Physics Coordinator, who, or a designee, forms a link to the analysis on an internal web page set aside for analyses under review.
4. The EB reviews the analysis and the note (see EB guidelines). For the analysis to be presented at a conference, the EB must give provisional approval to the analysis and to a note intended for submission to the conference. In general, the conference note, coauthored by the whole Collaboration, is a shorter version of the analysis note, written using recommended templates for text and macros for plots, and suitable for distribution outside of the Collaboration. For analyses proposed for publication without presentation at a conference, the EB approve the analysis, and the review proceeds directly to step 7 below.
5. The Physics Coordinator announces to the Collaboration a one-week review of the conference note. The EB grants full approval to the analysis and the note after the comments from the EB and the Collaboration are properly addressed. The EB chair subsequently notifies the Spokespersons, the Physics Coordinator, and appropriate Conveners of the approval.
6. With approval by the Spokespersons and the Physics Coordinator, the result can be submitted to conferences as a preliminary measurement. The Physics Coordinator, or a designee, posts the note and all its figures on a public DØ web page. This generally should happen at least one week (or two weeks if a Tevatron average of the result is planned) before the start of the intended conference.

*The following additional steps apply to publication in journals:*

7. A primary author, or an appointee of the physics group, drafts a publication using the template of the intended journal. The EB and the physics group review and approve the draft.
8. The EB chair, or a physics Convener, or a primary author requests a review of the draft by the Style Council.
9. On a recommendation by the EB chair, the Physics Coordinator announces a Collaboration review of the draft for a two-week period. The EB approves the draft for publication after the comments from the Collaboration are properly addressed. The EB chair notifies the Spokespersons and the Physics Coordinator of the approval.
10. A primary author, or the EB chair, or a designated EB member, summarizes comments received and their responses at an All-DØ Meeting or any similar forum as judged appropriate by the Physics Coordinator. This requirement can be waived by the Physics Coordinator in consultation with the EB chair

11. Upon a positive recommendation by the EB chair and the Conveners, final sign-off by the Spokespersons and the Physics Coordinator after verifying 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 Coordinator or a designee posts 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 Coordinator. This can take place any time during the review process.

Upon recommendation from appropriate Conveners, plots illustrating detector performance or similar issues can be presented at conferences after approval by the Spokespersons or the Physics Coordinator.

It is our plan to present 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 Coordinator, in consultation with appropriate Conveners. Clearly, approval for updates can be expedited by reducing the review time within the physics group prior to review by the full collaboration.

Finally, it's our duty to communicate our results to the public and our funding agencies. If, as judged by the Spokespersons or the Physics Coordinator, 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.