Dear Colleagues,

Thanks for your comments on the top mass draft paper. Since a significant number of collaboration comments relate to the general philosophy of the paper, it may be useful to give some explanation.

As almost everyone noticed, this is rather different from a typical D0 paper, basically because of Nature's editorial policy. The editors of Nature have been very clear with us that we do not just need to report a result; we also need to explain "what does this mean" and "why is this important?" In other words, we have to include in the paper quite a bit of interpretation and frankly we have to push the result, which we would not necessarily normally do. In our opinion, this is actually good.

It is good because we will reach a broader and unfamiliar audience in Nature; and it is also good because we ourselves should understand the implications of our results and yes, we should be prepared to explain them and push them. (Maybe this is a change from our usual practices, but we would argue that the traditional lower-key approach has not exactly worked well in generating a groundswell of interest in, or support for, high energy physics among other scientists.)

What this means for this particular paper is that we absolutely have to explain the impact of the top mass on the Higgs mass results. We have to explain why the actual top mass we get and the actual Higgs mass that it implies are of interest; we can't leave that to theorists to interpret. We have to explain the context in which people (e.g., Chanowitz) have been trying to make a big deal out of the Higgs mass in the past. We have to say that this measurement tells us something new and explain what it is and why it matters. We should do this responsibly, but it's an opportunity; let's take it.

We ask you to read Greg’s responses to your comments in this light and remember that we are trying to do something new here. It is a good thing and a worthwhile thing, but it means we have to change some of our habits.

Best regards,

Jerry and John