

Review of the review procedure

My personal observations from the ongoing reviews,
and some items following from related discussions

Frank Filthaut (Radboud University and Nikhef, Nijmegen, NL)

Figures: DUNE label

DUNE label:

- docdb-1115 only stipulates that before publication, all results must be labeled “DUNE preliminary”, but does not mention what should be done afterwards
- it seems reasonable to require some label for public plots, propose “DUNE” or “DUNE Simulation” (as appropriate)
 - perhaps also “DUNE Sensitivity” — we’re sufficiently far away from δ_{CP} sensitivity that this is likely to remain useful for a while




Figures: style

My experience from looking at the LBL paper draft: we need more uniformity

- wildly varying fonts, font sizes, colour schemes
- inconsistencies in axis labelling

docdb-1115 stipulates that the APB develop style guidelines and appoint a group of language/style editors ensure quality of text and images

- I think we should set this up ASAP
- and provide macros



Other public material

The CVN paper authors would like to make some auxiliary material public: network, several events

Assuming that this is deemed acceptable in principle: where does that go?

- from Alex's e-mail message: <https://gitlab.cern.ch/salonsom/cvn-paper>
- I pushed for a more centralised solution, and they are now working to move this to DUNE GitHub

Do we need a policy here, or will common sense suffice?

- I do not expect this to be a frequently occurring item

Note: work on making figures / tables publicly visible stalled for lack of time on my side

- let me know if you feel it's urgent for me to pick this up now

Procedural questions

How to converge after comments from Collaboration review?

- docdb-1115 stipulates questions should be addressed “to the satisfaction of the ARC”; this gave rise to the question whether this is the ARC chair or the full ARC
 - I believe common sense ought to largely suffice here, but lack of clarity could lead to delays — would it suffice to instruct the ARC chair?

Should people that commented during Collaboration review be informed of what was done with their comments?

- done for the LBL paper (as a “courtesy”), but have not yet seen this for the CVN paper
- I believe we should make this explicit (because of the potential need for further iteration), but also to give a short deadline for any follow-up comments
 - my experience: a latexdiff version can help to speed this up