

APB discussion items

Frank Filthaut

Laura Fields

Facts & observations

APB procedures & responsibilities (1)

Laid out in docdb-1115:

- steer review & authorship of full-DUNE publications
 - appointment of ARCs (typically discussed among full APB)
 - often takes (too much?) time to converge (meeting scheduling, availability of (deputy) chairperson to initiate the process, ...)
 - choice of journal: balance (currently have many EPJC papers), Open Access
 - KDAR paper led to issues due to JCAP not participating in SCOAP3
 - language / style: idea is that the APB “appoint a group of language/style editors” charged with optimising the quality of our publications
 - this has not happened yet
 - some work has been done by Jeremy Hewes -former ex-officio Young DUNE APB member- on figure style

APB procedures & responsibilities (2)

- steer review & authorship of full-DUNE publications (cont'd)
 - administration of author lists (chairperson + Maxine)
 - this ought to be mostly an automated process but at present it isn't quite the case:
 - submission (both to arXiv and to journal) is handled by primary authors, who may or may not be familiar with requirements from either side
 - different LaTeX formats used by different journals

APB procedures & responsibilities (3)

Laid out in docdb-1115:

- deal with requests for limited-authorship (“Technical”) papers
 - decision on limited versus full authorship (typically by discussion among full APB, after proposal by two APB members who have read the draft in some detail)
 - not always trivial, due to consideration of reliance on DUNE resources + requirement that TP do not make statements on “ultimate physics sensitivity”
 - idea is that authors contact us early in the process, but more often we are contacted only once a full draft exists (which may complicate the decision)
 - if approved: appointment of Technical Paper co-ordinator (often but certainly not always an APB member), who circulates to DUNE for 1 week and also moderates comments on author list
 - has worked without significant problems (e.g., no comments on author lists)

APB procedures & responsibilities (4)

Laid out in [docdb-1115](#):

- guide review of conference proceedings (this is mostly a service to our collaborators)
- appoint a coordinator, who circulates the proceedings to DUNE for 1 week, and checks suitability/status of figures and that the proceedings carry a single author name “for the DUNE Collaboration”
 - authors often fail to notify us the requisite minimum of 9 days in advance of submission deadline (and even if they do, it may take time to converge on a coordinator) — or sometimes they notify the SC instead
 - communication with Speakers Committee: APB chair & deputy chair see SC e-mail messages but are not typically aware of deadlines & proceedings details
 - for conferences with many speakers (e.g. NuFact, ICHEP), it is a challenge to organise the review even if deadlines are observed
 - req. of single author name sometimes felt by authors to be a problem

APB procedures & responsibilities (5)

Laid out in docdb-1115:

- Theory / phenomenology papers (co-)authored by DUNE collaborators: should only use publicly available information and only refer to DUNE in general terms (e.g. “large liquid-argon detectors like DUNE”)
- not reviewed by DUNE, so our only tasks consists in determining whether the paper satisfies these criteria
 - this presupposes that we are notified to start with — not sure this always happens
 - “general terms” requirement is not always easy to satisfy

Additional information

In the DUNE docdb server:

1) on the docdb homepage:

The screenshot shows the top navigation area of the DUNE docdb server. It includes a search bar with the text "ior", a "Show DUNE-doc-#" field with a "-v" dropdown, and a "Show documents modified in the last 20 days" field. Below these are links for "Calendar of events or today's events" and a "List:" section with several blue underlined links: "Authors", "Managed documents", "Topics", "All documents", "Groups", and "Keywords". A red arrow points from the "Topics" link to the right.

2) on the “Topics” page:

Authorship and Publications (7)

Paper type

- Full authorship (13)
- Limited authorship (21)
- Proceedings (13)
- Supplemental

- Policies and procedures (4)

Review lead

Review stage

- this requires manual updates to docdb entries' metadata and is therefore not guaranteed to be fully correct (needs effort)

Internal book-keeping: [google sheet](#) (on 3 main publication categories)

- viewable by anyone knowing the link

Manual (shared between chair & deputy chair): procedural items

Discussion points / proposals / plans / projects

Full-authorship publications (1)

Workflow: attempt to accelerate setting up ARCs

- still needs availability of chair / deputy chair to take initiative
- but are hoping to establish a list of collaborators (students excepted) in participating in ARCs, along with their areas of interest / expertise
 - but this needs to be setup / facilitated
 - most straightforward would be for people to tick boxes on some web form?

Having a fresh APB perspective on publications

- would be with an eye to consistency of message & quality of description and figures (this will -unfortunately- not address the language item)
- will only work if APB members are not members of ARCs
- tentative proposal: ensure that each paper is read by at least 1 APB member
 - organisation: pair up and then assign? Other alternatives?

Full-authorship publications (2)

Figure style:

- would like this to be picked up again (Young DUNE?). Uniformity between publications is not critical but we should at least strive for good quality

Review of the analysis itself:

- according to the policy document, documentation of the analysis is expected in the form of an “analysis package”
 - but in practice, ARC and Collaboration review stages only see the paper draft
- sentiment (e.g. by Inés and Chris) that more scrutiny would be welcome
 - code (for cross-checks or for “analysis preservation”?)
 - independent cross-check within WG?

(Not immediately sure what role the APB ought to take in this)

Conference proceedings

Need somewhat specific attention due to (often) time-critical nature following from submission deadlines

We are thinking that it would be good if organisation of their reviews (i.e., identifying a coordinator) could be taken up by a single APB member as a primary responsibility

- for a fixed term (e.g. 3 months only), then rotate?
- no other (new) obligations during this time
- ideally, would also keep in touch with SC especially about proceedings submission deadlines for conferences with more than a handful of DUNE speakers / poster presenters

Web pages

Internal:

- there are quite a few small details that, if not observed, may slow down the review & submission of papers
- idea: setup Wiki page providing such details. Volunteers to help fill it?

External:

- in 2020, started a project to make plots & tables from publications available for public use (e.g. for use in conference presentations)
 - mostly automated extraction of LaTeX items (captions + tables) from paper sources, followed by automatic web page generation
 - largely works, but needs technical support to host results & format according to desires
 - this could undoubtedly be done elsewhere than at Fermilab, but this would not give a good impression