Discussion session

José Repond
Argonne National Laboratory

CALICE Collaboration Meeting
DESY, Hamburg, Germany
March 20 – 22, 2013

Overview talks???

Guidelines for producing preliminary results

The only results permitted to be shown in CALICE talks are those which have been approved via the procedure outlined below. CALICE speakers are encouraged to include the CALICE logo in their talks. All results and figures should be labeled "CALICE Preliminary", or just "CALICE" in the case of published results.

New results for presentation based on data recorded using the test beam prototypes must be approved by the Collaboration by the following procedure. **Results which have not been approved before the scheduled presentation at the conference cannot be shown.** In this context, "test beam results" is deemed to include essentially all material about the detectors (hardware, performance, calibration procedures etc.) once the detectors have been integrated into the test beam setup.

A CALICE Analysis Note should be produced outlining the analysis method, including tables of numerical results and/or figures as appropriate. The note should be clear enough that another member of CALICE can understand what was done and would be able, if they so desired, to reproduce the essence of the analysis.

An analysis suitable for writing up in this form should normally have been already **presented to the Collaboration** at least once in either a CALICE general meeting, or analysis meeting.

When you are ready to start writing a note, you should contact the Chair of the Speakers' Bureau, who, in consultation with the other members of the SB, will set up **a small editorial group** of CALICE colleagues (typically about three people), the Editorial Board, whose task will be to scrutinize the work, maybe suggest improvements, and report eventually that they believe it to be reliable.

A draft note should be produced ***at least two weeks before the meeting*** at which the results are to be shown. The draft should be sent to the editorial group, who will liaise with the authors until they are satisfied with the work. A longer lead time is desirable otherwise there is no guarantee that your results will be approved in time. Email correspondence during the editorial process should include all members of the editorial group, and at least one member of the Speakers' Bureau. It is useful to keep a record of the correspondence, and for this purpose a web page will be set up by the analysis coordinators.

The **whole Collaboration** should then have an opportunity to comment on the note; this may be done by circulating the note **allowing a working week for comments**, specifying an explicit deadline for the receipt of comments, or by presenting the work in a talk at an advertised CALICE meeting.

The **Editorial Board** should oversee the process of responding to comments, providing advice to the authors, and ensuring that comments from the Collaboration are taken into account. Finally they should report to the Speakers' Bureau that the note is **ready for public presentation**. The final note should then be sent to the Chair and members of the Speakers' Bureau. After approval by the Chair (or the Spokesperson) it is to be stored on the web, and an email should be sent to the Collaboration to notify everyone.

Discussion

Clearly, we have to aim at having a **balanced procedure**, ensuring high quality, but also allow for speedy production of results to be made public.

A) Is this procedure too heavy for an R&D collaboration? If so, how to make it lighter without compromising the quality?

B) How to update results? How often, before final publication?

(currently we can write an addendum)