Qweak publication policy - draft 2 D.S. Armstrong Mar 30 2010

We anticipate a few different kinds of peer-reviewed publications arising from the Qweak experiment. These are 1) physics papers 2) general instrumentation papers and 3) sub-system instrumentation papers. It is appropriate that the procedures for defining authorship and for collaboration review of these three kinds of papers should differ, so we outline our expectations here. The existing policy for conference proceedings are presented in the "Talks Policy", and so are not discussed here.

For all Qweak publications, all potential co-authors must reply positively (eg via an email) that they have read and approve the paper in order for their names to appear on the submitted paper[1].

1) **Physics papers.** These include measurements of asymmetries (parity-violating, transverse, elastic, inelastic, aluminum, etc.) and any other physics observable that may arise. Candidates for authorship of these papers will be determined by the institutional representatives, and would normally include all individuals who have been deemed by their institutional representative to have contributed adequately to meeting the shift-taking goal for their institution. Institutional representatives may request that individuals be added to the author list who have not met the shift requirement, but who have made substantial contributions to the experiment, through analysis, theoretical input, or the construction of hardware. The institutional council will decide such special cases. In the case of people who contributed solely to hardware aspects it may be more appropriate to recognize their contributions via instrumentation papers (see below).

   Once a physics result is ready for publication, the IC will appoint a "writing team" that will be responsible for drafting a publication-quality draft. Once ready this will be circulated to the entire collaboration for comments. A reasonable time (three weeks) should be allowed for collaboration members to submit their comments and corrections. The writing team will consider these suggestions and revise the draft appropriately, and re-circulate the revised draft, allowing at least one week for final comments, unless the revisions are significant, whereupon a longer comment time would be appropriate. If there is internal disagreement as to whether a paper is ready for submission, the IC will decide. These papers should include the collaboration name at the bottom of the author list, and would normally be referred to as "Qweak Collaboration: A.A. Aardvark, et al."

---

[1] This is a requirement of the AIP statement of ethics and responsibilities of authors, which can be found at http://www.aip.org/pubservs/ethics.html . While it is often not followed in practice, the IC believes it to be a valuable practice to aspire to. Obvious exceptions will be made for deceased authors, for example. However, no living author should ever be surprised to discover himself or herself listed as an author on a paper they have not seen and approved.

Note that any unblinded asymmetry presented in anything other than a refereed paper from the collaboration (*i.e.* in a talk, conference proceedings, review article, grant proposal, or thesis) must be clearly labeled as "preliminary", unless it refers to an already published collaboration paper.

2) **General Instrumentation Paper(s).** This refers to a description of the entire experimental apparatus, or at least a majority of the equipment and the experimental technique, intended for eg. Nuclear Instruments and Methods or Review of Scientific Instruments. Authorship would include anyone that is nominated by an institutional representative as having made substantial contributions to the design, construction and commissioning of the apparatus, therefore might include individuals who did not actively participate in data-taking or data analysis. Procedures are otherwise the same as for the physics papers, and this paper or papers would also be official Qweak Collaboration papers.

3) **Subsystem instrumentation and other technical papers.** These would be papers, again intended for eg. Nuclear Instruments and Methods, IEEE Transactions in Nuclear Science, etc. which focus on a particular subsystem. The collaboration encourages publications of this type, examples of which might include QTOR, the field mapper, the target, the DAQ, any one of the sets of tracking detectors, the Compton, the region 3 MUX electronics, the scanner, QWAD, etc. Here the author list would generally be those who contributed significantly to that subsystem, and might include people (engineers, designers, technicians, students) who are not Qweak collaboration members. The authorship list would be defined internally by that subsystem group, and is not a matter for the collaboration. Such papers will not be generally considered as "collaboration publications"., and would not list "Qweak Collaboration" at the bottom of the author list. They must not include any "physics results" (i.e. unblinded asymmetries, cross sections, etc.)

However, since such papers reflect on the collaboration, and since they may involve the presentation of, eg. detector performance results obtained by the collaboration as a whole, the collaboration reserves the right to exercise some quality control. Authors should alert the IC that they are preparing such a paper. Once a publication-quality draft is ready, the paper's authors will submit it to the IC. The IC will circulate it to the collaboration as a whole for comments, and will appoint a "review team" of at least three collaboration members who are not coauthors on the paper. The review team will be responsible for a careful "fact check" and proof-reading of the paper, and will be responsible for providing feedback to the authors within 3 weeks. The collaboration reserves the right to veto any presentation of data taken with beam during Qweak running, and to exercise editorial control over any statements about the performance of other systems in the experiment. After they have addressed any concerns, the authors should submit a final version of the draft to the IC for approval; the IC will respond within two weeks.