

# ALICE Policy for Publications and Presentations

November 7, 2017

The Conference Committee can be contacted at [alice-cc@cern.ch](mailto:alice-cc@cern.ch)

The Editorial Board can be contacted at [alice-editorial-board@cern.ch](mailto:alice-editorial-board@cern.ch)

The Physics Board can be contacted at [alice-mgt-physics-board@cern.ch](mailto:alice-mgt-physics-board@cern.ch)

## 1 Introduction

This document defines the rules for ALICE publications and presentations. It addresses the following topics:

- ALICE official figures
- Conference presentations: selection of speakers, abstract submission, talk or poster preparation, rehearsals of talks, and conference proceedings
- Procedures for physics publications
- Posting of published data
- Analysis Notes, ALICE Public Notes, Technical Public Notes, Technical Publications
- Student theses
- Authorship rules

## 2 Physics Analysis Procedures

All data from all parts of the ALICE detector are available to all Member Institutes and Team Members of the ALICE collaboration for analysis. The groups and institutions responsible for each subsystem must ensure that the necessary analysis tools, algorithms, codes, and correction parameters for that subsystem are available, documented, and kept up-to-date.

All physics analyses in ALICE must comply with the ALICE computing rules approved by the Management Board: <http://alice-offline.web.cern.ch/General-Information/ComputingRules.html>.

Physics results presented in ALICE talks/posters, conference proceedings, and publications must be based on analysis carried out within an ALICE Physics Working Group (or Groups, in the case of overlapping topics). The analysis procedures and details of the evaluation of statistical errors and systematic uncertainties must be documented in an Analysis Note.

## 3 ALICE official figures

This section presents the definition, usage, and approval mechanisms of the various types of official ALICE figures:

- Simulation
- Performance
- Work in Progress
- Preliminary
- Published

All figures related to detector performance or physics results must be approved as official ALICE figures, following the procedures specified in this section, before they can be shown outside the Collaboration.

Each candidate for an official figure must be approved by the relevant Physics Working Group (PWG) or Project Group. If identification of the relevant group is not clear, the Physics Coordination chooses the PWG that is best suited for discussing the figure.

### 3.1 Bookkeeping of figures

- Each PWG and Project Group, in consultation with the Editorial Board (EB), contributes to an ALICE Repository of Figures accessible via a web interface located at

48 <http://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Figure/>. The Repository is maintained by the ALICE web  
49 masters.

- 50 ● The Repository contains all Simulation, Performance, Preliminary, and Published fig-  
51 ures.
- 52 ● Each figure entry in the Repository specifies a Contact Person and is accompanied by  
53 a complete caption.
- 54 ● Each figure must include the following:
  - 55 1. Clearly labelled variables and units of measure
  - 56 2. A legend specifying the colliding systems and energy and the nature of the uncer-  
57 tainties (statistical and systematic).
  - 58 3. Published figures must explicitly include the label ALICE.
  - 59 4. In case the figure was published in a Public Note the figure must include a reference  
60 to this note.
- 61 ● Each unpublished figure will be specified with its category (Simulation, Performance,  
62 Preliminary).
- 63 ● Only the most recent version of each Performance plot will be available in the Reposi-  
64 tory.

65 The following paragraphs define the various categories of official figures, their usage and  
66 their bookkeeping. Identical rules apply for results that are reported as numerical values.

## 67 **3.2 ALICE Simulation figures**

68 ALICE Simulation figures contain results of simulations of physics events and/or detector  
69 response, for example to illustrate expected performance of the detector, the size of correc-  
70 tions for detector effects, or reference distributions from event generators. Simulation figures  
71 must be accompanied by all relevant information to reproduce the figure, including version  
72 numbers of the software used, generator settings and a precise description of how the quan-  
73 tities in the figure were calculated from the simulation. This information is stored together  
74 with the figure in the Repository. Each ALICE Simulation figure has a unique identification  
75 number and must be labelled ALICE Simulation.

76 ALICE Simulation figures are discussed in the relevant Physics Analysis Group (PAG) or  
77 PWG and approved by the PWG convener(s) or Project leader(s) in consultation with the  
78 PAG coordinators.

### 3.3 ALICE Preliminary figures

ALICE Preliminary figures are intended for presentation at conferences and workshops. There are three subcategories of ALICE Preliminary figures:

1. Physics Preliminary figures show the results of analysis and must include estimates of all statistical and systematic uncertainties in the underlying analysis that are relevant for the interpretation of the measurement and the understanding of underlying physics. There will be only one version of each preliminary result. Numerical values of preliminary results may be given to persons who are not members of the ALICE collaboration on request. Such requests are handled by Physics Coordination. Preliminary results are superseded by the published version of the results.
2. Technical Preliminary figures provide supporting information about the analysis. Technical Preliminary figures are for example used to illustrate intermediate steps in the analysis or to compare different analysis methods for the same physical quantity. Technical Preliminary figures may show results that are not corrected for detector effects or results without systematic uncertainties. For Technical Preliminary figures, numerical values are not available to people outside the Collaboration.
3. Derived Preliminary figures contain reported results from Physics (or Technical) Preliminary figures, for example in a different graphical representation, or to compare to a (new) model prediction, to an existing result of a different ALICE measurement, or to results of other experiments.

Each ALICE Technical or Physics Preliminary figure must be presented at the Physics Forum and be approved by the PWG convener(s) and Physics Board before it can be shown outside the Collaboration. Technical Preliminary figures may subsequently be updated (for example with a larger data sample) after approval by the PWG convener(s) and Physics Board. ALICE Physics and Technical Preliminary figures must be accompanied by an Analysis Note, which contains all relevant information about how the figures were obtained, including the software version(s), the data set(s), selections that were used, analysis algorithms and a description of the calculation of all uncertainties. The Analysis Note is reviewed by an Analysis Review Committee which is appointed by the PWG convener(s) in consultation with the PAG coordinators. The Analysis Note is made available to the collaboration before the results are presented at the Physics Forum.

Derived Preliminary figures can only be shown outside the collaboration after approval by the PWG convener(s) and the Physics Board.

112 Each ALICE Preliminary figure has a unique identification number and must be labelled  
113 "ALICE Preliminary".

114 An ALICE Preliminary figure may be withdrawn in the case that an error is found in the  
115 analysis that invalidates the physics message of the figure. Such cases have to be brought to  
116 the attention of the Physics Board by the PWG convener(s) after which the figure will be  
117 withdrawn from the Repository. An Analysis Note must be prepared to document the error  
118 and the withdrawal of the figure. In this case the PB decides if the withdrawn Preliminary  
119 figure can be replaced by a corrected version or only by publishing the result. If an ALICE  
120 Public Note is published, a new corrected version containing the correct figure must be  
121 submitted to the EB for approval.

122 Some of the preliminary figures updated by the final analysis might not appear in the  
123 publication, for example because of a restriction on the article length. When this is the case,  
124 the EB can decide to make them publicly available via a Public Note containing the figures,  
125 the corresponding captions and a reference to the publication if the finalization of the figure  
126 to a published status is deemed important. Otherwise these preliminary figures are made  
127 obsolete.

### 128 **3.4 ALICE Performance figures**

129 ALICE Performance figures are used to illustrate aspects of detector performance, in a general  
130 context, independent of a specific analysis. Any figures that illustrate intermediate steps in  
131 an analysis are ALICE Preliminary figures (see Section 3.3).

132 ALICE Performance figures are intended to illustrate the quality of the calibration, the  
133 behaviour of ALICE (sub-)detectors, the resolution for tracking or particle identification  
134 techniques, etc. Performance figures can be shown outside the collaboration after approval  
135 by the relevant PWG convener(s), the Data Preparation Group (in consultation with the  
136 PB), or the relevant Project leader(s). Performance figures evolve with time, for instance  
137 with a new version resulting from a new data set. Any change of the figure requires explicit re-  
138 approval by the PWG convener(s), or the Data Preparation Group, or the Project leader(s).

139 Each ALICE Performance figure has a unique identification number and must be labelled  
140 "ALICE Performance."

### 141 **3.5 ALICE Work in Progress figures**

142 ALICE Work in Progress figures are transient, intended only for progress reports to fund-  
143 ing agencies, review committees, reports of students within ALICE institutes, and national  
144 physics society meetings. They cannot be used for general presentations such as conference

145 talks and seminars, other than these exceptional cases.

146 ALICE Work in Progress figures illustrate the status of an analysis, in which some correc-  
147 tions may not yet have been applied and from which quantitative physics conclusions cannot  
148 be drawn.

149 Work in Progress figures are for use by individual teams only. Therefore, the responsibility  
150 for quality control and approval rests with the corresponding team leader(s).

151 Work in Progress figures are not entered into the Repository and do not receive any figure  
152 identification number.

153 ALICE Work in Progress figures must not be made publicly accessible, e.g., the slides  
154 cannot be made accessible on a web page or in a meeting program.

### 155 **3.6 Published figures**

156 ALICE Published figures are all figures containing final results that appear in a publication  
157 or Public Note. Each ALICE Published figure has a unique number and is stored in the  
158 Repository, with reference to the corresponding publication or Public Note. When a figure  
159 is published, the corresponding Preliminary figure(s) are removed from the Repository (or  
160 marked obsolete).

### 161 **3.7 Conflicts and exemptions**

162 Conflicts regarding content and presentation of figures will be resolved by the Spokesper-  
163 son, in consultation with the Physics Board (PB) and the EB chair(s), PWG convener(s)  
164 and Project leader(s). Exemptions to the above general rules may only be granted by the  
165 Spokesperson, and only in exceptional circumstances.

## 166 **4 ALICE Presentations: Conference talks and posters, 167 major seminars, and technical presentations**

168 An ALICE Presentation is a talk or poster by an ALICE Collaborator, presented on behalf of  
169 the ALICE Collaboration. ALICE Collaborators should use good judgment in determining  
170 whether a presentation is being made on behalf of ALICE, and should contact the Conference  
171 Committee (CC) in case of doubt. While a sharp distinction sometimes cannot be drawn  
172 between an ALICE and a non-ALICE presentation, there are several elements that clearly  
173 require designation of a presentation as being on behalf of ALICE, including:

- 174 • Invitation for major seminars or conference talks to present ALICE results

- 175 • Submission of a contributed conference talk or poster to present ALICE results
- 176 • First public presentation of a Preliminary figure
- 177 • Significant discussion of Performance figures and their underlying analyses
- 178 • Discussion of ALICE technical issues
- 179 • Invitation for a seminar or conference talk which was arranged through the ALICE CC,
- 180 even if not only ALICE results are presented

181 The following committees and individuals play a role in the review and the approval of a  
 182 public presentation (abstract, talk, poster, and proceedings):

- 183 • The Presenter is the person giving a public presentation (talk or poster) on behalf of the  
 184 ALICE Collaboration. The Presenter is responsible to ensure that all appropriate steps  
 185 are followed and that all approvals are obtained before showing or publicly discussing  
 186 ALICE results outside the Collaboration.
- 187 • The Project Group(s) and/or the Physics Working Group(s) are the primary venues  
 188 where the Presenter discusses the results to be presented. The abstract, talk/poster,  
 189 and proceedings must be circulated in the PWG or Project Group for discussion prior  
 190 to delivery or submission to the conference, according to timelines defined below.
- 191 • The Team leader of the Presenter (or a person delegated by the Team leader) reviews  
 192 all material, i.e. abstract, talk, poster, and proceedings, and indicates their approval  
 193 in the Repository.
- 194 • Project leader(s) or PWG convener(s) are responsible for quality assurance of the ma-  
 195 terial, and must approve the abstract, talk/poster, and/or proceedings for topical pre-  
 196 sentations prior to delivery or submission to the conference.
- 197 • The CC coordinates all aspects of ALICE Conference presentations, with the goal of  
 198 equitable distribution of talks across the collaboration, effective quality assurance, and  
 199 efficient procedures. The CC chair(s) act on behalf of the CC, consulting and delegating  
 200 to members of the CC as appropriate. The CC calls for conference speakers and selects  
 201 speakers for oral presentations. The CC reviews abstracts, talks and posters to ensure  
 202 high scientific quality, and CC approval is necessary before submission or presentation.  
 203 The CC notifies the Team leader, PWG convener(s), and Project leader(s) about all  
 204 material that requires their review and approval. If one of the latter bodies does not  
 205 act even after a reminder, the final decision about approval rests solely with the CC.

206 However, due to the fact the abstract approval by the Team Leader implies also financial  
207 support to attend a conference, the Team Leader approval for abstract submission  
208 remains strictly mandatory.

- 209 • The EB provides oversight and management of conference proceedings and any other  
210 related document. The EB reviews each document submitted to conference proceedings  
211 and must approve it prior to submission.
- 212 • The CC organizes public rehearsal sessions in order to review presentations. The CC  
213 decides which conferences and speaking opportunities require rehearsals, and must com-  
214 municate those decisions to the Collaboration.
- 215 • Physics Coordination is responsible in consultation with the Spokesperson for the se-  
216 lection of speakers and the organization of rehearsals of talks for specific occasions such  
217 as CERN seminars and at the LHCC sessions.
- 218 • The Spokesperson is the final arbiter of all disputes arising at any stage of the conference  
219 presentation process.

220 The primary criteria of the CC for selecting speakers are the capability of the speaker  
221 to effectively address the audience with a high quality presentation of ALICE results and a  
222 fair and equitable distribution of talks among individuals and groups who have contributed  
223 to a given analysis or project. Concerning the latter, also career considerations, equal op-  
224 portunity, major presentations in the recent past or near future, and responsibilities for and  
225 contributions to the Collaboration are taken into account. The CC will seek input from the  
226 PB, PWG Convener(s) or Project leader(s), and the Spokesperson. The CC will maintain  
227 lists of eligible speakers on various topics, as appropriate, and review and revise such lists on  
228 a regular basis. Higher priority will be given to young scientists who have not yet obtained  
229 stable employment.

230 The talk rehearsal plays a crucial role in the preparation of a major seminar or conference  
231 talk. Its purpose is to ensure a high quality of the presentation. The approval of figures and  
232 the discussion of their physics message should take place prior to the rehearsal.

233 There are three general categories of ALICE talks: (i) Invited conference and major  
234 seminar talks, (ii) Contributed conference talks and posters, and (iii) Technical Project pre-  
235 sentations.

236 The mechanisms for discussion and approval of each of these are:



## 237 4.1 Speakers and Abstracts for Invited Conference Talks and Major 238 Seminars

- 239 • A Major Seminar is defined as a high profile talk to a broad audience at a specific  
240 institution. These may be known in different places as PH Seminar, Departmental  
241 Colloquium, Departmental Seminar, Invited Lecture, etc. The CC should be consulted  
242 in case of doubt whether a talk should be considered as a Major Seminar.
- 243 • The CC is responsible for selecting the ALICE speaker for an invited Conference Talk  
244 or Major Seminar. The CC can seek input from the Physics Board or poll the Collab-  
245 oration for nominations. ALICE Collaborators who have been invited ad personam for  
246 a Conference Talk or a Major Seminar on ALICE physics must request approval from  
247 the CC. The CC can suggest an alternative speaker.
- 248 • A CC chair is the point of contact between the Collaboration and each Conference  
249 organizing committee. The CC receives the conference invitation and corresponds with  
250 the conference organizing committee regarding the nature and scope of the talk.
- 251 • The CC will maintain an up-to-date list of all conference and major seminar invitations  
252 received and nominations made.
- 253 • The speaker nominated by the CC is responsible for composing and submitting the  
254 abstract, and for ensuring that all approvals for the abstract, talk and proceedings  
255 are obtained in a timely fashion, first from the Team leader, then from the PWG  
256 convener(s) or Project leader(s), and finally from the CC (for abstracts and slides) or  
257 the EB (for proceedings).
- 258 • The CC is responsible for the final approval of the abstract before it can be submitted.  
259 The abstract must be distributed to the Collaboration for discussion via upload to the  
260 Repository at least 7 days prior to the submission deadline of the conference. The  
261 speaker has to take the Collaboration discussion into account and revise the abstract  
262 appropriately. The CC will then approve the abstract for submission to the conference.

## 263 4.2 Speakers and Abstracts for Contributed Conference Talks and 264 Posters

- 265 • The ALICE PWGs will take a strategic approach to ALICE contributed conference  
266 presentations. The PWG convener(s) will solicit abstracts from the PWGs, to be  
267 considered as contributed talks and posters for a given conference. As part of this

268 process, the PWG will identify analyses and physics topics appropriate to a given  
269 conference, and the PWG convener(s) will work with the members of the PWG to  
270 ensure contributed abstracts in these areas.

- 271 ● Any member of ALICE may propose an abstract for consideration by the PWGs as a  
272 contributed talk or poster.
- 273 ● An abstract may have only one author, who will be the Presenter. Two PhD students  
274 or a postdoc and a PhD student can be joint authors of a poster.
- 275 ● The PWG convener(s) will identify cases of multiple abstracts on the same or largely  
276 overlapping topics. Such conflicts will be resolved by the CC and PWG convener(s),  
277 and not delegated to the conference organizers by submitting multiple overlapping  
278 abstracts. The CC chair(s) will have final say in case of conflict.
- 279 ● The abstract must be distributed to the Collaboration for discussion via upload to the  
280 Repository at least 7 days prior to the submission deadline of the conference. The  
281 author has to take the Collaboration discussion into account and revise the abstract  
282 appropriately. Upon review and approval from the author's Team leader and the PWG  
283 convener(s) or Project leader(s) the CC will review the abstract and give the final  
284 approval for submission to the conference.
- 285 ● For selected conferences the CC may decide that abstracts will not be submitted indi-  
286 vidually by the Presenters but centrally by the CC and anonymously "for the ALICE  
287 Collaboration." In that case, the abstracts will be prepared by the PWG convener(s) or  
288 Project leader(s) or by persons designated by the PWG convener(s) or Project leader(s).  
289 The review and approval procedure will be the same as for abstracts prepared by in-  
290 dividual Presenters with the exception of the Team leader approval. The latter will  
291 be required once the presentation is assigned to an individual Presenter. The CC will  
292 inform the PWG convener(s) and Project leader(s) when the central and anonymous  
293 submission process will be used for a conference.
- 294 ● Upon approval by the CC, the abstract is submitted to the Conference by the Presenter  
295 or a person in charge for the ALICE Collaboration.
- 296 ● For some conferences the submitted abstracts are published as proceedings. Such ab-  
297 stracts have to be uploaded by the Presenter to the Repository not later than 10  
298 working days before the abstract submission deadline. These abstracts are reviewed by  
299 the EB and CC, which will grant the final approval in agreement with the EB chair(s),  
300 in addition to the normal approval procedure.

### 4.3 Preparation of Presentations for Invited and Contributed Conference Talks, Major Seminars and Posters

- In general, new Preliminary Results are first reported at Conferences and not seminars. Presentation of new Preliminary results at a Major Seminar requires approval of the Spokesperson.
- Only approved ALICE figures may be shown. Refer to Section 3 for the definition of each type of figure and its intended use. It is the responsibility of the Presenter to ensure that appropriate approval has been obtained for all figures.
- A draft of the talk slides must be uploaded to the Talks Repository (located at <https://aliceinfo.cern.ch>) for Collaboration discussion at least 7 days prior to the seminar or the start of the conference. It is understood that for major conferences, preceded by the approval of new results, less time might be available for the review and approval of slides or posters. In such cases the CC may communicate different deadlines.
- Talks of a broad nature must be uploaded to the General Talks section of the Repository. Talks of a topical nature have to be uploaded to the corresponding PWG or Project section of the Repository. The Presenter has to take the Collaboration discussion into account and revise the slides/poster appropriately. The slides/poster have to be reviewed and approved by the Presenter's Team leader, Physics Coordination (in case of General presentations), the appropriate PWG convener(s) or Project leader(s) (in case of Topical presentations), and by the CC prior to the seminar or start of conference.
- The CC will determine whether the figures are appropriate for the occasion.
- Upon approval by the CC, which may require a rehearsal as described below, the presentation is posted on the ALICE Conferences web page as the As Approved version. Only cosmetic changes can be made after this point, and no changes may be made to the approved figures. The final version should be uploaded as the As Given version.
- Conference presentations including results of several experiments are approved by the ALICE CC in agreement with the CC (or their equivalents) of all other involved collaborations.
- Poster review is carried out according to the procedure of contributed presentations.

## 4.4 Rehearsals for Invited and Contributed Conference Talks and Major Seminars

For major conferences and individual presentations, in particular those which include new results, the CC may require the rehearsal of talks by the presenters. The CC will communicate to the relevant PWG convener(s), Project leader(s), and presenters for which conferences or presentations rehearsal sessions will be organized by the CC. The rehearsal sessions are open to the Collaboration and active participation is encouraged.

- The rehearsal will in general take place during the week before the start of the conference, prior to CC approval of the slides.
- The rehearsal of each talk requires a member of the CC to be present. For topical talks a representative of the corresponding PWG or Project is required to be present. For general talks a representative of Physics Coordination is required to be present.
- The presenter will consider comments and modifications suggested in the discussion which takes place after each rehearsal talk. The presenter will upload a revised version of the slides to the Repository for further review and approval.

## 4.5 Conference Proceedings

- A Conference Proceeding is the write-up of a presentation at a conference.
- It is the responsibility of the Presenter to ensure that the necessary approvals are obtained in a timely fashion.
- For topical presentations, the Proceedings draft is distributed by the Presenter, after approval by their Team leader, for discussion within the appropriate Physics Working Group at least 15 working days prior to the conference deadline. After discussion, the PWG convener(s) review the Proceedings draft and, upon approval, send it to the EB for review and approval. Submission of the proceedings to the EB must occur at least 5 working days prior to the conference deadline.
- For general presentations, the Proceedings draft is made available for the Collaboration on the ALICE web site at least 15 working days prior to the conference deadline. The EB reviews the Proceedings draft. The EB may delegate the review of proceedings to other ALICE Collaborators, as appropriate.
- Upon approval by the EB, the Presenter submits the Proceedings to the Conference and may post it on the arXiv.

- 361 • Conference Proceedings including results of several experiments are approved by the  
362 ALICE EB in agreement with the EB (or their equivalents) of all other involved col-  
363 laborations.

## 364 4.6 Project Technical Presentations

- 365 • Project Technical Presentations are conference talks and seminars of a technical nature,  
366 presenting results from an existing ALICE Project or developments towards a potential  
367 future ALICE Project.
- 368 • Project Technical Presentations may be made either on behalf of the entire ALICE  
369 Collaboration or of a subset of ALICE working on a specific Project. The Project  
370 leader(s) and the CC determine the authorship of the contribution. The procedures in  
371 this section apply in both cases.
- 372 • Such presentations may arise due to an invitation from a conference, contribution of a  
373 presentation to a conference, or invitation for a seminar.
- 374 • The Project leader(s) are responsible for choosing the speaker.
- 375 • Only official figures from the Repository can be included in Project Technical Presen-  
376 tations.
- 377 • The procedures for reviewing and approving the abstract, the slides/poster, and the  
378 proceedings are the same as for all other ALICE presentations.
- 379 • For some Technical Presentations proceedings are requested by the organizer before the  
380 conference. Such proceedings have to be uploaded by the author to the Repository not  
381 later than 10 working days before the start of the conference, and these are reviewed by  
382 the EB and CC, which will grant the final approval in agreement with the EB chair(s),  
383 in addition to the normal approval procedure.

## 384 5 Procedures for Physics Publications

385 The following committees and individuals play a role in the preparation of each Physics  
386 Publication:

- 387 • The Paper Committee (PC) can only be formed when the analysis results fulfil at least  
388 the criteria for being approved as preliminary; i.e., the results have been presented and  
389 approved at the Physics Forum, the corresponding Analysis Note has been approved

390 by the PWG convener(s). The content of the paper should be defined.

391  
392 The PC is headed by the PC chair, who is responsible for the editing and assembling  
393 of material. The PC may be composed of further members e.g. having carried out the  
394 analysis. A large PC (more than 4 persons) may be formed in case of long papers and  
395 complex analyses. The PC is appointed by the PWG convener(s) and approved by the  
396 PB. The PC is responsible for all steps from the first draft until the final publication.

- 397 • The Internal Review Committee (IRC) is appointed by the EB once a first complete  
398 draft of the paper is made available for review.

399  
400 One member of the IRC is appointed to be the IRC chair, serving as the primary contact  
401 person for the IRC and managing the IRC activities. The IRC comprises experts and  
402 non-experts on the topic of the manuscript, drawn from across the Collaboration. The  
403 IRC carries out a comprehensive review of the physics analysis, accompanying docu-  
404 mentation, and the text of the initial manuscript, as well as revisions to the manuscript  
405 and responses to comments from the Collaboration and the journal referee at subse-  
406 quent stages of the publication process. The EB defines the charge of each IRC, and  
407 may include special tasks and requests in certain cases.

- 408 • The Editorial Board (EB) provides oversight and management of the publication pro-  
409 cess, ensuring that ALICE Publication Procedures are followed. The EB chair(s) act  
410 on behalf of the EB, consulting the members of the EB as appropriate. The EB chair(s)  
411 periodically report on the status of all papers in preparation during EB meetings. The  
412 EB decides on a list of actions to be taken for delayed papers, with the aim of bringing  
413 them to completion.

- 414 • The Physics Board (PB) provides oversight and review of the physics content of the  
415 manuscript.

- 416 • The Spokesperson is the final arbiter of all disputes arising at any stage of the publi-  
417 cation process.

418 Preparation of a Physics Publication occurs in several distinct steps, with a recommended  
419 time schedule. Paper Flow scheme is presented at <http://aliceinfo.cern.ch/ArtSubmission/>.

## 5.1 Initial preparation of manuscript and supporting documentation

- Once an analysis is sufficiently advanced, an Analysis Note is prepared and presented to the PWG. This note contains all information needed for the reproduction of the analysis. A contact person is appointed by the PWG convener(s) for each Analysis Note. Analysis Notes are internal and signed by a subgroup of the collaboration, essentially all those who have contributed to the analysis. Authorship is decided by the PWG convener(s).
- The PWG convener(s) and PAG coordinator(s) appoint Analysis Review Committees (ARC) whose task is to follow the analysis progress and the preparation of the Analysis Note critically and provide support and feedback to the people carrying out the analysis. An ARC member is expected to give a statement when the results are presented at the Physics Forum.
- The PWG convener(s) may propose an ALICE Public Note containing preliminary results to be approved. A contact person is appointed by the PWG convener(s) for each Note. The ALICE Public Note can result from merging of several Analysis Notes and is signed by the Collaboration. The names of the authors of the Note are documented and visible within the collaboration. The PWG convener(s) appoint an internal committee reviewing the Note (NC). The NC is usually composed of members of the PWG and a person from a different PWG to give feedback from an external member. The results of the ALICE Public Note are presented and approved at the Physics Forum. Before the results are publicly shown, the Note has to be approved by the EB. The Note is made publicly available on CDS at the time when the results are publicly shown. The convener(s) should encourage the members of the PWG to provide ALICE Public Notes to accompany ALICE preliminary results whenever possible.
- The PWG convener(s) determine if a physics analysis is ready for consideration as a paper; i.e. the content of the paper is defined, the Analysis Note is approved and, if prepared, the corresponding ALICE Public Note is approved.
- The PWG convener(s) recommend the paper for the presentation at the Physics Forum and for the PB approval.
- Upon the PB approval the PWG convener(s) appoint the PC to prepare the initial manuscript and to create a dedicated page on the ALICE publication web site. The

452 PB may require at this stage revisions or the merging of several ongoing analyses into  
453 a single paper.

- 454 ● The PB recommends to the EB that an IRC be formed.
- 455 ● The PB determines the target journal for the manuscript, in consultation with the PC  
456 and IRC.
- 457 ● The EB announces the appointment of the IRC and the target journal on the web  
458 pages.
- 459 ● The PB is responsible for ensuring that the software and data used for the analysis  
460 comply with the ALICE computing rules ( [http://alice-offline.web.cern.ch/General-  
461 Information/ComputingRules.html](http://alice-offline.web.cern.ch/General-Information/ComputingRules.html)). All analysis code has to be uploaded to the AL-  
462 ICE software repository.

## 463 5.2 First Collaboration Review

- 464 ● The IRC reviews the manuscript and supporting documentation, and recommends cor-  
465 rections and changes as necessary.
- 466 ● Upon approval of the draft by the IRC, the EB verifies that the actions of the PC  
467 and IRC meet the required standards, and reviews the draft before approving it for  
468 circulation to the full collaboration. The EB review is expected to be delivered within  
469 5 working days.
- 470 ● Upon EB approval, the EB circulates the draft to the full Collaboration for detailed  
471 comment for 10 working days. This review period may be extended by another 5  
472 working days if it takes place during periods in which limited reviewer availability is  
473 foreseen or if more extended feedback is desired.
- 474 ● All supporting material specifying additional analysis details must be made available  
475 to the collaboration at this stage.
- 476 ● This is the main review period for the Collaboration, and it is expected that any  
477 remaining significant issues will be raised at this step.
- 478 ● Up to 5 member institutes are specifically requested by the EB to comment in detail  
479 during the Collaboration review period.



### 480 5.3 Second Collaboration Review

- 481 ● The PC prepares a new draft and a set of replies to the Collaboration comments.
- 482 ● The IRC and the EB review the revised draft and responses to comments, and recom-  
483 mend relevant corrections and changes as necessary and appropriate.
- 484 ● The PB is involved in case of major changes or open issues.
- 485 ● Upon IRC approval, the EB circulates the revised manuscript, including revisions to  
486 the author list that arose, to the full collaboration for comments for a minimum of 5  
487 working days. This period can be extended by up to 5 more days in case very significant  
488 modifications to the paper are introduced after the first collaboration review
- 489 ● The main purpose of this second comment period is for the Collaboration to verify that  
490 all points raised in the first comment period have been addressed, though on occasion  
491 a significant new issue may still be raised at this step.
- 492 ● The PC prepares a new draft, in response to new comments received. It also prepares a  
493 file in a format supported by the HEPData database, containing the numerical values  
494 corresponding to the published results.
- 495 ● The IRC reviews the changes and the file prepared for the HEPData database and  
496 performs a check of the numerical values in the HEPData file, and upon acceptance  
497 recommends to the EB that the paper is ready for publication.
- 498 ● The EB carries out a final review of all comments and revisions, and submits the paper  
499 draft for CERN review. CERN comments and approval are expected within 1 week.

### 500 5.4 Submission to journal and response to referees

- 501 ● The manuscript submission to the journal and arXiv and the uploading of the HEPdata  
502 file are carried out by the EB chair(s) or a person in charge.
- 503 ● The response from the journal referee(s) is made available to the Collaboration via the  
504 corresponding website.
- 505 ● The PC prepares a revised manuscript and a response to the referees' comments.
- 506 ● The IRC reviews the modified manuscript and response to the referees' comments, and  
507 recommends corrections and changes as necessary.

- 508 • Upon approval by the IRC, the EB reviews the changes to the text and the responses  
509 to the referees' comments.
- 510 • In case of major changes, the EB, in consultation with the PB, sends the revised  
511 manuscript and responses to the referees to the collaboration with a deadline for com-  
512 ments of 5 working days. The PC prepares a new draft in response to comments  
513 received from the Collaboration at this step.
- 514 • The IRC reviews the changes, and upon acceptance recommends to the EB that the  
515 paper is ready for resubmission.
- 516 • The EB carries out a final review of all comments and revisions, and upon acceptance  
517 the EB chair(s) or a person in charge resubmits the manuscript to the journal and posts  
518 the revised version on arXiv.

## 519 **5.5 Final steps**

520 Upon submission to arXiv the paper is made publicly available on the CERN Document  
521 Server and on the ALICE web site.

522 If the paper is rejected by the journal or changes requested by the journal are deemed  
523 unacceptable to the Collaboration, appeal or resubmission to a different journal will be  
524 considered and formulated by the Spokesperson, the EB chair(s) and the PB coordination in  
525 consultation with the PC, IRC, PB, and EB.

## 526 **5.6 Exceptions**

527 Procedures deviating from the above can be approved by the MB for individual papers in  
528 order to speed up the publication process in exceptional circumstances. Such exceptions are  
529 communicated to the PB.

## 530 **6 Posting of Published Data**

531 All figures and data from every ALICE physics publication will be made publicly available  
532 on the ALICE web site. Each paper will have has a web page that includes links to all figures  
533 in the paper in formats suitable for inclusion in both presentations and documents.

## 534 7 Other types of publications and notes

### 535 7.1 Analysis Notes

536 Analysis Notes contain all information needed for the reproduction of the analysis.

537 They are intended to communicate information to the collaboration and document it  
538 for future reference. Analysis Notes are signed by a subgroup of the collaboration and are  
539 approved by the PWG convener(s).

540 Analysis Notes are not publicly available and may not be distributed outside the Col-  
541 laboration. They are accessible to all members of the Collaboration on the ALICE web site  
542 [https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Notes/Documents/Review/reviewitems\\_analysis\\_note](https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Notes/Documents/Review/reviewitems_analysis_note).

### 543 7.2 ALICE Public Notes

- 544 • ALICE Public Notes accompany preliminary results and publications. They contain  
545 supporting material, additional and complementary figures and explanation of the  
546 methodology used in the analysis.
- 547 • ALICE Public Notes can result from merging of several Analysis Notes.
- 548 • ALICE Public Notes are authored by the ALICE Collaboration. The names of the  
549 authors of the analysis are documented and visible within the collaboration on the  
550 link: [https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Notes/Documents/Review/reviewitems\\_public\\_note](https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Notes/Documents/Review/reviewitems_public_note)
- 551 • The EB circulates the Public Note to the collaboration for at least 5 working days and  
552 may designate one member institute to comment in detail.
- 553 • Upon EB approval, the ALICE Public Note is submitted to the CERN Document  
554 Server: <http://cds.cern.ch/collection/ALICE%20Public%20Notes?ln=en>.

### 555 7.3 Technical Public Notes

- 556 • ALICE Technical Note contains technical information about the ALICE detector and  
557 its performances, including both hardware and software.
- 558 • The authorship of the Note shall be defined by the appropriate Project leader(s).
- 559 • The Project leader(s) circulate the Note among all members of the Project for comments  
560 and approves it for submission to the EB.

561 • If a Technical Note is authored by the whole collaboration the EB circulates the draft  
562 to the collaboration for comments for at least 5 working days.

563 • Upon EB approval, the Note is submitted to the CERN Document Server:  
564 <http://cds.cern.ch/collection/ALICE%20Public%20Notes?ln=en>.

## 565 **7.4 Technical Publications**

566 The purpose of an ALICE Technical Publication is to communicate technical information  
567 about the ALICE detector and its performance, including both hardware and software, to  
568 the scientific community. The authorship of these papers shall be defined by the appropriate  
569 Project leader(s).

570 The Project leader(s) circulate the draft among all members of the Project for comment,  
571 and approves it for submission to the EB, along with a recommendation for the journal. The  
572 EB reviews the draft and either returns it to the Project leader(s) with comments or approves  
573 it for publication.

574 The EB chair(s) or a person in charge submits the manuscript to the journal and post  
575 it on the arXiv. Response from the journal and referee reports will be circulated among all  
576 members of the Project for comment, and resubmission will follow the same procedure as the  
577 initial submission.

## 578 **7.5 Usage of ALICE data and methods in non-ALICE publications**

579 • Members of the ALICE Collaboration may be authors of review papers and papers on  
580 general methods, etc.

581 • ALICE physics and technical data that have not been published by the ALICE Col-  
582 laboration, in conference proceedings or in a refereed journal, may not be included in  
583 non-ALICE publications.

584 • ALICE physics and technical data that are presented in a student thesis but not in  
585 conference proceedings or in a refereed journal may not be included in non-ALICE  
586 publications.

## 587 **8 Student theses**

588 The Editorial Board maintains a list of ALICE students and their thesis topics. This list can  
589 be used by the CC, Physics Board and Physics Working Groups to track student activity and

590 promote student involvement in conferences. It is the responsibility of the PWG convener(s),  
591 and Project leader(s), together with the thesis advisor(s), to ensure that an electronic copy  
592 of the thesis is uploaded in a timely fashion.

593 Data and analyses presented in a student thesis but not in ALICE Conference Proceedings  
594 or in ALICE refereed publication are not considered to be published ALICE results. Results  
595 obtained by the student must be labelled this thesis. The text must be clear in order to  
596 prevent such results being taken from a publicly available thesis and considered erroneously  
597 as results of the ALICE Collaboration.

598 All student theses presenting ALICE data must be made available to the collaboration  
599 upon acceptance of the thesis and uploaded to CDS. Thesis subjects are on GLANCE, thesis  
600 on CDS. It is the responsibility of the thesis advisor and the PWG convener(s) or Project  
601 leader(s) to ensure an electronic copy of the thesis and that it is uploaded in a timely fashion.

## 602 **9 Authorship**

603 The Institute Team leaders are responsible for supplying a list of names, in accordance  
604 with the ALICE procedure for M&O payments and related descending authorship rights  
605 (c.f. document ALICE-INT-2006-005), in the corresponding GLANCE database. This list  
606 contains the names of the authors, the institute to which they belong and the date of joining  
607 the ALICE collaboration. The Institute Team leader is also responsible for announcing the  
608 departure of people from the collaboration.

609 Qualifications to sign physics publications:

- 610 1. A person must be registered in the ALICE Collaboration Database with the following  
611 status: Physicist, Postdoc, Senior Engineer or PhD Student;
- 612 2. Physicists, Postdocs and Senior Engineers must be ALICE members for at least one  
613 year to be eligible for authorship rights; in addition they must count for the sharing  
614 of the budget for Maintenance and Operation Cat. A. If a postdoc was previously an  
615 ALICE student, their authorship starts immediately;
- 616 3. PhD students must be ALICE members for at least 6 months to be eligible for author-  
617 ship rights; If a PhD student was previously an ALICE Master student, their authorship  
618 starts immediately;
- 619 4. PhD students must provide six months equivalent of service work for the Collaboration;  
620 Failure to do so in due time can lead to the suspension of signature rights;

621 5. The corresponding institute must be in good standing, as determined by the Collabo-  
622 ration Board and the Constitution;

623 6. The qualification period stops when leaving ALICE: PhD students keep authorship  
624 rights for 6 months after their departure date. Physicists, Postdocs, Senior Engineers  
625 keep authorship rights for 12 months after their departure date;

626 Exceptions from this rule may be granted by the MB on suggestions from the EB chair(s)  
627 in consultation with the EB and spokesperson.

628 Any author can remove their name from the author list in a particular case. Removal  
629 of a qualified author from the author list by the Team leader requires a mutual agreement  
630 between the author to be removed and the Team leader.

631 In the case of a change of affiliation within the collaboration the member stays affiliated  
632 with the institute that pays the M&O cost for the one additional year. Other procedures are  
633 possible with the agreement of all parties involved.