Policies for the Publication and Presentation of STAR Results

(Adopted: 5 May 2008)

CONTEXT: These STAR Policies are built on the presumption of trust, integrity, responsibility, collaboration and collegiality. In this context, it is assumed that STAR collaboration members will willingly abide by these Policies.

DEFINITIONS: -

1. ***STAR Results***: "*STAR Results*" is taken to mean any plots, tables, numbers, formulas, and/or text that arise from and/or are based on STAR data.
2. ***Published STAR Results:*** "*Published STAR Results*" are those *STAR Results* that have been approved by the relevant PWG and the GPC and the spokesperson and have been accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. This designation does not include Conference Proceedings that include *Preliminary STAR Results*.
3. ***Preliminary STAR Results***: "*Preliminary STAR Results*" are all *STAR Results* that are **not** *Published STAR Results*.
4. ***Approved STAR presentations***: "*Approved STAR Presentations*" are those presentations for which the venue, the presenter, and the presentation, are all approved by STAR.
5. ***All Other Presentations****: "All Other Presentations"* are those presentations by STAR collaborators that use or convey *STAR Results* but which presentations are neither monitored nor approved by STAR.
6. ***Public STAR Results***: "*Public STAR Results*" are those *STAR Results* that have been presented in an *Approved STAR Presentation* but are **not** *Published STAR Results.*

GOALS - The goals of the STAR Collaboration regarding the formal sharing of *STAR Results* are:

1. ***To foster speedy distribution of STAR Results*** that the Collaboration has agreed are sound and ready for presentation and/or publication.

2. ***To avoid unfounded*** rumors and premature presentation or publication.

3. ***To assure the equitable assignment of credit*** to individuals for their work.

POLICIES - The following policies and practices have been adopted to further the above listed goals.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

1. ***Availability of STAR Data:*** Data from all parts of the STAR detector shall be available to all members of the STAR Collaboration for analysis. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of all collaborators to see that the necessary correction algorithms and correction parameters be updated and made available to the entire Collaboration in a timely manner. Any member of the Collaboration is free to analyze any part of the data.

2. ***Data Analyses in the Context of the Physics Working Group (PWG):*** It is anticipated

that all STAR data will be analyzed in collaboration with the STAR Physics Working Groups (PWG), with the possible exception of technical papers. PWGs shall be designated and PWG convenors appointed by the spokesperson for each major physics analysis topic in STAR. The PWG convenorships are expected to rotate approximately every two years at the discretion of the spokesperson.

3. ***The Common Effort:*** Given the overriding principle of open communication within the collaboration, collaborators should, upon request of a colleague, provide relevant code and input assumptions that would permit results to be checked and confirmed. Computer code will be kept in a common STAR software archive, and code and Data Summary Tapes (DST's) will be accessible to all collaborators.

PRESENTATION OF STAR RESULTS:

4. ***Members of the Collaboration should exercise caution*** and good judgment when discussing *STAR Results* with individuals outside the Collaboration before the results have become *Public STAR Results*. When individuals outside the Collaboration are consulted for advice on the analysis or interpretation of data, those individuals should be asked to respect the confidentiality of the *STAR results* discussed.

The presentation of STAR Results is divided into two categories:

5. ***Approved STAR Presentations:*** Members of the Collaboration who have been selected to represent the STAR collaboration by making a presentation of *STAR Result*s must follow these steps and abide by these guidelines:
    1. The presentation shall have the name of the presenter and the words "For the STAR Collaboration".
    2. *Preliminary STAR Results* must be labeled "**preliminary**".
    3. If an abstract is required, the draft abstract should be submitted to the relevant PWG at least one week prior to the submission due date. When the PWG approves the abstract, the PWG convenor will send to the chairperson of the Talks Committee the following information: the name of the presenter, the title of the presentation, the conference or venue at which the presentation will be given, the dates for the conference, and whether this is a contributed or an invited presentation. Abstracts that are submitted too late to be considered by the PWG may be rejected.
    4. The complete draft presentation must be posted to the relevant PWG with a response time of at least two weeks prior to the presentation. Comments are to be sent to the presenter with a copy to the PWG list.
    5. The complete draft presentation must be posted to the startalks list at least one week prior to the presentation. Comments are to be sent to the presenter with a copy to the startalks list.
    6. The presenter must rehearse the talk before several members of the STAR collaboration to include the Council representative from the presenter's institute or designated substitute. The Council representative or designated substitute shall so inform the PWG that this step has been satisfactorily completed. (For major conferences, such as Quark Matter, there will be a rehearsal before the collaboration, which is scheduled by the Spokesperson, prior to presentation of the results.)

7. The presenter is required to obtain approval from the PWG and the STAR Physics Analysis Coordinator prior to posting a copy of the talk as a manuscript to electronic preprint libraries.
8. After the presentation is given, the presenter must post the presentation on the presentations website. It is the responsiblity of the presenter's Council member and the PWG convener to ensure this posting is done.
9. In all instances, the Spokesperson has the right to intervene and disapprove a talk, in whole or in part, if it is deemed inappropriate or if it will not represent the Collaboration well.

6. ***All Other Presentations:*** Besides the *Approved STAR Presentations*, there are many venues at which STAR collaborators will present *STAR Results*. These include, but are not limited to oral presentations with accompanying visuals: seminars and colloquia, job interviews, funding requests and reports, Ph.D. thesis defense, laboratory reviews, etc. These policies have no intention of monitoring these presentations, either in content or in place or time or venue. There are, however, several general and a few specific comments that do apply.
    1. While these *Other Presentations* do not formally represent STAR (as in *Approved STAR Presentations*) they do report on *STAR Results* and it is clear to the listener/reader that the presenter is a member of the STAR collaboration. Therefore, it is not possible for this presentation, especially its content, to be divorced from STAR and it is entirely likely that it will be inferred that the presenter speaks for STAR. This is not all bad; these presentations can help to spread news of the good work at STAR in other venues. But, the presenter is urged to err on the side of caution.
    2. *Published STAR Results* are, of course, the preferred content for these talks. *Public STAR Results,* assuming these have not been superceded by more current results, are also acceptable. In a presentation that includes any *STAR Results* that are **not** *Published STAR Results*, the presentation must make it absolutely clear that these *STAR Results* are "**preliminary**". The text or oral presentation should not claim or conclude more than is appropriate for *STAR Results* that are **not** *Published STAR Results* but are preliminary.
    3. Wisdom would suggest that, if possible, the presentation be shared with at least one or more STAR collaborators to help guard against misrepresenting STAR and creating an embarrassmant for the presenter and for STAR.
    4. The presenter is encouraged to practice the talk in the presence of another STAR collaborator(s) and, perhaps the Council representative unless confidentiality dictates otherwise.
    5. Finally, because these *Other Presentations* are not formally monitored by STAR even though they will, even tacitly, represent STAR, it is incumbant on the presenter to be faithful to these guidelines in the spirit of collaboration and collegiality.

SELECTION OF PRESENTERS TO REPRESENT STAR:

7. ***The Talks Committee:*** To aid and guide this selection process, the Spokesperson will designate a Talks Committee of at least seven (7) persons, each serving for two (2) years. The spokesperson will annually appoint one member as chair of the Talks Committee, preferably from among the continuing members, to serve for one (1) year.

Appointments should be made prior to the summer collaboration meeting. (Reappointments are not prohibited.) The Talks Committee will strive to distribute speaking invitations received by the Collaboration on the basis of suitability of the speaker to the topic, and an equitable distribution of talks to individuals and institutions with appropriate consideration of regional distinctions. As an aid to this end, a record of talks will be maintained on the presentations website and a list of future conferences relevant to STAR will be maintained on the startalks website.

1. ***Personal Invitations to Speak:*** Members of the Collaboration who receive personal invitations to present talks that will represent the STAR collaboration must inform the Spokesperson (by e-mail) at the time the invitation is received. The spokesperson will consult with theTalks Committee to assure that the invitee is the appropriate presenter. (It is assumed that there will need to be persuasive arguments made to alter the name of the STAR representative as presenter.) The presenter will follow the guidelines for *Approved STAR Presentations*. .

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS:

8. ***Submission of Conference Proceedings:*** All conference proceedings prepared by a STAR-selected presenter (*Approved STAR presentation*) must be submitted to the relevant PWG for review and endorsement. To allow adquate time for the PWG to review the draft conference proceedings, the presenter should post an electronic copy of the draft to the PWG at least two weeks prior to due date for submission to the conference organizers. In addition, the draft conference proceedings must be posted to the startalks list one week prior to the time for submission of the manuscript to allow for comments on the draft. When the PWG has affirmed the content of the draft proceedings the PWG convener will so inform the Physics Analysis Coordinator who will endorse the submission of the manuscript in writing to the author with a copy to the PWG members and the spokesperson.

9. ***Preliminary STAR Results:*** All *STAR Results* that are **not** *Published STAR Results* must be clearly labeled "*Preliminary*" in any conference proceedings. Moreover, the PWG should be attentive to the text to guard against statements that compromise the preliminary nature of the *STAR Results* described in the submission.

PUBLICATION OF STAR RESULTS IN PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS

These policies and procedures address the publication of *STAR Results* only in peer-reviewed journals. Publication of *STAR Results* that are **not** *Published STAR Results* on preprint archives or in textbooks is not permitted. The one exception is the publication of conference proceedings as described above. Moreover, the "publication" of *STAR Results* that are **neither** *Published STAR Results* **nor** *Public STAR Results* on web pages, personal or organizational, is not permitted; these may only be posted on secure websites.

10. ***An early preview of papers*** under consideration should be discussed within the Physics Working Group of interest. This preview should include a brief introduction to the paper, an outline of the data and physics issues to be addressed in the paper, and draft copies of the figures and tables that would appear in the paper. When the convenors of that PWG agree, the Spokesperson or the Physics Analysis Coordinator will provide this

material to the PWG Convenors. The principal author(s) will then present the proposal for discussion during a PWG Convenor meeting. The subsequent recommendation from the Convenors concerning the proposed paper is advisory to the principal author(s) and the Godparent committee.

11. ***Review and Discussion in PWG:*** It is anticipated that the analysis and initial draft of manuscripts describing *STAR Results* will originate in a PWG, with the possible exception of manuscripts describing technical accomplishments. The PWG will work with the PAs to vet the physics analysis and, through careful reading of drafts of the manuscript, help to assure that the manuscript is "sound", i.e., accurate, complete, and well written in all its parts. In parallel, the PWG will assure that a STAR technical note, as described below, is prepared. When the PWG is agreed that the manuscript is sound and the technical note is current and complete, the convener shall so inform the spokesperson and request that a GPC be appointed to provide an independent review of the manuscript.

12. ***The God-Parent Committee:*** Upon receipt of the draft of a paper and the STAR technical note relating to that paper (see below), the Spokesperson shall appoint a Godparent Committee (GPC) to act as an internal STAR editorial board to guide the paper to journal submission.
    1. The GPC will have an appointed chairperson, a representative from the PWG, one or more of the PAs, and at least two additional STAR collaborators, one of whom will be designated as responsible for the grammer and logical flow of the content of the manuscript. All of the appointees should agree that this service will be a high priority for them so as to expedite the publication of the paper.
    2. The GPC will meet no later than three weeks after their appointment to establish a *schedule* for their work that will be shared with the PWG conveners and the spokesperson.
    3. The GPC will review the paper to ensure that the presentation of the physics (or technical) message and the data is clear and persuasive. It should take into account the overall construction of the paper and the logical flow of the text as well as the technical accuracy and the correctness of the analysis. The GPC should affirm that the most current author list and acknowledgments are used.
    4. Through interaction with the PAs and the PWG (or technical group) from which it originated, the GPC will provide recommendations regarding changes necessary for the submission of the paper to the collaboration and for its ultimate publication.
    5. The GPC chairperson is encouraged to provide timely (e.g., bi-weekly) reports to the relevant PWG (or technical group) on the GPC progress.
    6. After approval from the GPC, the paper will be made available on the starpapers mailing list for comments from the collaboration as a whole for a minimum of two weeks. In rare and unusual circumstances, the spokesperson may abbreviate this period for collaboration comment. Collaboration members should communicate their comments to the starpapers mailing list as soon as possible within the designated time for review.
    7. When the GPC and the PAs are agreed that the paper is ready for submission to the designated journal, the GPC chairperson will so inform the spokesperson who will consider this recommendation, and if approved, will authorize the PA's to submit the paper for publication in the approved journal.

8. Throughout the process the GPC will strive to facilitate the process so that speedy publication can be accomplished.

13. ***Five STAR Institutions Reading:*** Concurrent with the posting of the paper to the collaboration (12.f.) the spokesperson or the Physics Analysis Coordinator will specify five STAR institutions to review and comment on the paper. This reading and commenting is not expected to be done by experts but by any of the STAR authors on the paper from these institutions and will not duplicate the work done by the experts on the PWG (or technical group) or the GPC. These comments will be incorporated in a final draft to the extent the GPC and the PA's conclude they are relevant and appropriate. Council representatives from these institutions are responsible for timely comments to the starpapers mailing list within the two week period from his/her institution. The selection of the five institutions is at the discretion of the Spokesperson and will rotate among all STAR member institutions. In rare and unusual circumstances, the spokesperson may bypass this step in the review process.

14. ***Referee's Reports:*** Referees' reports should be distributed to the collaboration upon receipt by the corresponding author. When follow-up is required, the principal author(s) and GPC should distribute their response to the referees and the revised manuscript to the collaboration just prior to resubmission. If there are rather major changes to the manuscript, it should be made available on the starpapers mailing list for comments from the collaboration as a whole for one week. The Spokesperson will provide guidance in the process and will adjudicate any conflicts and will finally authorize resubmission of the manuscript. The spokesperson may request the Physics Analysis Coordinator to appoint an independent ad hoc Adjudication Advisory Committee to advise the spokesperson on how to resolve difficult conflicts and thereby expedite the process. During the GPC review process, the related technical note shall be revised as needed to reflect the final content of the paper.

15. ***Archive of the Acceped Manuscript:*** When the paper has been *accepted* for publication by the relevant journal the PAs are responsible for posting the paper, as accepted, to the preprint arXiv.

16. ***The Related Technical Note:*** The related technical note shall be prepared by the PAs and reviewed by the PWG and submitted to a protected STAR web site designated for this purpose. In general, the contents of the technical note should contain sufficient information so that an experienced student/young postdoc should be able to repeat the analysis and get the same results. Specifically, the technical report should include:

    1. a clear statement of the goals of the paper
    2. the names and contact information for the PAs
    3. the data used for the paper
    4. the analysis methods used, cuts applied, embedding procedures, etc.
    5. the location of all relevant computer codes used in the analysis
    6. the versions of event generators and Monte Carlo
    7. a table of systematic errors

17. ***Single or Few Authorship Papers:***

1. **That include *Preliminary STAR Results:***

   Comment: The intent here is to avoid placing *Preliminary STAR Results* in the public print domain to which citations can point. The concern is that these *Preliminary STAR Results* can, and at times do change rather dramatically yielding substantially altered physics interpretations. It does not reflect well on STAR to have *STAR Results*, albeit *Preliminary STAR Results* in print that may then have to be superceded and corrected. (The routine exception to this concern is the case of Conference Proceedings for which case it is clear that these *Preliminary STAR Results* were presented orally and visually at conference and represent a "work in progress.") The policy admits exceptions and provides guidelines for them as follows:

   In general, STAR Collaborators should not publish "single" or "few" author papers that include *Preliminary STAR Results*. Exceptions may be granted by the Spokesperson if, at a minimum, the *Preliminary STAR Results* are with the GPC or approved by the PWG and such publication of these *Preliminary STAR Results* will not negatively impact the final STAR publication of the result.

2. **That include only *Published STAR Results:***

   Comment: The following policy represents a courtesy gesture and permits the spokesperson to anticipate any possible conflict between this paper and other star work in progress. This policy is **not** intended as a formal review or approval or censorship.

   If a STAR Collaborator(s) writes a "single" or "few" author paper that includes only *Published STAR Results*, the author(s) should provide a copy of the manuscript to the Spokesperson a few days prior to journal submission.

AUTHORSHIP:

18. ***The Author List:*** The Spokesperson shall solicit an author list from each institution at least once per year. This list will be maintained on the author list website. To be an author on a STAR paper, a STAR Collaboration member must have made a substantial contribution to STAR. Authors are expected to have worked on STAR for at least one half year prior to submission of a paper. The authors of papers will be those collaborators who have contributed to construction of the detector hardware or software, and/or the taking or analysis of the data. Authors are also expected to have contributed to some aspect of the construction, operation, and maintenance of STAR.

    In recognition of their contributions, collaborators who have made significant contributions to the construction of the detector but have left the Collaboration prior to the taking of data will be included on the initial papers of the Collaboration using that equipment. Normally collaborators remain authors for one year after leaving STAR, provided that they have been a general STAR author for at least one full year; however, individuals who have made special contributions to a given topic, either in hardware or analysis, should be retained on the author list of papers for which their contributions are

relevant. Technical papers need only list as authors those individuals who contributed to that project, but the "STAR Collaboration" should be acknowledged. Decisions on the inclusion of authors will be done on the basis of these guidelines by the Council member from the author's institution with the concurrence of the Spokesperson.

All qualified authors, as defined above, will be included on all STAR physics publications regardless of the origination or responsibilities for analysis of the data unless requested by the author individually. The authors of papers will be listed in alphabetical order, preceded or followed by the phrase "STAR Collaboration". Papers which result from student's theses should be so indicated by appropriate footnotes. Papers for conference proceedings are normally submitted in the speaker's name, plus other major contributors if appropriate, plus "STAR Collaboration".

In infrequent cases, one or more STAR-authors may choose not to be listed among the authors on a given paper. This may arise because of disagreements with the contents of the paper that were unable to be resolved. In these cases it is the responsiblity of these authors to notify the spokesperson and the GPC in writing (e-mail) of their request to be removed from the author list.

STUDENT THESIS TOPICS:

19. ***Graduate Student Theses***: The Spokesperson will maintain a list of students' thesis topics that will be posted on a website and that will be updated annually. Council members are urged to inform the spokesperson of student thesis topics chosen or changed at any time. In addition, the relevant PWG should also be apprised of the student's topic. The Council may aid in resolving any conflicts.

PRESS RELEASES:

20. ***Refrain from Press Releases:*** Members of the Collaboration should not issue press releases or call press conferences without the approval of the Spokesperson, who will consult with the members of the Council.

ERRONEOUS PUBLICATIONS:

21. ***Procedures for Handling Errors in Publications:*** When an error is discovered in a STAR publication, the following actions should be considered and, if appropriate, some or all should be implemented by the Spokesperson:

    1. Inform the community as soon as the error is discovered by notifying the BNL Associate Director for Nuclear and Particle Physics and the Spokesperson of the other RHIC experiments.

    2. Inform all STAR Collaborators about the problem and that the erroneous result should not be used in any talks, papers, etc.

    3. Consider a formal retraction if the error changes the qualitative implications or the publication.

4. Form an internal committee to investigate and understand the origin of the error and any lessons that can be learned from the incident.

5. Once a new result is available this committee will verify its reliability. The new result will then be publicized in a talk at an appropriate meeting or conference.

6. Publish an erratum and, if appropriate, publish a new paper with the correct results.