Dear Collaborators,

Thank you for your valuable feedback on our policy documents. Your input has been crucial in refining them to better serve the ePIC collaboration.

We've reviewed all comments and made adjustments to enhance clarity, fairness, and practicality. Below, you'll find our responses and the revisions made.

Thank you,
CTC

Responses to BNL Comments (Received 7/22/2024)

Comments from BNL on the ePIC Conference Policy (Draft April 19, 2024)

Compiled by Peter Steinberg and Thomas Ullrich

The comments below are displayed as provided by the users. Only minor edits were per- formed for clarity. The comments and questions below are not meant as a "BNL" view but simply a compilation of the input we received.

- General comment: Given the early state the collaboration is in, if these policies are in general too restrictive for now. An incremental approach might be more adequate.

    Response: We have removed the part of the policy regarding the approval of results as "Public," along with requirements related to plot visuals, as discussed at the CC Meeting in Lehigh.

- Same rules for a 30 min DIS talk than a 10 min DNP student talk? What about some
introducing a more relaxed category?

    Response: We believe that all talks should be treated equally if they are presented on behalf of the ePIC Collaboration, so we adhere to high-quality collaboration standards. The approval process and review focus on the working group (e.g., physics, detector), and we have shortened the review time accordingly.

- Text should emphasize more clearly that approving a result and approving a talk are different procedures.

    Response: We discussed this topic at the Lehigh CC meeting and decided to remove result approval from our policy entirely. It will be governed by a separate set of ePIC guidelines. We have also added a new section: III.3.3 Designation and Approval of ePIC Public Results.

- These rules put quite some load on conveners and coordinators.

    Response: We have aimed to strike a balance in this process. Conveners and DSCLs serve as the primary experts responsible for the initial and thorough review of the speakers' work. The second-step approver's role is to conduct a final integrity check. It's important to note that the talk approval process is distinct from the public result approval process.

- L44 what are "internal quality standards" -> do you mean "collaboration quality standards"

    Changed to "collaboration"

- L45"Public" and "Published" are technical terms? Same with "Results"

    We moved the definition of terms at the beginning of the Policy to make it clear

- Are "quality assurance measures" (L52) the same or different than "quality standards"

    Changed to "quality standards"

- What is "sound"? I think you need to define a few terms up front, and focus on conconcepts like "approval", which implicitly includes things like "sound", "correct", "high quality"

    "Sound" removed

- L63 the typical concept is "preliminary", which implies "public, but not yet published".

    Response: We have discussed this extensively within the CTC and with collaborators. We prefer to retain the term "Public," meaning results (any, i.e., technical, simulations, beam tests, etc.) released for external presentation. "Preliminary" has a specific connotation, implying that results can be shown only once and typically refer to collaboration physics data. We anticipate that in the future, when ePIC has "Preliminary" results in this sense, the policy can be adjusted accordingly. However, for now, we prefer to focus on the general term of "Public" results, as this status is the key consideration when presenting results outside the collaboration.

- L94 How are statistics and other information maintained and disseminated?

    CTC keeps spreadsheets and an up to date Wiki page with that information.

- L101 isn't this redundant with L76?

    We prefer to repeat this information in this part of the policy to clearly state who is responsible for reviewing the policy, collecting feedback, and so forth. L76 (current version L72) emphasizes the frequency of the process.

- L104 Where is the list of conferences maintained?

    As of now, here: https://eic-conferences.lbl.gov/home, also linked at the wiki: https://wiki.bnl.gov/EPIC/index.php?title=Conferences. We added a sentence "This list is shared via the ePIC CTC Wiki page or website.".

- L111 Is there any mechanism for ePIC members outside the CTC to recommend speakers? Forward reference L164?

    What is meant is that CTC should collect the list of nominated speakers with nomination rationale and archive it. The procedure for nominations to CTC is presented in Section: III.1 Selection of Speakers

- L127 What resources are needed within ePIC to maintain demographic information?

Ideally a database of members of signing institutions/authors with their institution/location (by default), carrier-status, and pronouns.

- L137 If the eMC does its job correctly, then whatever systems eCTC devices should always have access to the standing (or authorship status) of the ePIC member. The key point is that the charter requires institutional and individual good standing for speakers (unless they carry over good standing from a previous institution).

    We adjusted the wording accordingly to match the Membership Policies and the Charter.

    L147: Membership Status: A speaker should hold the status of an ePIC author and be a member of a signing institution, as defined by the Charter and Membership Policy of the ePIC Collaboration.

    Exceptions to this requirement may be granted in special cases, such as, e.g., for undergraduate students or technical staff, and should be requested by the institutional representative to the ePIC CTC. The ePIC CTC, after consultation with the ePIC Leadership Team, will grant or not grant the exception. In case of any disagreement, the matter will be referred to the ePIC Leadership Team for the final decision.

    The Charter says (4.3 Good Standing in EPIC): *"The notion of being a "member in good standing" is crucial for determining access to experimental resources,* **as well as being a precondition for authorship of scientific and technical papers produced by the collaboration**. *"*

    Then in the 4.4 Rights of EPIC members, it is stated that:

    *Membership in good standing in the EPIC collaboration **provides additional benefits including:***

    • *Eligibility to serve as technical or physics group conveners or subconveners, and other Collaboration roles and bodies.*

    • ***Eligibility to give talks on behalf of the EPIC collaboration***

    There is an explicit statement about the exception for the authorship, but there is not on being a speaker:

On individual papers, exceptional authorship can be granted for specific cases, and typically for individuals who contributed substantially to the publication. Examples include collaborators who left EPIC less than a year ago, non-PhD students, or even non-members who contributed substantially to a paper or analysis. Approval of exceptions is made by the spokesperson and publication committee.

We think that the wording in the Charter is unclear—whether it implies a requirement or a benefit, and whether they are the same. We would like to include the possibility of requesting an exception for non-ePIC authors (as defined in the Membership Policy) to give a talk. For instance, this could apply to an undergraduate student from a signing institution who does not hold individual authorship but wishes to present a talk or poster at an APS meeting, or a PhD student who has recently left an institution and wants to present on their previous work. After consultation with the CC leadership we concluded that this exception has been overlooked in the Charter. It will be adjusted in the next version of the Charter.

- L143 What is a "conference publication"? Is this a stand in for "conference proceedings"?

  Changed to proceedings

- L144 Is a "public result" the same as a "Public Result"? It's also not clear to me how publication policies affect the review of conference proceedings?

  Changed to Public Result

  We also added the information about conference proceedings repeating after the Charter: Conference proceedings approval is oversight and managed by the Publication Committee.

- L155 Who defines "primary" in a group?

  CTC will consult conveners/DSCLs regarding the primary analysers, and make their best judgment as in L165

- L162 I'm not sure what question this is answering. Presumably it's implicit that your committee utilizes all available information and makes the best choice, based on it, but not in a strict algorithmic sense.

  We prefer to keep it.

- L174 I think fairness suggests that individual invitations are discouraged, and are not authorized by ePIC. If someone is invited personally, they are speaking personally and must treat the talk as a "non-ePIC" talk. However, it needs to be considered by eCTC whether the basis for the talk is "in fact" because the invitee is a senior ePIC person - and that person may need to yield to eCTC (as bureaucratic as that sounds...)

  Some conferences, such as LHCP, tend to send invitations directly to the speakers rather than through speakers' committees. We don't want to interfere with direct invitations from organizers, but if the talk is about ePIC in a conference setting, we believe it should be reviewed by the ePIC Collaboration.

- L184 What are "conference materials", you mean the author line in the talk?

  Defined explicitly now in L184

  "This encompasses all invited and contributed ePIC Conference Presentations, covering abstracts, posters, and oral presentation slides referred later in the policy as conference materials. Conference proceedings approval is oversight and managed by the Publication Committee."

- L187 We should standardize some jargon between these committees. We call the set of top-level convenors "activity coordinators", since they are people who are re- sponsible for the actions of other collaborators. I assume you mean the same by "first step approving entities".

  We defined the approving entities for the purpose of the approval process in the III.3.1 Approving Entities

- Somehow I would prefer something like "group approval" and "coordinator approval"

  Coordinator approval is happening only at the second step of the approval process. The group approval is envisioned as a main approval step, and is governed by the conveners/DSCLs

- L199 You're expecting the analysis coordinator and TC to approve every public talk, and even every plot?

  Only every talk in the second step of the approval. Discussed at the CC in Lehigh. This is to ensure the integrity of all ePIC Talks and Posters, but

> *the heavy lifting is done in the first step of the approval process in the group.*

- L213 "Presenter" -> "Speaker"

  changed

- L219 "disapproval"? You mean a flat rejection?

  > *Each convener/leader will communicate their decision on the presentation's approval or disapproval to be shown outside of ePIC. The decision about moving forward with not all conveners/leaders approving is explained in the following text (i.e. in case of two conveners not agreeing the coordinator will decide, etc). The rationale needs to be shared with the CTC, and will be shared with the Spokesperson's Office and the CC chairs, and with the speaker.*

- L232 Are normal people supposed to subscribe to epic-talks@lists.bnl.gov, or is this
  just for the eCTC?

  > *Yes, it is supposed to be for the whole collaboration.*
  > *https://wiki.bnl.gov/EPIC/index.php?title=Conferences#epic-talks_Mailing_List*

- L237 You expect the analysis coordinator to check if all comments have been incorporated? This sounds far more feasible to the "first step" (since there are more of them, and they have expert knowledge)

  > *Analysis coordinator will judge if the collaboration comments (second step of approval only) from the epic-talks list have been reasonably incorporated in the talk. The first step comments within the respective WG/DSC will be checked at the first step. L249 wording adjusted:*

  > "*The second-step approver should conduct a final integrity check and ensure that relevant comments from the collaboration **from the second step of the review** have been incorporated.*"

- L242 It sounds to me as if general talks should always get approval from the subgroups and only bubble up to the more general coordinators after their OK

  > *"Prior to submission for approval," has been put now at the beginning of the sentence to make it clearer. The text does not mention that the*

approval from first-step approval entities is required, but that the Overview talks go directly to step two.

- L250 Maybe you could formalize that the eCTC will delegate a reviewer of every final product, to ensure basic quality/integrity/consistency

  We prefer to allow the CTC to organize the review process internally. Our goal is to avoid adding complexity to the approval process by not making the CTC a second-step approver in addition to the coordinators. Additionally, CTC members may not always have the specific domain expertise needed to assess integrity and consistency across all topics.

- L253 It's only the CTC who knows the rationale for "disapproval"? - if so, how does that square with a goal of "transparency"?

  Addressed:

  "This rationale should be shared with the ePIC CTC, who will then communicate it to the speaker and the ePIC Leadership Team."

- L261 The abstract usually far precedes the talk itself, and the latter is often some what out of sync

  This line clarifies that speakers are responsible for submitting ePIC approved abstracts to conference organizers and for posting their slides or posters on the conference website.

- L268 What does an institution have to do with a talk? Many institutes will not have sufficient subject expertise, or are too small. The review should be an ePIC responsibility.

  *We envision that for important conferences, reviews will be organized with the Working Groups (WGs) or Detector Subsystem Collaborations (DSCs), as mentioned in line 285 'Rehearsals should be organized within their own institutions and/or the relevant detector subsystem collaboration or working group'. While WG/DSC rehearsals for **all** ePIC talks and posters could be burdensome for the groups, we believe that individuals will find expertise within their own institutions. This is because, in the vast majority of cases, they are directly involved in the topic being presented and are affiliated with that institution - postdocs and students will have their PIs, and PIs will have other group members and postdocs/students to consult. In the rare instances where expertise is lacking, indeed, the*

rehearsal within the WG/DSC will be the way to go.

- L285 There should be a blanket prohibition on showing non-approved talks. The only exception might be envisioned in the context of a thesis defense.

  We discussed this topic extensively in the CTC. We do not believe that talks listed in this point should be reviewed by the entire collaboration, as they might include sensitive information, e.g., budget and workforce details. It is expected that Public or Published results are presented during these talks; however, exceptions may be granted in special cases, such as, e.g., thesis defenses, job interviews. This procedure is anticipated to be outlined in a separate, dedicated result release policy referenced in Section III.3.3. If this policy has not yet been implemented, we propose that exceptions are requested by the institutional representative of the speaker to the CTC. The CTC, after consulting with CC leadership and the Spokesperson's Office, will decide whether to grant the exception. In case of any disagreement, the matter will be referred to the CC leadership and the Spokesperson's Office for the final decision. We have included this wording in the policy.

  We removed the part on the Policy related to the comments below (Discussion at the CC Meeting in Lehigh on release of ePIC results, etc.)

- L294 "regulations" -> "rules" or maybe even "recommendations"

- L301 This could be simplified as saying that all information in ePIC plots requires approval. If new information is added that is ePIC's responsibility then that new information needs approval. The only exception could be theory curves superimposed on existing public results.
- L304 There is no room for disagreement if the policy is crafted precisely. Again, it's easiest if all results require approval and come from official archives.

- L310 Typically submitted results are "final" even before publication. You did not cover this case.

- L311 "Public epic results published in conference proceedings" again are usually called "preliminary". If they are not preliminary, then they can't be shown.

- L323 I would suggest being specific about how and where the labels go on each plot, e.g. inside the ROOT frame, outside of it, etc.

- L344 "individual or group responsible" -> who defines this in general? Shouldn't the responsibility lie with the working group, since individual members will come and go? That said, a pertinent author list would be helpful, for people's career advance- ment.

- L347 "brief but descriptive description" -> "caption"

Responses to LBNL Comments (Received 5/22/2024)

The 2 week approval time (for abstracts and talks) is quite long, to the point where in practice it will probably be missed often. This is then likely to put a larger burden on early-career members than on established members, who in practice often get more leeway with approval timelines. The suggestion is to consider a shorter period, for example 1 week, with provisions e.g. for holiday periods.

The 2 week approval time, if strictly enforced, seems likely to result in presentations that are not quite ready enough so that feedback can optimally serve the end product and be good use of time and effort. The suggestion is to consider a shorter period, for example 1 week, with provisions e.g. for holiday periods.

> *We have adjusted the policy to require 7 weekdays for the approval of ePIC overview talks (one-step approval) and 8 weekdays for other talks (four days for each of the two approval steps). Initially, we set the approval time for other talks to 4 + 3 days. However, following feedback from the CC Meeting at Lehigh, we realized that 3 days may be too short for Coordinators. Therefore, we have revised the approval time to 4 + 4 days as a reasonable compromise.*

Section III.3.1 includes discusses approval processes for different types of talks, but assumes that everything fits into physics, computing or detector. There are some other possibilities that do not fit into these categories. Presentations on DEI are clearly none of these. Presentations on education using ePIC (if ePIC were to get involved in a citizen-science imitative, for example) also do not fit into these categories. The suggestion is to consider a fourth category, 'other', with an appropriate approval route.

> We included the instructions regarding presentations on "other" topics.

> *L214: For presentations on other topics than outlined above, for example, DEI, outreach, etc., CTC will define directly the approval chain and entities. The speaker should contact*

the committee at least 8 weekdays in advance before the conference begins or before the abstract submission deadline.

Responses to Glasgow Comments (Received 5/13/2024)

Hello, I have collected feedback from my University and copying it below. But firstly I would like to say a big thank you for preparing the policy and document!

Overall we were happy with it as an institute. The comments are below.

The two week period will be very difficult for many people to adhere to consistently. Can there be some room for slack in this, especially if people are struggling with the deadline can they give a heads up so that someone from CTC can expect to review the talk on a shorter deadline. In many cases not being able to make two weeks deadline due to other commitments overlapping will put people off accepting opportunities to talk.

> *We adjusted the review time. See response to the LBNL comment above.*

Is the the point at 158 needed considering career stage is considered in 156

> *Removed in 158*

Will there be any step where either a CTC representative watches the presentation rehearsals, or organises a mass rehearsal for more major conferences/cases where there are a significant number of ePIC talks - just for style consistency in these bigger cases?

> *Yes we do envision mass rehearsals for the major conferences, where reviewing entities and CTC will be present. The sentence has been explicitly added:*
>
> *"For major conferences in the field, a coordinated rehearsal may be organized across different detector subsystem collaborations or working groups. This will be initiated by the CTC after consultation with the Spokesperson's Office and the CC leaders."*

Responses to Valpo Comments (Received 7/27/2024)

Hi Maria, Brian-

Just anecdotal off-the-cuff feedback.

Maybe it's because I'm used to 1+1 = 2 weeks at STAR.

But, three days for the second stage (collaboration approval) seems fast. Even if that's 3x24 hours it implies e.g. a tight turnaround over a weekend.

If we're expecting mostly comments from conevners (which is what mostly seems to happen at STAR), then we just require them to be very on the ball (or to deputize appropriately) maybe that's OK. But, a tight schedule is going to tend to (further?) limit broader collaboration input. Maybe that's OK.

4+3 doesn't seem impossible to me for uncontroversial talks. And, I guess there's no guarantee of a *positive* result after 4 days (or 3 days), just a reasonable chance of a couple of feedback cycles, a cutoff period for new comments, etc. If it's controversial I guess it could reasonably be delayed.

Anyway, I'm not saying anything profound. But, you reported that all feedback had been "1+1 weeks is too slow". So, I thought I'd provide something on the other side, where my instincts say "wow, 4+3 days, and especially the 3 days part, seems very quick".

Best,
Adam

Adam Gibson-Even (he/him)
Associate Professor, Department of Physics and Astronomy
Valparaiso University

> *Following this feedback and the discussion at the Lehigh CC meeting, we realized that 3 days may be too short for Coordinators. Therefore, we have revised the approval time to 4 + 4 days as a reasonable compromise.*