

ePIC Results Release Policy

This policy details the approval procedures for releasing ePIC results to the public.

1. Definitions

1.1 Approval body

Working Group Level

- Physics results: Physics Working Group conveners.
- Detector drawings and performance results: Detector Subsystem Collaboration (DSC) leaders.
- Software and Computing, DAQ related results: Software Working Group or DAQ Electronics Group conveners.
- For results involving multiple working groups or multiple subsystems, approvals from all relevant working groups, such as Physics, Software, DSC, Cross Cutting, are required. In this case, coordinators assign one working group as the primary one to oversee the approval procedure.

Coordinator Level

- Physics results: Physics Analysis Coordinators (ACs).
- Detector drawings and performance results: Technical Coordinator Office.
- Software and Computing, DAQ related results: Software and Computing Coordinator(s).

1.2 ePIC results

Published ePIC Results: These are ePIC Results that have been reviewed and approved according to the ePIC Publication Policy and released to the public. This designation does not include Conference Proceedings that include Public ePIC Results.

Public ePIC Results: These are all ePIC Results that are approved for presentation outside the ePIC Collaboration by ePIC members and that are not Published ePIC Results.

Non-public ePIC Results: These are special ePIC Results that can be used in presentation under certain circumstances, such as regional meetings, job interviews, theses, etc.

1.3 Other

email: used throughout the policy to imply the agreed upon form of centralized communication within the collaboration.

2. General rules

2.1 Approval procedure

- For all *Working Group Level* approval requests, working groups have 1 week to make a decision. It is highly recommended that proponents provide regular updates in working group(s) meetings to facilitate the approval process.
 - For new results to be presented at a conference, approval requests to working groups should be made at least 2 weeks before the conference starts.
 - For results that need approval at the *Coordinator Level*, approval requests to working groups should be made at least 1 week before the coordinator approval.
 - For results that are not intended for a conference, approval requests to working groups should be made at least 1 week before the usage of the new results.

- Proponents of new ePIC results should submit requests for approval via email to the relevant working group(s).

- Each working group convener is expected to provide feedback and communicate their decision to the proponents within 1 week. Failure to respond within this timeframe can result in the convener's decision not being considered for the approval or disapproval of the requests. If no convener responds within 1 week, proponents can request relevant *Coordinator(s)* to make a decision.

- If a working group has only one convener and this convener requests approval of new ePIC results, the relevant *Coordinator(s)* should assign one person from the

same working group or act themselves as the approval body at the *Working Group Level*.

- In situations where conveners of the reviewing working group are split in the decision, the majority opinion determines the outcome. In case there is an equal split, *Coordinator(s)* will make a decision for the approval or disapproval of the requests based on the available information.
- In case of dispute during the approval process within the *Working Group Level*, proponents can appeal to the *Coordinator Level*. If that does not resolve the dispute or the dispute is with the *Coordinator Level*, proponents can appeal to the Spokesperson Office, and finally to ePIC Collaboration Council (CC) if the Spokesperson Office could not resolve the dispute.
- In all instances, a decision to disapprove a result by working group conveners or *Coordinator(s)* must be accompanied by a written rationale, which will be shared with the Spokesperson Office. In case the disapproval is handed down by the Spokesperson Office, the reasoning must be provided in writing by the Spokesperson Office to ePIC CC.

2.2 Public ePIC Results

- All approved results must be reproducible, i.e., they are produced based on official records, such as official plans and designs, geometry files, simulation campaigns, test beam, real data, etc.
- All approved figures should include appropriate tags and list sufficient information, such as collision system and energy, beam polarization if any, process of interest, axis titles with appropriate units, legend, etc, for correct interpretation of the results presented.
- It is the data points and associated message, not the figures themselves, that are approved. ePIC members can make new figures using approved data points and uncertainties. Should this happen, new figures need to be approved at *Working Group Level* before they can be released.
- All approved results should be uploaded to the ePIC Documentation Management System (DMS), such as Zenodo, by the proponents with required

accompanying documents. In case a result is updated, the new result should supersede the old one in DMS.

- Presenters are highly encouraged to include only approved ePIC results stored in the ePIC DMS in their presentations. Copy-and-pasting from others' presentations is discouraged as they could include obsolete results.
- Any request for data points of *Public ePIC Results* from people outside of the ePIC Collaboration should be directed to the Physics Analysis Coordinators, who will distribute the requested data points. PACs will make it clear to the requesters that these data should be labelled clearly and appropriately, such as ePIC Preliminary, in their presentations and papers.

3. Approval Procedures

3.1 Approval procedure for Public ePIC Results

3.1.1 Performance results

Scope

- Results that do not contain new physics messages.

Tag

- ePIC Test Beam: results based on test beam data.
- ePIC Computing: results related to software and computing infrastructure, algorithm, flow chart, plans, DAQ, etc.
- ePIC Performance: results based on simulation, cosmic ray data, real data, etc.
- ePIC Simulation: results based on simulation, machine learning, etc.
- ePIC Technical: technical/engineering drawings.

Approval procedure

- Approval body: *Working Group Level*
- Timeline: *1 week*

Version control

- These results can be updated upon approval by the same approval body.
- All approved results should include release month and year (mm/yyyy).

Accompanying documents

- A brief summary of information, in the form such as metadata, a brief note, slides, etc, needed for reproducing the results, e.g., campaign tag, geometry tag, production tag, analysis cuts, test condition, collision information, etc.

3.1.2 Preliminary results

Scope

- Results based on real collision data and contain new physics messages.

Tag

- ePIC Preliminary.

Approval procedure

- Step 1
 - Approval body: *Working Group Level*
 - Timeline: *1 week*
- Step 2
 - Approval body: *Coordinator Level* at a Physics Forum, run by ACs and open to the entire collaboration.
 - New results, requested to be approved, should be posted 3 work days before the Physics Forum starts. Comments from the collaboration should be communicated prior to or at the Physics Forum.

Version control

- No updates are allowed for preliminary results until they become *Published ePIC Results*.
 - Exceptions for releasing a secondary preliminary on the same result can be requested to and granted by the Spokesperson Office under extraordinary circumstances, e.g., work on publishing a preliminary result has been halted for more than 1 year due to reasons such as the main analyzer has left the field, and the Collaboration Council should be informed. The release of secondary preliminary results needs to proceed through the official approval procedure outlined above.
- If a preliminary result is found erroneous and the associated physics message would change, it should not be shown in public until the corrected result is published. Such erroneous preliminary results should be marked as withdrawn in the DMS. Whether an official statement to the community about the erroneous results is warranted will be under the discretion of the Spokesperson Office.

Accompany document

- Analysis note based on the official ePIC template and including all relevant details of the analysis procedure for producing the results.
- Analysis codes, including instructions on how to run them, uploaded to the ePIC repository, such as GitHub.

3.2 Approval procedure for Published ePIC Results

3.2.1 Published results

Scope

- Any final results that are released to the public following the publication policy.

Tag

- ePIC

Version control: N/A

Approval procedure: see publication policy.

Accompanying document: see publication policy.

Upload to DMS: see publication policy.

- Published results will supersede corresponding preliminary results in DMS.

3.3 Approval procedure for non-Public ePIC Results

3.3.1 Work in progress

Scope

- Any results, but no new physics messages can be extracted from them. How to achieve this will be dealt with on a case-by-base basis, e.g. using arbitrary units for yield measurement or showing only uncertainty projection for asymmetry measurement.

Use case

- Students and postdocs present their own work at regional or national conferences that do not have proceedings, such as APS, EPS meetings.
 - If required, presentations including work-in-progress figures can be uploaded online.
 - In case the student or postdoc presenter could not give the presentation, the alternative speaker, regardless of their professional status, can also present these results.
- Presentations for job interviews.
 - Work from a student's thesis does not require approval by ePIC to be shown at a job interview by the student, but cannot be presented as an ePIC approved result.

Tags

- ePIC Work In Progress.

Approval procedure

- Approval body: *Working Group Level*
- Timeline: *1 week*

Version control: N/A

Accompanying document: N/A

Upload to DMS: N/A

3.3.2 Non-approved results

Scope

- Any non-approved ePIC results.

Use case

- *Reviews, seminars and colloquia*: only public or published ePIC results are expected to be presented. Requests to show non-approved ePIC results should be made to the relevant approval body (see below).
- *Progress reports to funding agencies, funding proposals*: these are confidential processes that the ePIC Collaboration does not have jurisdiction over. **No approval from ePIC is needed.**
- *Thesis*: the ePIC Collaboration does not have jurisdiction over. **No approval from ePIC is needed.**

Tags

- *Reviews, seminars and colloquia*: ePIC Work In Progress.
- *Thesis*: This Thesis.

Approval procedure

- Only applies to *reviews, seminars and colloquia*
 - Approval body: *Working Group Level*
 - Timeline: *1 week*

Version control: N/A

Accompanying document: N/A

Upload to DMS: N/A