

Publication Policy of the ePIC Collaboration

1

2

1. Publication categories

3

This publication policy details the different steps that ePIC authors must take to bring the results obtained to a final publication. The individual steps are sub-divided for three specific paper categories: conference proceedings, technical and simulation papers, and physics papers. Each category has its own workflow and decision chain based on the results and the individuals involved. For the purpose of publication reviews, the Publication Policy Committee (PC) will be extended to a larger editorial board (EB) to be elected by the Collaboration Council.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1 Conference Proceedings

11

Conference proceedings are based on information presented by a collaboration member in a conference talk or poster. Whether the proceedings are peer reviewed or not, the approval process remains the same. Since the talk/poster had to be approved by a previous decision chain, which is already detailed in the Conference Committee Policy, the publication will follow the same procedure for the proceedings. That means conference proceedings will be reviewed under the guidance of the relevant project leaders or working group conveners, together with the technical/computing/physics coordinators, and the final approval by the PC/EB.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1.2 Technical and Simulation Papers

20

Technical papers refer to detector papers, software/computing papers, and analysis techniques papers, and simulation papers refer to any detector or physics analysis based on simulated data. Decisions on technical and Simulation papers will be initiated and overseen by the respective project leader. The project leader can choose to form an internal review committee of experts. The only reviews by non-project members, will be in the final steps of the decision chain, namely the required approval by the technical/computing/analysis coordinator and the final approval by the PC/EB.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1.3 Physics Papers	28
A physics publication in a peer-reviewed journal requires the full decision chain and work flow, which are detailed in Section 2.	29 30
2. Workflow and decision chain - from analysis to peer-reviewed publication	31 32
All publications described in this policy should be based on measurements that are appropriately approved and labeled, according to the ePIC Result Release Policy on publishable data.	33 34 35
The most elaborate publication category, which is the final physics papers, will have to pass through the following decision chain before submission to the journal.	36 37
a.) the physics working group or technical project coordination.	38
b.) the physics coordinators and the collaboration forum.	39
c.) the internal review committee.	40
d.) the institutional and collaboration reviews.	41
e.) the publication committee/editorial board.	42
f.) the spokesperson's office.	43
2.1 Physics Working Group duties and guidelines	44
A paper starts with the formation of a primary author (PA) group within a physics working group. The group should have a common interest. The size of the group can be determined by the authors themselves under the guidance of the working group conveners.	45 46 47
At the appropriate time, the PAs will propose an analysis to the physics working group. At the time of completion of the analysis the PAs will draft an analysis note, which will be internally reviewed in the working group by an Analysis Review Committee (ARC), chosen by the conveners. Analysis notes are not publicly available and may not be distributed outside the Collaboration. They are accessible to all members of the Collaboration on the ePIC Web site. Upon approval of the analysis note by the conveners, the PAs propose a manuscript of a certain length with a defined set of figures for publication in a particular journal, accompanied by the detailed analysis note, which contains all information needed for the reproduction of the analysis, including a detailed uncertainty determination of the final results. The data and software used in the analysis note need to adhere to the accessibility policy in Sec. 4.1.	48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58
2.2 Physics Coordination and Public Forum	59
This proposal will be reviewed in a public forum by the physics coordinators, under the advice of the physics working group coordinators, for its suitability in terms of journal	60 61

choice, content, and figures. If it passes this review, the PC/EB will choose an internal review committee (IRC), consisting of three to five collaboration members to review the paper and the analysis steps. The PAs by default will be part of the IRC and may give suggestions to the PC/EB regarding its members. **At the time of the forum, a group of experts, chosen by the spokespersons office in accordance with the physics coordinators, will also decide whether a result verification through multiple analyses is necessary to publish the measurement. If so, the relevant Physics Working Group will be charged with producing such a cross-check in a timely manner.**

2.3 Internal Review Committee duties and guidelines

The IRC has particular duties that go beyond the review of the analysis method and physics message, including quality assurance of the analysis code (availability and applicability), as well as the appropriateness and correctness of the language used in the paper. The initial IRC review should be limited to three months or less. The IRC will submit written updates on the paper progress to the PC after three months and then monthly until the completion of the review process. Every six months, IRC Chairs will meet with the PC during a collaboration meeting to provide an oral update. An IRC can be replaced by the PC due to inactivity after a one-year review period.

2.4 Collaboration and institutional review guidelines

After IRC approval, the PC/EB will submit the paper for simultaneous reviews by the whole collaboration and five institutions selected by the PC/EB. Both reviews are to be completed within two weeks. The combined comments, which are collected on the paper webpage, will be addressed by the primary authors in up to four weeks after receipt. The potential changes and answers submitted by the PAs will be reviewed and approved by the original commenters within one week.

2.5 Final Administrative Approvals and Journal Submission

This version of the paper will then undergo a final reading by a selected PC/EB member within one additional week, before the paper will be approved by the spokesperson's office. **Upon final approval, the PC/EB, in coordination with the primary authors, will send the paper to the journal and simultaneously post it on the preprint server. A designated primary author will be appointed as the contact person for correspondence with the journal.** After publication, the authors are responsible for making the analysis results available to the public according to the policy in Sec. 4.3.

2.6 Guidelines for Publication Re-Submission	95
Journal reviews which require revisions have to be addressed by the primary authors, and then approved by the IRC and the PC/EB before re-submission.	96 97
3. Guidelines for extraordinary publications	98
3.1 Guidelines for Erroneous Publications	99
Examples leading to erroneous publications include, but are not limited to: fundamentally wrong steps in the analysis leading to erroneous results, a plot/graph that incorrectly represents the present work or the work of others, a statement or statements that improperly describe the analysis or the results or the implications of the results. Somewhat less serious mistakes include a misstatement describing the work of others, the inclusion of the work of others without proper attribution, a missed citation or reference, an incorrect historical statement, an erroneous attribution, or a plot/graph with minor mistakes. When a mistake is discovered in an ePIC publication, and depending on its severity, the following actions should be considered and, if appropriate, some or all should be implemented by the PC/EB in consultation with the spokesperson, the primary authors, the relevant working group conveners, and the internal review committee	100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform the community as soon as the mistake is discovered by notifying the Deputy/Associate Directors at the two host laboratories (BNL and JLAB). • Inform all ePIC Collaborators and impose that the erroneous result should not be used in any future presentations, papers, etc. • Consider a formal retraction if the mistake changes the qualitative implications of the publication. • The PC should form an ad-hoc internal committee to investigate and understand the origin of the mistake and any lessons that can be learned from the incident. • Once a new result is available, this committee will verify its reliability. The new result will then be publicized in a presentation, at an appropriate meeting or conference. • Publish an erratum and, if appropriate, publish a new paper with the correct results. The process for the review of the erratum must follow the standard procedures for the publication of ePIC results. The membership of the IRC may be the same as that for the original paper. The author list for the erratum should be the same as the author list for the original publication (including authors who have since left ePIC) and may include additional authors who have made specific contributions to this erratum, including new results. 	111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128

3.2 Guidelines for Press Releases	129
Members of the Collaboration or participating universities/laboratories should not issue press releases or call press conferences without the written consent of the spokesperson's office.	130 131 132
4. Accessibility of data and software inside and outside the collaboration	133
4.1 Accessibility inside the collaboration	135
All data obtained with the ePIC detector are available to all collaborators 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 ePIC must comply with the ePIC policy for data and analysis preservation. Requests from colleagues within the collaboration to provide code and parameters must be granted and accompanied by publishing the analysis code in a repository in the GitHub organization of the ePIC collaboration, available for all collaboration members.	136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143
4.2 Accessibility outside the Collaboration	144
Given the overriding principle of open communication, collaborators should, upon request from a colleague, provide relevant input assumptions that would permit published results to be checked and confirmed. Detailed analysis code can be made available on a case-by-case basis, but should not be shared without approval by the physics coordinator. The results themselves will be stored and made available on a service platform, such as 'hepdata', in tabularized form upon publication of the paper.	145 146 147 148 149 150 151
4.3 Book keeping of all figures and paper versions during the work flow	152
Each working group, in consultation with the Publication Committee, contributes to an ePIC Repository of Figures accessible via a web interface.	154 155
The repository contains all figures of all publishable data categories. Each figure entry in the Repository specifies a Contact Person and is accompanied by a complete caption. Each figure must include clearly labeled variables and units of measure, plus a legend specifying the colliding systems and energy and the nature of the uncertainties (statistical and systematic). Figures must explicitly include an ePIC label according to their data category.	156 157 158 159 160 161

ePIC simulation, performance, Work in progress plots can and need to be updated 162
with their most recent version. ePIC preliminary plots can only be updated with ePIC 163
final plots that are approved for publication. 164

A paper webpage and repository will be established when the paper has been proposed 165
to the physics coordination and will be closed when the final version has been approved by 166
the journal. The analysis note and all paper versions, as well as all comments throughout 167
the drafting and review processes will be maintained on the affiliated website. 168

5. Authorship guidelines 169

5.1 General paper authorship 170

An official ePIC Author List will be maintained by the Publication Committee and pub- 171
lished on the ePIC Author List website. 172

At least once per year, the Spokesperson shall solicit an author list from each institu- 173
tion via the ePIC council representative. Inclusion in the institution's author list implies 174
that the individual must have worked on ePIC for at least six months and must be 'in 175
good standing' according to the membership rules. In general, collaborators on an institu- 176
tion's author list are encouraged to contribute to some aspect of the design, construction, 177
and operation of ePIC. Authors who have been collaborators for at least one full year 178
will remain on the institution's author list for one year after leaving the Collaboration. 179
Changes to the institution's author list may be made between annual solicitations by 180
communicating these to the Publication Committee by email. 181

All persons listed on the ePIC Author List will be authors on all ePIC physics public- 182
ations. In infrequent cases, one or more ePIC authors may choose not to be listed among 183
the authors on a given paper. This may arise because of disagreements with the contents 184
of the paper that were unable to be resolved. In these cases, it is the responsibility of 185
these authors to notify the spokesperson and the PC in writing (e-mail) of their request 186
to be removed from the author list for that specific paper. 187

Occasionally additional authors, who are not listed on the ePIC Author List, may 188
be added on specific physics papers. Such additions may include a student or a former 189
ePIC collaborator who has left the collaboration for more than one year, who have made 190
significant contributions to a detector in ePIC or to the analysis or software development 191
that was significant for a specific result in the paper. Such inclusions can be initiated 192
by the relevant council representative or the principal authors. The inclusion must be 193
endorsed by the PAs and approved by the publication committee and the spokesperson's 194
office. 195

The authors of papers will be listed in alphabetical order, preceded or followed by the 196
phrase "ePIC Collaboration". Papers for conference proceedings are normally submitted 197
in the speaker's name, plus other major contributors if appropriate, plus "on behalf of 198
the ePIC Collaboration". 199

5.2 Technical and simulation papers with limited authorship 200

Technical and simulation papers need only list as authors those individuals who contributed to that project, but the "ePIC Collaboration" should be acknowledged. The decision of the final author list lies with the project leader and the technical/computing/analysis coordinator, and can include non-ePIC members or all members. Project leaders are allowed to initiate ePIC sub-groups (e.g. the ePIC-TOF group or the ePIC luminosity group) for the purpose of publication and presentations, but the member, and subsequent author, lists have to be approved by the respective coordinators and the spokesperson's office. 208

5.3 Few author physics papers 209

Few author papers that include 'Preliminary ePIC results' fall under these special guidelines. The intent here is to avoid placing 'Preliminary ePIC Results' in the public print domain, to which citations can point. The concern is that these results can and at times do change rather dramatically yielding substantially altered physics interpretations. The standard exception is the case of Conference Proceedings, which implies that these 'Preliminary ePIC Results' were presented orally and visually at conferences. 215

For standard publications, ePIC Collaborators should not publish "single" or "few" author papers that include 'Preliminary ePIC Results'. Exceptions may be granted by the Spokesperson if, at a minimum, the preliminary results are with the IRC or approved by the PWG and the publication of these preliminary results will not negatively impact the final ePIC publication of the result. 220

5.4 Thesis guidelines 221

The Spokesperson will maintain a list of ePIC students and their thesis topics, which will be posted on a website and updated annually. Council members are urged to inform the spokesperson of a student's thesis topic, chosen or changed at any time. In addition, this list can be used by the Conference Committee, DSCs and all Working Groups to track student activity and promote student involvement in conferences. 226

Official collaboration approval of a thesis completion also requires completion of the student's service work duties. It is the responsibility of the WG convener(s), and Project leader(s), together with the thesis advisor(s), to ensure that an electronic copy of the thesis is uploaded to the ePIC document server in a timely fashion after completion. Data and analyses presented in a student thesis but not in ePIC Conference Proceedings or in ePIC refereed publications are not considered published ePIC results. 232