MINOS Authorship and Publications Rules

(Version 10, Approved February 2012)

The administration of the approval of refereed papers, physics results, conference submissions and publications and of the MINOS author list will be the responsibility of the MINOS Authorship and Publications (MAP) committee. The committee will consist of the spokespeople, the IB chairperson and the elected members of the executive committee. The committee will elect a MAP chairperson and deputy and a Technical Paper Coordinator.

MINOS Analysis Approval Procedure

1) The decision as to whether to have a blind analysis and any blinding procedure which will be used in the analysis must be presented to, and approved by, the collaboration in an early stage of the analysis.
2) The approval of the collaboration must be given before any un-blinding of an analysis.
3) The MAP committee will define the means of the approval.

MINOS Data Approval Procedure

The data approval procedure is covered, by a separate document, which was approved in December 2006. *(Student theses are not covered by this procedure.)*

MINOS Paper Approval Procedure

1) There will be three types of paper approval;
   a) Long Physics papers (PRD type)
   b) Time sensitive shorter Physics papers (PRL type)
   c) Technical papers
2) Physics Papers
   a) Draft papers will normally be born and iterated within the appropriate working group and are thus expected to be quite mature before being submitted for consideration for publication. For PRL type papers, there should be a draft (without results) available for reading as part of the box opening.
   b) Draft papers from the working groups or any other sources will be submitted for consideration to the MAP committee.
   c) The MAP committee will appoint an ad hoc group of referees, at least 2 from the full collaboration and one from MAP, who are knowledgeable on the subject of the paper but not directly associated with the work reported. The MAP chair will choose the chair of the ad-hoc committee. The charge of the ad-hoc committee will be to discuss the paper with the authors with the constructive objective of improving the physics and/or the presentation of the paper to bring it to a publication-ready standard.
   d) Papers are expected to be written in clear English. At least one member of each paper committee should be given the responsibility to carefully review the language in the paper. At every stage in the paper's review, comments should be

separated into those of a physics/structural (substantive) nature, and those regarding the word style and/or Figure formats.

e) After the author(s) have received and acted on the ad-hoc committee's comments, the revised paper, together with the ad-hoc committee's report, will be announced either via an email to minos_authors or at an open session at a collaboration meeting. These documents will be placed on the internal web for collaboration review. This is followed by a reading period which is three weeks for PRD type papers and ten days for PRL type papers.

f) During the reading period, collaboration members may make comments to the ad-hoc committee, who will filter these comments to those which in their opinion improve the paper, and those which do not. The author(s) will have the responsibility of incorporating any changes which are the outcome of this process. The ad-hoc committee will be responsible for responding to any substantive comments which are considered not to warrant inclusion, but not for any such style comments.

g) At the end of the reading period the authors will produce another version of the paper which will be posted for collaboration comments. One week will be allocated to this, after which the ad-hoc committee and author(s) will produce what is expected to be a final version.

h) It is expected that each committees work will be done in a timely matter. The MAP chair will give each committee a timeframe in their charge, depending on the length of the paper. It is up to the committee chairman to ensure rapid turnaround to the author(s), and it is up to the MAP Chair to monitor the timeliness of the committee responses.

i) Once the above is done, the ad-hoc committee can decide either to recommend to MAP that they approve the paper for publication, or, if there are substantial changes to ask the author(s) to post the paper for another week of collaboration scrutiny and the ensuing comments.

j) If at this point there is an impasse between the ad-hoc committee and the authors or if the ad-hoc committee feels that there is no consensus in the Collaboration either on major physics issues or on suitability for publication, the ad-hoc committee will refer the issue to MAP.

k) The MAP committee will approve the paper for publication, if it considers that a consensus of the collaboration has been reached and that the paper is suitable for publication. This will be done by a full review of the ad-hoc committee's report and of the comments received.

l) If the MAP committee considers that valid criticism has been made it will appoint a further ad-hoc committee to study the objections with the paper’s authors. A revised paper will be presented to the collaboration as in d).

m) If a consensus still cannot be reached a vote of the whole collaboration will be held. Of those voting, a 90% majority in favor of publication will be required for publication.

n) If the journal refereeing process requires any significant change to the physics content of the paper the changes must pass through the approval process as above except that the presentation to the collaboration may be made at a phone meeting if the next collaboration meeting is more than one month away.

   o) Any timeframe can be extended at the discretion of the MAP chair to account for holidays or special circumstances.
3) Technical papers
   a) Technical papers are expected to come from relatively small groups who have done R&D on a hardware or software component of the MINOS experiment or have used the MINOS MC for studies of physics capabilities beyond the remit of the MINOS experiment.
   b) Draft papers will be produced by the group and submitted to the Technical Paper Coordinator who will appoint a small group of referees. The referees will read the paper in depth and offer comments to the authors and MAP on both content and editorial issues.
   c) After the interaction with the readers the revised paper will be posted on the internal web site and comments to the authors and MAP invited from the full collaboration. Ten days will be allowed for comments.
   d) The final responsibility for the paper belongs to the authors. However the MAP committee will review both the reader's and the collaboration's comments and if it considers that they have substance, which has not been addressed it will notify the full collaboration.
4) The MAP committee will maintain a set of guidelines for the authors of papers, covering time-scales, procedures and contact persons.

MINOS Authorship Rules

Current Authors:

- PhD physicist or graduate student
- Currently working on MINOS
- Has input at least one calendar year of significant effort.
- Is commitment to do significant work, which is of general utility to the collaboration other than analysis (service work). The spokespersons, with the advice of various working group leaders, will both provide a list of tasks that qualify to be designated service work and certify (upon recommendation of the IB representative of the relevant MINOS group) when that obligation has been fulfilled.

Legacy author:

- Has left the collaboration
- Has been a current author in the past
- Stays one year as legacy author, for each two years worked on MINOS (fractions rounded up). Except for graduate student and postdocs, the maximum legacy time is limited to 1 year.
- Legacy authors will be asked to consider signing up to be on the paper.
- If a collaborator dies, he/she will be treated as a legacy author who has signed up to be on the paper (but not if a legacy author dies).

1) Physics papers

a) Physics papers will be signed by the full collaboration (current and legacy authors).
b) Other people, who have made significant contributions to MINOS, may automatically be authors of the first MINOS paper and the first paper dealing with neutrino oscillations using the NuMI beam.
c) Each group will submit to the IB a set of names for general authorship of those who qualify under the above criteria plus any other names that the group wishes to put forward for special consideration, yearly on the 1st January.
d) The MAP committee will vet the names list. If, after discussion between the committee and the group, there is still disagreement on whether a name qualifies, a vote, decided by a simple majority of those present, will be held in the IB.
e) A special case for inclusion on a specific paper may be made to the MAP committee, either by a group or an individual, when the person in question has made an important contribution to that paper but does not qualify for authorship under the general rules. If the MAP committee rejects the case, the group or individual may appeal to the IB, which will vote as in section f).
f) Authors will be listed in alphabetical order with references to an institution list, also in alphabetical order.
g) Any author may remove their name from a paper by notifying the chairperson of the MAP committee.
h) A new MINOS collaborator will be eligible for authorship in a MINOS physics paper if he(she) has fulfilled his(her) MINOS obligation by the end of the last (in case there are more than one) 3-week Collaboration comment period on that paper. It shall be the responsibility of the Institutional IB rep to provide that information to the person(s) responsible for the paper submittal.
i) For other purposes, the date of a paper will be considered the start of the first 3-week Collaboration comment period on that paper.
j) An author who has moved from one institution to another will have the former institution listed for six months for every year at the former institution.

2) Technical papers
   a) Technical papers will have a restricted set of authors consisting of those who have made a significant intellectual contribution to the subject of the paper.
   b) The Technical Paper Coordinator will act as a moderator for the author list.
   c) A draft paper will contain a proposed author list. Anybody not on the list who thinks they have a case for inclusion may contact the authors and the Technical Paper Coordinator.
   d) Disputes over authorship will be resolved by the MAP committee, appeals may be made to the IB as in section 1)f).

Conference Presentation Approval Procedure

1) Only approved physics results may be presented at conferences and in seminars.
2) Other MINOS results are on a graded scale of sensitivity. In general detector and event pictures may be shown without approval. Care should be taken with items closer to physics, such as resolutions. Data shown at semi-public occasions such as

PAC or Lehman reviews may be shown. In case of doubt the chairperson of MAP should be consulted.

3) It is the responsibility of the physics working groups and particularly the working group conveners to maintain a reasonable supply of new results, including Monte Carlo and detector diagnostic results, available for conference speakers. Conveners should refer to the list of approved speakers and conference dates on the MINOS web to provide a timely set of results.
4) Conference presentations and any subsequent proceedings will be signed as "John Bull, for the MINOS collaboration".
5) Speakers must post their slides on the MINOS web site at least one week before the first day of the conference and send an email to minos_authors informing the collaboration of their presence.
6) All results not yet published in journals shall be noted as preliminary.
7) Written conference proceedings must be submitted to the MAP Committee for approval. Provided only approved results are included approval will normally be automatic.
8) Adherence to these regulations is a condition for future conference presentations.