HPS Rules: Making results public in a Thesis

Raphaël Dupré

IPN Orsay
CNRS-IN2P3
Université Paris-Sud

Unité mixte de recherche

CNRS-IN2P3
Université Paris-Sud

91406 Orsay cedex
Tél. : +33 1 69 15 73 40
Fax : +33 1 69 15 64 70
http://ipnweb.in2p3.fr

First Recorded Discussion

- **Point 4 refers to the rule at the time**

Heavy Photon Search Group / ... / 2012 Meetings of EC

Edit Watch Share •••

09.07.2012 EC

Created by john a. jaros, last modified on May 30, 2013

Present: Stepan, FX, Matt, Takashi, John Please send comments/correction to the whole mail list.

1. News
Stepan noted that McKeown showed (Full) HPS running in 2015 (with p charge radius) in Hall B before NSAC. This possibility lets JLAB make good use of Hall B before CLAS is ready to go, and helps remove HPS from competing for time after CLAS is installed. Also moves us along, but will make us think harder about how much we need to and can upgrade the Test Run experiment in time. Good for discussion at the Collaboration meeting.

2. Election at collab meeting.
The EC's duty is to "oversee". EC okayed proposed election procedure for Collab Business Meeting Day 3: 1)review Yuri's request; 2)allow discussion; 3)vote on secret ballot; 4)spokespeople tabulate and announce result.

3. John will set up an EC page on confluence for meeting minutes, collaboration author list, thesis list, etc.

4. Consensus is that a paper on multiple scattering should not be considered a collaboration physics result, so should not be subject to all the formalities of EC and PPC approvals. It will still of course need to be approved by the committees and collab for publication.

New Business: Physics Results

Again from the Bylaws:

- "Approval of official results, both preliminary and final, will be coordinated by the EC and the PPC and voted on by the Collaboration..."
- "Test data and measurements that illustrate the performance of the HPS apparatus, beam quality, etc., may be shown…at the speaker's discretion. However, HPS physics data and results must not be presented without the consent of the collaboration."

"Tails of the Multiple Coulomb Scattering Distribution"
HPS Physics Result or Test Measurement?

- **John's slide in Collab. Meeting September 2012 and June 2013**

Discussion with Thesis Rules (2.2)

01.30.2014 EC

Created by john a. jaros, last modified on Jan 30, 2014

Present: Raphael, Tim, Takashi, Marco Oriunno, Stepan, Maurik, FX, John

Comments and corrections should be sent to the entire EC mail list.

0. Review of the DOE Report on the Review, and McKeown's prescription for HPS approval.
The documents were distributed before the meeting as input for today's discussion.
HPS Approval Document.docx Report of the Review of the HPS Experiment.pdf

1. Preparing Next Documents
We discussed preparing a new document which will serve as a formal response to the DOE Review as well as the Approval document that Bob McKeown has requested. A tentative outline and writing assignments are shown in the attached ppt. Next HPS Documents.ppt

2. Thesis Policy
We reviewed the revised thesis policy John showed at the Collaboration Meeting.

Several changes were suggested: 1) ask clearly that students make significant and original contributions to whatever analysis they are working on; 2) refer students and advisors to the HPS policy regarding dissemination of results; 3) make clear that the student need not wait on HPS publishing its results before defending a thesis.

John has amended the draft with these points. Everyone should review and make further suggestions as needed.
Thesis Policy Guidelines.ppt

Respectfully submitted,

John

HPS Thesis Policy

1. An HPS thesis should present the details of a new intellectual contribution to HPS science to which the student has made major contributions.

2. Ideally, students will present original analyses in their theses. However, several students may use the same HPS data set and may write on the same topic if each of them has made significant contributions to the HPS analysis of that topic.

3. A thesis ideally concentrates on particle physics/nuclear physics results from HPS, but may also describe hardware and technical developments in the experiment.

4. Advisors and students are required to submit proposals for future thesis work to the EC for approval. If the proposal becomes unworkable because of extenuating circumstances, a revised proposal may be submitted. The EC will work with the advisor and student toward a mutually acceptable proposal.

5. Advisors and students are reminded of HPS Collaboration Policy for Presentations and Publications, which require pre-approval of all physics results by the collaboration before they are presented in a public forum or document.

6. A student who is defending a thesis is urged to invite HPS collaboration members to her/his Thesis Defense.

7. HPS's primary goal as an experiment is to deliver its principal physics results in a timely way. Thesis students are expected to play as large a role in this as they can, but presentation of HPS results need not wait on the student's timetable, nor must presentation of a student's thesis wait on the relevant HPS results being made public (but see #5).

- **John's slide in Collab Meeting June 2014**

5.

V. Reminder: HPS Thesis Policy

1. An HPS thesis should present the details of a new intellectual contribution to HPS science to which the student has made major contributions.

2. Ideally, students will present original analyses in their theses. However, several students may use the same HPS data set and may write on the same topic if each of them has made significant contributions to the HPS analysis of that topic.

3. A thesis ideally concentrates on particle physics/nuclear physics results from HPS, but may also describe hardware and technical developments in the experiment.

4. Advisors and students are required to submit proposals for future thesis work to the EC for approval. If the proposal becomes unworkable because of extenuating circumstances, a revised proposal may be submitted. The EC will work with the advisor and student toward a mutually acceptable proposal.

5. Advisors and students are reminded of HPS Collaboration Policy for Presentations and Publications, which require pre-approval of all physics results by the collaboration before they are presented in a public forum or document.

6. A student who is defending a thesis is urged to invite HPS collaboration members to her/his Thesis Defense.

7. HPS's primary goal as an experiment is to deliver its principal physics results in a timely way. Thesis students are expected to play as large a role in this as they can, but presentation of HPS results need not wait on the student's timetable, nor must presentation of a student's thesis wait on the relevant HPS results being made public (but see #5).

- **John's slide in Collab Meeting January 2015**

5.

EC Discussion Point 5

06.11.2015 EC

Created by john a. jaros on Jun 11, 2015

Present: FX, Raphael, Stepan, Maurik, Tim, Takashi, John

1. Proposal for HPS shift schedule for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016

Stepan updated our expectations for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016. Arne is seeing lots of CEBAF commissioning time being required this fall, and priority given to 12 GeV operations in Halls A and D. HPS is an unhappy fourth. In addition, the 12 GeV project is talking about 2 shifts per day during the week. This doesn't leave us much running time for the fall, but it's still worth taking if we have some assurances that it will materialize.

We will try to get updated information for the Collaboration Meeting, and assess there whether it will be worth our while to run weekends only in the Fall. For now, we should assume that Fall shifts are only on weekends.

We are urged to consider running in the Spring 2016 by Volker. Of course, we already are, but we will make it a point to push this case with JLAB. The spokespeople will send the appropriate note to JLAB management.

2. Sub-System Expert Shift Proposal

After some vigorous and perhaps incomplete discussion, we decided to leave unchanged the present sub-system expert shift policy. All experts were called on extensively for the Spring run, and we are not yet a smooth-running experiment, so all experts are needed.

3. Days, Nights, and Weekends Proposal

As mentioned above, we are tentatively considering weekend running only for Fall shifts in 2015. We'll hope to resolve our plans at Paris after collaboration wide discussion.

4. Subsystem work needed for fall run

EC agreed that each subsystem be asked to present its plans for fixes/upgrades at Paris, including items, costs, manpower needed, and schedule. They will be asked to keep the EC in the loop before Paris so we can start to address manpower and budget issues that arise.

5. Guidance on what plots to show and what message to give re the 2015 Engineering Run.

EC agreed with Stepan's concern that viewer's may misinterpret the recent reach plots and detector performance plots shown to JLAB management. We agreed that there are enough uncertainties about the reach that we should not issue new plots until such plots are justified --not anytime soon. John will draft a set of guidelines for HPS speakers who will address the Engineering run in talks over the next couple of months. EC will edit and omment, then we'll send to HPS and the PPC.

Respectfully,

John
EC Chair

Analysis note and New physics results

Heavy Photon Search Group / ... / 2017 EC Meetings

Edit Watch Share ...

04.07.2017 EC

Created by john a. jaros on Apr 07, 2017

Present: Stepan, Maurik, Tim, Matt, Raphael, Nathan, John

Please send comments/corrections to the above email list.

1. Procedures for reviewing papers and approving presentation of new physics results Norman Graf reminded us that HPS has established no written rules for how/when to unblind, what the role of a review committee should be, or what level of detail was expected in an analysis note. The review committee he chairs was established and charged by the analysis group to help in the unblinding decision for the 2015 bump hunt analysis, but found their role confused by their own expectations and that called out in the bylaws for a physics publications review committee. We all agreed it is time to better spell out our procedures for reviewing for unblinding, reviewing new results, and preparing publications. The sooner the better.

To this end, Norman agreed, with the help of the present review committee, to circulate proposed guidelines for the level of detail needed in an analysis note before the upcoming collaboration meeting. He also agreed that the present review committee (Raphael, FX, Valeri, and Norman) would propose changes to our bylaws, which more accurately spell out the role of the review committee for future physics results.

The analysis group convernors, Nathan and Matt, were asked to propose more formal procedures for reviewing an analysis and deciding upon its readiness to be unblinded. More discussion on what actually constitutes unblinding is in order. They should propose bylaw additions/changes if they think them appropriate. We were reminded that the analysis group was given the authority to decide on whether to unblind at our last Collaboration meeting. An analysis note is prerequisite to unblinding. To help with their decision, they constituted and charged (Norman's) review committee. One of many questions worth settling is when in this process the analysis note should be released to the entire collaboration.

Our present bylaws do spell out procedures for how to present new physics results. These make no mention of an analysis note being circulated to the collaboration before approval, nor mention of any role for a review committee at the approval stage. It will be useful if Norman and his committee, the analysis group, and any other interested parties weigh in on any modifications needed in our present bylaws in these respects.

The lack of full and proper documentation of all aspects of the experiment impedes our backing up new physics results. We must continue to take steps to remedy this situation, especially concerning tracking.

Present Bylaws

11.3 Physics Data and Results for Presentation and Publication

Test data and measurements that illustrate the performance of the HPS apparatus, beam quality etc., may be shown during the development stage of the experiment at the speaker's discretion. However, HPS physics data and results must not be presented publicly without the consent of the collaboration.

For talks at which HPS physics data are to be presented, "key transparencies" should be circulated for comment as far in advance of the talk as possible. The decision to present the data must be made by the Collaboration prior to the presentation of the talk (approval can be granted in a phone conference); the circulation of "key transparencies" is intended to provide opportunity for useful feedback to the speaker from the collaboration at large rather than to be used as a basis for deciding what may or may not be presented in public.

Preliminary and Final Results: For any particular physics quantity, members of the collaboration should only show the official "preliminary" and the "final" result plots that have been agreed on by the collaboration as a whole. These results should be the subject of collaboration-wide discussion, and final approval for dissemination will come from both the Executive and Publication Committees and then the Collaboration, as outlined below.

Approved Plots of Physics Data: As the Collaboration develops results, they should be displayed on "approved plots" that everyone will use in talks and publications. These plots should be of very high quality and general usefulness. Plots that have been approved for release by the Publications Committee and the Executive Committee will be sent to the Collaboration for discussion and for a vote on whether to release the results. A two-thirds vote of approval from the Collaboration will make the results official. Preliminary results should be clearly labeled as such. These plots should be maintained in a protected web area, and if published can be moved to an open web area. A descriptive text should accompany these plots. The Publication Committee may decide that a certain plot is superseded and remove it from the web site.

11.4 Publications

Any paper reporting the result of an experiment using HPS data requires the approval of the Collaboration before publication. Authorship is by alphabetical order of the authors' family names. Authorship issues fall under the domain of the EC.

Present HPS Thesis Policy

HPS Thesis Policy 1/30/2014 jj

1. An HPS thesis should present the details of a new intellectual contribution to HPS science to which the student has made major contributions.
2. Ideally, students will present original analyses in their theses. However, several students may use the same HPS data set and may write on the same topic if each of them has made significant contributions to the HPS analysis of that topic.
3. A thesis ideally concentrates on particle physics/nuclear physics results from HPS, but may also describe hardware and technical developments in the experiment.
4. Advisors and students are required to submit proposals for future thesis work to the EC for approval. If the proposal becomes unworkable because of extenuating circumstances, a revised proposal may be submitted. The EC will work with the advisor and student toward a mutually acceptable proposal.
5. Advisors and students are reminded of HPS Collaboration Policy for Presentations and Publications, which require pre-approval of all physics results by the collaboration before they are presented in a public forum or document.
6. A student who is defending a thesis is urged to invite HPS collaboration members to her/his Thesis Defense.
7. HPS's primary goal as an experiment is to deliver its principal physics results in a timely way. Thesis students are expected to play as large a role in this as they can, but presentation of HPS results need not wait on the student's timetable, nor must presentation of a student's thesis wait on the relevant HPS results being made public (but see #5).

Interim rules for presenting new HPS Results

- At least one week before the public talk, circulate key new physics results to all HPS and present the results to the collaboration in an ad hoc phone meeting. Ideally, present a draft of the talk to be given.

- The Analysis Group, the EC, and the PPC decide whether or not to approve the results asap after the presentation. If a group withholds approval, they must promptly articulate their objections and reconsider approval after receiving a response.

- Once fully approved, the collaboration is asked to vote their approval. One day will be allowed to respond. If two thirds or more of those voting approve, the results become official HPS results. All results at this time, well before publication, are labelled "preliminary".

- The PPC follows its established role of reviewing the talk and suggesting changes to improve its comprehensibility.

Going Public

Procedures for Making New Physics Results Public

- **Our Bylaws say the following:**
  1. circulate key slides before the talk
  2. show only official "preliminary" or "final" results
  3. discuss new results before the talk
  4. get approvals from EC, PPC, and 2/3rds of Collaboration

- **We've modified these slightly:**
  1. circulate and discuss the results for the collaboration a week before the presentation.
  2. EC, PPC, and Analysis Group must all approve
  3. Then, Collaboration votes. Approved if 2/3rds of members agree.
  4. PPC still reviews proposed presentation

Presenting New Physics Results

- **We've modified our bylaws slightly:**

1. Circulate and discuss the results for the collaboration a week before the presentation.
2. EC, PPC, and Analysis Group must all approve
3. Then, Collaboration votes. Approved if 2/3^{rds} of members agree.
4. PPC still reviews and Oks proposed presentation