

Steps towards BT paper

With approaching of launch, we should consider our strategy for publication of BT results before all our efforts are dispersed.

I believe we should identify the path towards a new assessment of the CAL discrepancies (energy scale, caltransrms, longitudinal position measurement) - below is a first list to discuss:

- analysis with updated pedestal files - Sasha
- new CU calibration - SLAC
- reprocess of key runs using the above updates - Johan, Franz
- re-evaluation of discrepancies - all

When this is done, depending on the residual discrepancies, we should consider the following options:

1. residual discrepancies at few% level: we could publish a short paper with the current status and the basic data-MC comparison plots; in order to minimize the effort, I would discuss this only and refer to the GLAST symposium paper for description of the setup and dataset. *Pro* is that we release the pressure on us for releasing our analysis to the collaboration, we have a paper for reference that ensure that our performance parameterization based on MC is grossly under control; *con* is that we would presumably prefer to publish better results after such a big effort and we may not find the energy to finalize the analysis to sub-% level
2. no significant improvement in the agreement: continue analyzing and delay publication until we have a good agreement. *Pro* is that we look for a final solution, *con* is that we have no clear idea of when this is possible and we will have less and less time/people to work on this
3. no significant improvement in the agreement: publish a short note where we honestly state the status of our analysis (8-10% discrepancy), conclude that we are currently dominated by uncertainties in the CU calibration and are working on that. This would require at least, in my opinion, that we prepare two very clear and well motivated statements: i) explain why we believe the CAL calibration on orbit will be better than the CU calibration with a beam and ii) provide some initial indication that the discrepancies are not so critical for bkg rejection through the study of stretched variables datasets

We should discuss this during the meeting and provide feedback to the publication board on what the group thinks.