

ANNEX F - ALICE Policy for Publications and Presentations (Adopted November 29, 2019)

- The Conference Committee can be contacted at alice-cc@cern.ch
- The Editorial Board can be contacted at alice-editorial-board@cern.ch
- The Physics Board can be contacted at alice-mgt-physics-board@cern.ch

Section 1. Introduction

This document defines the rules for ALICE publications and presentations. It addresses the following topics:

- ALICE official figures
- Conference presentations: selection of speakers, abstract submission, talk or poster preparation, rehearsals of talks, and conference proceedings
- Procedures for physics publications
- Posting of published data
- Analysis Notes, ALICE Public Notes, Technical Public Notes, Technical Publications
- Student theses
- Authorship rules

Section 2. Physics Analysis Procedures

All data from all parts of the ALICE detector are available to all Member Institutes and Team Members of the ALICE collaboration 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 ALICE must comply with the ALICE computing rules approved by the Management Board:

<http://alice-offline.web.cern.ch/General-Information/ComputingRules.html>

Physics results presented in ALICE talks/posters, conference proceedings, and publications must be based on analysis carried out within an ALICE Physics Working Group (or Groups, in the case of overlapping topics). The analysis procedures and details of the evaluation of statistical errors and systematic uncertainties must be documented in an Analysis Note.

Section 3. ALICE official figures

This section presents the definition, usage, and approval mechanisms of the various types of official ALICE figures:

- Simulation
- Performance
- Work in Progress
- Preliminary
- Published

All figures related to detector performance or physics results must be approved as official ALICE figures, following the procedures specified in this section, before they can be shown outside the Collaboration.

Each candidate for an official figure must be approved by the relevant Physics Working Group (PWG) or Project Group. If identification of the relevant group is not clear, the Physics Coordination chooses the PWG that is best suited for discussing the figure.

Section 3.1 Bookkeeping of figures

- Each PWG and Project Group, in consultation with the Editorial Board (EB), contributes to an ALICE Repository of Figures accessible via a web interface located at <http://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Figure/>. The Repository is maintained by the ALICE web masters.
- The Repository contains all Simulation, Performance, Preliminary, and Published figures.
- Each figure entry in the Repository specifies a Contact Person and is accompanied by a complete caption.
- Each figure must include the following:
 1. Clearly labelled variables and units of measure
 2. A legend specifying the colliding systems and energy and the nature of the uncertainties (statistical and systematic).
 3. Published figures must explicitly include the label “ALICE”.
 4. In case the figure was published in a Public Note the figure must include a reference to this note.
- Each unpublished figure will be specified with its category (Simulation, Performance, Preliminary).
- Only the most recent version of each Performance plot will be available in the Repository.

The following paragraphs define the various categories of official figures, their usage and their bookkeeping. Identical rules apply for results that are reported as numerical values.

Section 3.2 ALICE Simulation figures

ALICE Simulation figures contain results of simulations of physics events and/or detector response, for example to illustrate expected performance of the detector, the size of corrections for detector effects, or reference distributions from event generators. Simulation figures must be accompanied by all relevant information to reproduce the figure, including version numbers of the software used, generator settings and a precise description of how the quantities in the figure were calculated from the simulation. This

information is stored together with the figure in the Repository. Each ALICE Simulation figure has a unique identification number and must be labelled “ALICE Simulation”.

ALICE Simulation figures are discussed in the relevant Physics Analysis Group (PAG) or PWG and approved by the PWG convener(s) or Project leader(s) in consultation with the PAG coordinators.

Section 3.3 ALICE Preliminary figures

ALICE Preliminary figures are intended for presentation at conferences and workshops. There are three subcategories of ALICE Preliminary figures:

1. Physics Preliminary figures show the results of analysis and must include estimates of all statistical and systematic uncertainties in the underlying analysis that are relevant for the interpretation of the measurement and the understanding of underlying physics. There will be only one version of each preliminary result. Numerical values of preliminary results may be given to persons who are not members of the ALICE collaboration on request. Such requests are handled by Physics Coordination. Preliminary results are superseded by the published version of the results.
2. Technical Preliminary figures provide supporting information about the analysis. Technical Preliminary figures are for example used to illustrate intermediate steps in the analysis or to compare different analysis methods for the same physical quantity. Technical Preliminary figures may show results that are not corrected for detector effects or results without systematic uncertainties. For Technical Preliminary figures, numerical values are not available to people outside the Collaboration.
3. Derived Preliminary figures contain reported results from Physics (or Technical) Preliminary figures, for example in a different graphical representation, or to compare to a (new) model prediction, to an existing result of a different ALICE measurement, or to results of other experiments.

Each ALICE Technical or Physics Preliminary figure must be presented at the Physics Forum and be approved by the PWG convener(s) and Physics Board before it can be shown outside the Collaboration. Technical Preliminary figures may subsequently be updated (for example with a larger data sample) after approval by the PWG convener(s) and Physics Board. ALICE Physics and Technical Preliminary figures must be accompanied by an Analysis Note, which contains all relevant information about how the figures were obtained, including the software version(s), the data set(s), selections that were used, analysis algorithms and a description of the calculation of all uncertainties. The Analysis Note is reviewed by an Analysis Review Committee which is appointed by the PWG convener(s) in consultation with the PAG coordinators. The Analysis Note is made available to the collaboration before the results are presented at the Physics Forum.

Derived Preliminary figures can only be shown outside the collaboration after approval by the PWG convener(s) and the Physics Board.

Each ALICE Preliminary figure has a unique identification number and must be labelled "ALICE Preliminary".

An ALICE Preliminary figure may be withdrawn in the case that an error is found in the analysis that invalidates the physics message of the figure. Such cases have to be brought to the attention of the Physics Board by the PWG convener(s) after which the figure will

be withdrawn from the Repository. An Analysis Note must be prepared to document the error and the withdrawal of the figure. In this case the PB decides if the withdrawn Preliminary figure can be replaced by a corrected version or only by publishing the result. If an ALICE Public Note is published, a new corrected version containing the correct figure must be submitted to the EB for approval.

Some of the preliminary figures updated by the final analysis might not appear in the publication, for example because of a restriction on the article length. When this is the case, the EB can decide to make them publicly available via a Public Note containing the figures, the corresponding captions and a reference to the publication if the finalization of the figure to a published status is deemed important. Otherwise these preliminary figures are made obsolete.

Section 3.4 ALICE Performance figures

ALICE Performance figures are used to illustrate aspects of detector performance, in a general context, independent of a specific analysis. Any figures that illustrate intermediate steps in an analysis are ALICE Preliminary figures (see Section 3.3).

ALICE Performance figures are intended to illustrate the quality of the calibration, the behaviour of ALICE (sub-)detectors, the resolution for tracking or particle identification techniques, etc. Performance figures can be shown outside the collaboration after approval by the relevant PWG convener(s), the Data Preparation Group (in consultation with the PB), or the relevant Project leader(s). Performance figures evolve with time, for instance with a new version resulting from a new data set. Any change of the figure requires explicit re-approval by the PWG convener(s), or the Data Preparation Group, or the Project leader(s).

Each ALICE Performance figure has a unique identification number and must be labelled "ALICE Performance."

Section 3.5 ALICE Work in Progress figures

ALICE Work in Progress figures are transient, intended only for progress reports to funding agencies, review committees, reports of students within ALICE institutes, and national physics society meetings. They cannot be used for general presentations such as conference talks and seminars, other than these exceptional cases.

ALICE Work in Progress figures illustrate the status of an analysis, in which some corrections may not yet have been applied and from which quantitative physics conclusions cannot be drawn.

Work in Progress figures are for use by individual teams only. Therefore, the responsibility for quality control and approval rests with the corresponding team leader(s).

Work in Progress figures are not entered into the Repository and do not receive any figure identification number.

ALICE Work in Progress figures must not be made publicly accessible, e.g., the slides cannot be made accessible on a web page or in a meeting program.

Section 3.6 Published figures

ALICE Published figures are all figures containing final results that appear in a publication or Public Note. Each ALICE Published figure has a unique number and is stored in the Repository, with reference to the corresponding publication or Public Note. When a figure is published, the corresponding Preliminary figure(s) are removed from the Repository (or marked obsolete).

Section 3.7 Conflicts and exemptions

Conflicts regarding content and presentation of figures will be resolved by the Spokesperson, in consultation with the Physics Board (PB) and the EB chair(s), PWG convener(s) and Project leader(s). Exemptions to the above general rules may only be granted by the Spokesperson, and only in exceptional circumstances.

Section 4. ALICE Presentations: Conference talks and posters, major seminars, and technical presentations

An ALICE Presentation is a talk or poster by an ALICE Collaborator, presented on behalf of the ALICE Collaboration. ALICE Collaborators should use good judgment in determining whether a presentation is being made on behalf of ALICE, and should contact the Conference Committee (CC) in case of doubt. While a sharp distinction sometimes cannot be drawn between an ALICE and a non-ALICE presentation, there are several elements that clearly require designation of a presentation as being on behalf of ALICE, including:

- Invitation for major seminars or conference talks to present ALICE results
- Submission of a contributed conference talk or poster to present ALICE results
- First public presentation of a Preliminary figure
- Significant discussion of Performance figures and their underlying analyses
- Discussion of ALICE technical issues
- Invitation for a seminar or conference talk which was arranged through the ALICE CC, even if not only ALICE results are presented

The following committees and individuals play a role in the review and the approval of a public presentation (abstract, talk, poster, and proceedings):

- The Presenter is the person giving a public presentation (talk or poster) on behalf of the ALICE Collaboration. The Presenter is responsible to ensure that all appropriate steps are followed and that all approvals are obtained before showing or publicly discussing ALICE results outside the Collaboration.
- The Project Group(s) and/or the Physics Working Group(s) are the primary venues where the Presenter discusses the results to be presented. The abstract, talk/poster, and proceedings must be circulated in the PWG or Project Group for discussion prior to delivery or submission to the conference, according to timelines defined below.
- The Team leader of the Presenter (or a person delegated by the Team leader) reviews all material, i.e. abstract, talk, poster, and proceedings, and indicates their approval in the Repository.
- Project leader(s) or PWG convener(s) are responsible for quality assurance of the material, and must approve the abstract, talk/poster, and/or proceedings for topical presentations prior to delivery or submission to the conference.

- The CC coordinates all aspects of ALICE Conference presentations, with the goal of equitable distribution of talks across the collaboration, effective quality assurance, and efficient procedures. The CC chair(s) act on behalf of the CC, consulting and delegating to members of the CC as appropriate. The CC calls for conference speakers and selects speakers for oral presentations. The CC reviews abstracts, talks and posters to ensure high scientific quality, and CC approval is necessary before submission or presentation. The CC notifies the Team leader, PWG convener(s), and Project leader(s) about all material that requires their review and approval. If one of the latter bodies does not act even after a reminder, the final decision about approval rests solely with the CC. However, due to the fact the abstract approval by the Team Leader implies also financial support to attend a conference, the Team Leader approval for abstract submission remains strictly mandatory.
- The EB provides oversight and management of conference proceedings and any other related document. The EB reviews each document submitted to conference proceedings and must approve it prior to submission.
- The CC organizes public rehearsal sessions in order to review presentations. The CC decides which conferences and speaking opportunities require rehearsals, and must communicate those decisions to the Collaboration.
- Physics Coordination is responsible in consultation with the Spokesperson for the selection of speakers and the organization of rehearsals of talks for specific occasions such as CERN seminars and at the LHCC sessions.
- The Spokesperson is the final arbiter of all disputes arising at any stage of the conference presentation process.

The primary criteria of the CC for selecting speakers are the capability of the speaker to effectively address the audience with a high quality presentation of ALICE results and a fair and equitable distribution of talks among individuals and groups who have contributed to a given analysis or project. Concerning the latter, also career considerations, equal opportunity, major presentations in the recent past or near future, and responsibilities for and contributions to the Collaboration are taken into account. The CC will seek input from the PB, PWG Convener(s) or Project leader(s), and the Spokesperson. The CC will maintain lists of eligible speakers on various topics, as appropriate, and review and revise such lists on a regular basis. Higher priority will be given to young scientists who have not yet obtained stable employment.

In the interest of valuing and promoting the work done by junior scientists in the collaboration, former ALICE Collaborators (having left the Collaboration by no more than 12 months) on request are allowed to act as presenters (talk or poster) on behalf of the ALICE Collaboration, but only for presentations on work with a significant direct contribution by them within ALICE (typically a former PhD student, no longer with ALICE, presenting ALICE results, discussed in his/her thesis). These requests shall be considered and granted by the CC chairs in consultation with the Physics Board.

The talk rehearsal plays a crucial role in the preparation of a major seminar or conference talk. Its purpose is to ensure a high quality of the presentation. The approval of figures and the discussion of their physics message should take place prior to the rehearsal.

There are three general categories of ALICE talks: (i) Invited conference and major seminar talks, (ii) Contributed conference talks and posters, and (iii) Technical Project presentations.

The mechanisms for discussion and approval of each of these are:

Section 4.1 Speakers and Abstracts for Invited Conference Talks and Major Seminars

- A Major Seminar is defined as a high profile talk to a broad audience at a specific institution. These may be known in different places as PH Seminar, Departmental Colloquium, Departmental Seminar, Invited Lecture, etc. The CC should be consulted in case of doubt whether a talk should be considered as a Major Seminar.
- The CC is responsible for selecting the ALICE speaker for an invited Conference Talk or Major Seminar. The CC can seek input from the Physics Board or poll the Collaboration for nominations. ALICE Collaborators who have been invited ad personam for a Conference Talk or a Major Seminar on ALICE physics must request approval from the CC. The CC can suggest an alternative speaker.
- A CC chair is the point of contact between the Collaboration and each Conference organizing committee. The CC receives the conference invitation and corresponds with the conference organizing committee regarding the nature and scope of the talk.
- The CC will maintain an up-to-date list of all conference and major seminar invitations received and nominations made.
- The speaker nominated by the CC is responsible for composing and submitting the abstract, and for ensuring that all approvals for the abstract, talk and proceedings are obtained in a timely fashion, first from the Team leader, then from the PWG convener(s) or Project leader(s), and finally from the CC (for abstracts and slides) or the EB (for proceedings).
- The CC is responsible for the final approval of the abstract before it can be submitted. The abstract must be distributed to the Collaboration for discussion via upload to the Repository at least 7 days prior to the submission deadline of the conference. The speaker has to take the Collaboration discussion into account and revise the abstract appropriately. The CC will then approve the abstract for submission to the conference.

Section 4.2 Speakers and Abstracts for Contributed Conference Talks and Posters

- The ALICE PWGs will take a strategic approach to ALICE contributed conference presentations. The PWG convener(s) will solicit abstracts from the PWGs, to be considered as contributed talks and posters for a given conference. As part of this process, the PWG will identify analyses and physics topics appropriate to a given conference, and the PWG convener(s) will work with the members of the PWG to ensure contributed abstracts in these areas.
- Any member of ALICE may propose an abstract for consideration by the PWGs as a contributed talk or poster.
- An abstract may have only one author, who will be the Presenter. Two PhD students or a postdoc and a PhD student can be joint authors of a poster.
- The PWG convener(s) will identify cases of multiple abstracts on the same or largely overlapping topics. Such conflicts will be resolved by the CC and PWG convener(s), and not delegated to the conference organizers by submitting multiple overlapping abstracts. The CC chair(s) will have final say in case of conflict.
- The abstract must be distributed to the Collaboration for discussion via upload to the Repository at least 7 days prior to the submission deadline of the conference. The author has to take the Collaboration discussion into account and revise the

abstract appropriately. Upon review and approval from the author's Team leader and the PWG convener(s) or Project leader(s) the CC will review the abstract and give the final approval for submission to the conference.

- For selected conferences the CC may decide that abstracts will not be submitted individually by the Presenters but centrally by the CC and anonymously “for the ALICE Collaboration”. In that case, the abstracts will be prepared by the PWG convener(s) or Project leader(s) or by persons designated by the PWG convener(s) or Project leader(s). The review and approval procedure will be the same as for abstracts prepared by individual Presenters with the exception of the Team leader approval. The latter will be required once the presentation is assigned to an individual Presenter. The CC will inform the PWG convener(s) and Project leader(s) when the central and anonymous submission process will be used for a conference.
- Upon approval by the CC, the abstract is submitted to the Conference by the Presenter or a person in charge “for the ALICE Collaboration.”
- For some conferences the submitted abstracts are published as proceedings. Such abstracts have to be uploaded by the Presenter to the Repository not later than 10 working days before the abstract submission deadline. These abstracts are reviewed by the EB and CC, which will grant the final approval in agreement with the EB chair(s), in addition to the normal approval procedure.

Section 4.3 Preparation of Presentations for Invited and Contributed Conference Talks, Major Seminars and Posters

- In general, new Preliminary Results are first reported at Conferences and not seminars. Presentation of new Preliminary results at a Major Seminar requires approval of the Spokesperson.
- Only approved ALICE figures may be shown. Refer to Section 3 for the definition of each type of figure and its intended use. It is the responsibility of the Presenter to ensure that appropriate approval has been obtained for all figures.
- A draft of the talk slides must be uploaded to the Talks Repository (located at https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Documents/Conferences_and_Contributions) for Collaboration discussion at least 7 days prior to the seminar or the start of the conference. It is understood that for major conferences, preceded by the approval of new results, less time might be available for the review and approval of slides or posters. In such cases the CC may communicate different deadlines.
- Talks of a broad nature must be uploaded to the “General Talks” section of the Repository. Talks of a topical nature have to be uploaded to the corresponding PWG or Project section of the Repository. The Presenter has to take the Collaboration discussion into account and revise the slides/poster appropriately. The slides/poster have to be reviewed and approved by the Presenter's Team leader, Physics Coordination (in case of General presentations), the appropriate PWG convener(s) or Project leader(s) (in case of Topical presentations), and by the CC prior to the seminar or start of conference.
- The CC will determine whether the figures are appropriate for the occasion.
- Upon approval by the CC, which may require a rehearsal as described below, the presentation is posted on the ALICE Conferences web page as the “As Approved” version. Only cosmetic changes can be made after this point, and no changes may be made to the approved figures. The final version should be uploaded as the “As Given” version.

- Conference presentations including results of several experiments are approved by the ALICE CC in agreement with the CC (or their equivalents) of all other involved collaborations.
- Poster review is carried out according to the procedure of contributed presentations.

Section 4.4 Rehearsals for Invited and Contributed Conference Talks and Major Seminars

For major conferences and individual presentations, in particular those which include new results, the CC may require the rehearsal of talks by the presenters. The CC will communicate to the relevant PWG convener(s), Project leader(s), and presenters for which conferences or presentations rehearsal sessions will be organized by the CC. The rehearsal sessions are open to the Collaboration and active participation is encouraged.

- The rehearsal will in general take place during the week before the start of the conference, prior to CC approval of the slides.
- The rehearsal of each talk requires a member of the CC to be present. For topical talks a representative of the corresponding PWG or Project is required to be present. For general talks a representative of Physics Coordination is required to be present.
- The presenter will consider comments and modifications suggested in the discussion which takes place after each rehearsal talk. The presenter will upload a revised version of the slides to the Repository for further review and approval.

Section 4.5 Conference Proceedings

- A Conference Proceeding is the write-up of a presentation at a conference.
- It is the responsibility of the Presenter to ensure that the necessary approvals are obtained in a timely fashion.
- For topical presentations, the Proceedings draft is distributed by the Presenter, after approval by their Team leader, for discussion within the appropriate Physics Working Group at least 15 working days prior to the conference deadline. After discussion, the PWG convener(s) review the Proceedings draft and, upon approval, send it to the EB for review and approval. Submission of the proceedings to the EB must occur at least 5 working days prior to the conference deadline.
- For general presentations, the Proceedings draft is made available for the Collaboration on the ALICE web site at least 15 working days prior to the conference deadline. The EB reviews the Proceedings draft. The EB may delegate the review of proceedings to other ALICE Collaborators, as appropriate.
- Upon approval by the EB, the Presenter submits the Proceedings to the Conference and may post it on the arXiv.
- Conference Proceedings including results of several experiments are approved by the ALICE EB in agreement with the EB (or their equivalents) of all other involved collaborations.

Section 4.6 Project Technical Presentations

- Project Technical Presentations are conference talks and seminars of a technical nature, presenting results from an existing ALICE Project or developments towards a potential future ALICE Project.

- Project Technical Presentations may be made either on behalf of the entire ALICE Collaboration or of a subset of ALICE working on a specific Project. The Project leader(s) and the CC determine the authorship of the contribution. The procedures in this section apply in both cases.
- Such presentations may arise due to an invitation from a conference, contribution of a presentation to a conference, or invitation for a seminar.
- The Project leader(s) are responsible for choosing the speaker.
- Only official figures from the Repository can be included in Project Technical Presentations.
- The procedures for reviewing and approving the abstract, the slides/poster, and the proceedings are the same as for all other ALICE presentations.
- For some Technical Presentations proceedings are requested by the organizer before the conference. Such proceedings have to be uploaded by the author to the Repository not later than 10 working days before the start of the conference, and these are reviewed by the EB and CC, which will grant the final approval in agreement with the EB chair(s), in addition to the normal approval procedure.

Section 5 Procedures for Physics Publications

The following committees and individuals play a role in the preparation of each Physics Publication:

- The Paper Committee (PC) can only be formed when the analysis results fulfil at least the criteria for being approved as preliminary; i.e., the results have been presented and approved at the Physics Forum, the corresponding Analysis Note has been approved by the PWG convener(s). The content of the paper should be defined.
The PC is headed by the PC chair, who is responsible for the editing and assembling of material. The PC may be composed of further members e.g. having carried out the analysis. A large PC (more than 4 persons) may be formed in case of long papers and complex analyses. The PC is appointed by the PWG convener(s) and approved by the PB. The PC is responsible for all steps from the first draft until the final publication.
- The Internal Review Committee (IRC) is appointed by the EB once a first complete draft of the paper is made available for review.
One member of the IRC is appointed to be the IRC chair, serving as the primary contact person for the IRC and managing the IRC activities. The IRC comprises experts and non-experts on the topic of the manuscript, drawn from across the Collaboration. The IRC carries out a comprehensive review of the physics analysis, accompanying documentation, and the text of the initial manuscript, as well as revisions to the manuscript and responses to comments from the Collaboration and the journal referee at subsequent stages of the publication process. The EB defines the charge of each IRC, and may include special tasks and requests in certain cases.
- The Editorial Board (EB) provides oversight and management of the publication process, ensuring that ALICE Publication Procedures are followed. The EB chair(s) act on behalf of the EB, consulting the members of the EB as appropriate. The EB chair(s) periodically report on the status of all papers in preparation during EB meetings. The EB decides on a list of actions to be taken for delayed papers, with the aim of bringing them to completion.

- The Physics Board (PB) provides oversight and review of the physics content of the manuscript.
- The Spokesperson is the final arbiter of all disputes arising at any stage of the publication process.

Preparation of a Physics Publication occurs in several distinct steps, with a recommended time schedule. Paper Flow scheme is presented at <http://aliceinfo.cern.ch/ArtSubmission/>

Section 5.1 Initial preparation of manuscript and supporting documentation

- Once an analysis is sufficiently advanced, an Analysis Note is prepared and presented to the PWG. This note contains all information needed for the reproduction of the analysis. A contact person is appointed by the PWG convener(s) for each Analysis Note. Analysis Notes are internal and signed by a subgroup of the collaboration, essentially all those who have contributed to the analysis. Authorship is decided by the PWG convener(s).
- The PWG convener(s) and PAG coordinator(s) appoint Analysis Review Committees (ARC) whose task is to follow the analysis progress and the preparation of the Analysis Note critically and provide support and feedback to the people carrying out the analysis. An ARC member is expected to give a statement when the results are presented at the Physics Forum.
- The PWG convener(s) may propose an ALICE Public Note containing preliminary results to be approved. A contact person is appointed by the PWG convener(s) for each Note. The ALICE Public Note can result from merging of several Analysis Notes and is signed by the Collaboration. The names of the authors of the Note are documented and visible within the collaboration. The PWG convener(s) appoint an internal committee reviewing the Note (NC). The NC is usually composed of members of the PWG and a person from a different PWG to give feedback from an external member. The results of the ALICE Public Note are presented and approved at the Physics Forum. Before the results are publicly shown, the Note has to be approved by the EB. The Note is made publicly available on CDS at the time when the results are publicly shown. The convener(s) should encourage the members of the PWG to provide ALICE Public Notes to accompany ALICE preliminary results whenever possible.
- The PWG convener(s) determine if a physics analysis is ready for consideration as a paper; i.e. the content of the paper is defined, the Analysis Note is approved and, if prepared, the corresponding ALICE Public Note is approved.
- The PWG convener(s) recommend the paper for the presentation at the Physics Forum and for the PB approval.
- Upon the PB approval the PWG convener(s) appoint the PC to prepare the initial manuscript and to create a dedicated page on the ALICE publication web site. The PB may require at this stage revisions or the merging of several ongoing analyses into a single paper.
- The PB recommends to the EB that an IRC be formed.
- The PB determines the target journal for the manuscript, in consultation with the PC and IRC.
- The EB announces the appointment of the IRC and the target journal on the web pages.
- The PB is responsible for ensuring that the software and data used for the analysis comply with the ALICE computing rules (<http://alice-offline.web.cern.ch/General->

[Information/ComputingRules.html](#)). All analysis code has to be uploaded to the ALICE software repository.

Section 5.2 First Collaboration Review

- The IRC reviews the manuscript and supporting documentation, and recommends corrections and changes as necessary.
- Upon approval of the draft by the IRC, the EB verifies that the actions of the PC and IRC meet the required standards, and reviews the draft before approving it for circulation to the full collaboration. The EB review is expected to be delivered within 5 working days.
- Upon EB approval, the EB circulates the draft to the full Collaboration for detailed comment for 10 working days. This review period may be extended by another 5 working days if it takes place during periods in which limited reviewer availability is foreseen or if more extended feedback is desired.
- All supporting material specifying additional analysis details must be made available to the collaboration at this stage.
- This is the main review period for the Collaboration, and it is expected that any remaining significant issues will be raised at this step.
- Up to 5 member institutes are specifically requested by the EB to comment in detail during the Collaboration review period.

Section 5.3 Second Collaboration Review

- The PC prepares a new draft and a set of replies to the Collaboration comments.
- The IRC and the EB review the revised draft and responses to comments, and recommend relevant corrections and changes as necessary and appropriate.
- The PB is involved in case of major changes or open issues.
- Upon IRC approval, the EB circulates the revised manuscript, including revisions to the author list that arose, to the full collaboration for comments for a minimum of 5 working days. This period can be extended by up to 5 more days in case very significant modifications to the paper are introduced after the first collaboration review
- The main purpose of this second comment period is for the Collaboration to verify that all points raised in the first comment period have been addressed, though on occasion a significant new issue may still be raised at this step.
- The PC prepares a new draft, in response to new comments received. It also prepares a file in a format supported by the HEPData database, containing the numerical values corresponding to the published results.
- The IRC reviews the changes and the file prepared for the HEPData database and performs a check of the numerical values in the HEPData file, and upon acceptance recommends to the EB that the paper is ready for publication.
- The EB carries out a final review of all comments and revisions, and submits the paper draft for CERN review. CERN comments and approval are expected within 1 week.

Section 5.4 Submission to journal and response to referees

- The manuscript submission to the journal and arXiv and the uploading of the HEPdata file are carried out by the EB chair(s) or a person in charge.

- The response from the journal referee(s) is made available to the Collaboration via the corresponding website.
- The PC prepares a revised manuscript and a response to the referees' comments.
- The IRC reviews the modified manuscript and response to the referees' comments, and recommends corrections and changes as necessary.
- Upon approval by the IRC, the EB reviews the changes to the text and the responses to the referees' comments.
- In case of major changes, the EB, in consultation with the PB, sends the revised manuscript and responses to the referees to the collaboration with a deadline for comments of 5 working days. The PC prepares a new draft in response to comments received from the Collaboration at this step.
- The IRC reviews the changes, and upon acceptance recommends to the EB that the paper is ready for resubmission.
- The EB carries out a final review of all comments and revisions, and upon acceptance the EB chair(s) or a person in charge resubmits the manuscript to the journal and posts the revised version on arXiv.

Section 5.5 Final steps

Upon submission to arXiv the paper is made publicly available on the CERN Document Server and on the ALICE web site.

If the paper is rejected by the journal or changes requested by the journal are deemed unacceptable to the Collaboration, appeal or resubmission to a different journal will be considered and formulated by the Spokesperson, the EB chair(s) and the PB coordination in consultation with the PC, IRC, PB, and EB.

Section 5.6 Exceptions

Procedures deviating from the above can be approved by the MB for individual papers in order to speed up the publication process in exceptional circumstances. Such exceptions are communicated to the PB.

Section 6. Posting of Published Data

All figures and data from every ALICE physics publication will be made publicly available on the ALICE web site. Each paper will have a web page that includes links to all figures in the paper in formats suitable for inclusion in both presentations and documents.

Section 7. Other types of publications and notes

Section 7.1 Analysis Notes

Analysis Notes contain all information needed for the reproduction of the analysis.

They are intended to communicate information to the collaboration and document it for future reference. Analysis Notes are signed by a subgroup of the collaboration and are approved by the PWG convener(s).

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 ALICE web site https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Notes/Documents/Review/reviewitems_analysis_note.

Section 7.2 ALICE Public Notes

- ALICE Public Notes accompany preliminary results and publications. They contain supporting material, additional and complementary figures and explanation of the methodology used in the analysis.
- ALICE Public Notes can result from merging of several Analysis Notes.
- ALICE Public Notes are authored by the ALICE Collaboration. The names of the authors of the analysis are documented and visible within the collaboration on the link:
https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Notes/Documents/Review/reviewitems_public_note
- The EB circulates the Public Note to the collaboration for at least 5 working days and may designate one member institute to comment in detail.
- Upon EB approval, the ALICE Public Note is submitted to the CERN Document Server: <http://cds.cern.ch/collection/ALICE\%20Public\%20Notes?ln=en>

Section 7.3 Technical Public Notes

- ALICE Technical Note contains technical information about the ALICE detector and its performances, including both hardware and software.
- The authorship of the Note shall be defined by the appropriate Project leader(s).
- The Project leader(s) circulate the Note among all members of the Project for comments and approves it for submission to the EB.
- If a Technical Note is authored by the whole collaboration the EB circulates the draft to the collaboration for comments for at least 5 working days.
- Upon EB approval, the Note is submitted to the CERN Document Server:
<http://cds.cern.ch/collection/ALICE\%20Public\%20Notes?ln=en>

Section 7.4 Technical Publications

The purpose of an ALICE Technical Publication is to communicate technical information about the ALICE detector and its performance, including both hardware and software, to the scientific community. The authorship of these papers shall be defined by the appropriate Project leader(s).

The Project leader(s) circulate the draft among all members of the Project for comment, and approves it for submission to the EB, along with a recommendation for the journal. The EB reviews the draft and either returns it to the Project leader(s) with comments or approves it for publication.

The EB chair(s) or a person in charge submits the manuscript to the journal and post it on the arXiv. Response from the journal and referee reports will be circulated among all members of the Project for comment, and resubmission will follow the same procedure as the initial submission.

Section 7.5 Usage of ALICE data and methods in non-ALICE publications

- Members of the ALICE Collaboration may be authors of review papers and papers on general methods, etc.
- ALICE physics and technical data that have not been published by the ALICE Collaboration, in conference proceedings or in a refereed journal, may not be included in non-ALICE publications.
- ALICE physics and technical data that are presented in a student thesis but not in conference proceedings or in a refereed journal may not be included in non-ALICE publications.

Section 8. Student theses

The Editorial Board maintains a list of ALICE students and their thesis topics. This list can be used by the CC, Physics Board and Physics Working Groups to track student activity and promote student involvement in conferences. It is the responsibility of the PWG convener(s), and Project leader(s), together with the thesis advisor(s), to ensure that an electronic copy of the thesis is uploaded in a timely fashion.

Data and analyses presented in a student thesis but not in ALICE Conference Proceedings or in ALICE refereed publication are not considered to be published ALICE results. Results obtained by the student must be labelled "this thesis". The text must be clear in order to prevent such results being taken from a publicly available thesis and considered erroneously as results of the ALICE Collaboration.

All student theses presenting ALICE data must be made available to the collaboration upon acceptance of the thesis and uploaded to CDS. Thesis subjects are on GLANCE, thesis on CDS. It is the responsibility of the thesis advisor and the PWG convener(s) or Project leader(s) to ensure an electronic copy of the thesis and that it is uploaded in a timely fashion.

Section 9. Authorship

The Institute Team leaders are responsible for supplying a list of names, in accordance with the ALICE procedure for M&O payments and related descending authorship rights (c.f. document ALICE-INT-2006-005), in the corresponding GLANCE database. This list contains the names of the authors, the institute to which they belong and the date of joining the ALICE collaboration. The Institute Team leader is also responsible for announcing the departure of people from the collaboration.

Qualifications to sign physics publications:

1. A person must be registered in the ALICE Collaboration Database with the following status: Physicist, Postdoc, Senior Engineer or PhD Student;

2. Physicists, Postdocs and Senior Engineers must be ALICE members for at least one year to be eligible for authorship rights; in addition they must count for the sharing of the budget for Maintenance and Operation Cat. A. If a postdoc was previously an ALICE student, their authorship starts immediately;
3. PhD students must be ALICE members for at least 6 months to be eligible for authorship rights; If a PhD student was previously an ALICE Master student, their authorship starts immediately;
4. PhD students must provide six months equivalent of service work for the Collaboration; Failure to do so in due time can lead to the suspension of signature rights;
5. The corresponding institute must be in good standing, as determined by the Collaboration Board and the Constitution;
6. The qualification period stops when leaving ALICE: PhD students keep authorship rights for 6 months after their departure date. Physicists, Postdocs, Senior Engineers keep authorship rights for 12 months after their departure date;

Exceptions from this rule may be granted by the MB on suggestions from the EB chair(s) in consultation with the EB and spokesperson.

Any author can remove their name from the author list in a particular case. Removal of a qualified author from the author list by the Team leader requires a mutual agreement between the author to be removed and the Team leader.

In the case of a change of affiliation within the collaboration the member stays affiliated with the institute that pays the M&O cost for the one additional year. Other procedures are possible with the agreement of all parties involved.