CALICE Publication Workflow

This document provides an updated reminder of the procedures for the publication process of CALICE papers and analysis notes. It builds on the “Guidelines for presentation of CALICE results” given at https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/pub/CALICE/SpeakersBureau/Guidelines_1.2.pdf

These procedures are to be followed for all publications of CALICE results.

Procedures for the publication of a CALICE Paper

1. **Preparation:** Contact the Chair of the Speakers Bureau to set up an editorial board for the paper, giving the title and the expected time scale for the availability of a first full draft. At this point, suggestions for potential board members can also be made. The SpB chair will, in consultation with the SpB, set up an editorial board for the paper with typically three members, and an indico page to be used for the work of the board.

2. **Editorial Board Process:** The author uploads a first draft of the paper (with line numbers), and informs all members of the board that the draft is now available. While not required, it is helpful to give a deadline for first comments, with 2 to 3 weeks considered reasonable (to be adjusted for exceptionally long papers). Once comments are received, answers to all comments are to be made available, and a new version of the paper should be announced for comments. To keep the process moving, it is strongly suggested to respond to comments by the referees in a timely manner. This cycle is repeated until all questions are answered and the paper is judged to be ready to proceed by all board members. At this point, the SpB chair should be informed by the author, and each Editorial Board member should explicitly send consent to collaboration review to the SpB chair.

3. **Collaboration Review:** After receiving formal approval for collaboration review from the SpB Chair, a dedicated version of the paper for collaboration review should be uploaded to the paper indico page. Then, an announcement of the review should be sent to the CALICE list by the author, giving a deadline for comments not shorter than two weeks. During the collaboration review, all comments received should be answered by uploading the comments and responses to the indico page, and by providing an updated draft of the paper. Once answers are available, the collaborators who have sent comments should be notified. In the event of substantial changes, additional time for comments (not shorter than one week) has to be be foreseen, following another announcement to the collaboration. In any case, sufficient time for follow-up questions has to be provided following answers to questions raised by the Collaboration. The members of the editorial board should be made aware of the comments and responses to the Collaboration. At the conclusion of the collaboration review, the author and the board members inform the SpB chair, confirming that all issues raised have been properly addressed.

4. **Collection of Author List:** In parallel to the collaboration review, the author list and acknowledgment section for the paper will be collected. The author lists for each paper are “opt in”; only responding institutes will be included. The SpB chair, or a designate, will contact the CALICE group leaders to provide a paper-specific author list as well as updated acknowledgement sections. The modifications are typically collected via a specific page on the CALICE twiki. At the end of the collection period, the SpB chair makes the author list available to the author for inclusion in the paper. The CALICE
author list is ordered alphabetically by city of the institution, with CERN listed under “C”.

5. **Final Circulation:** After the completion of the collaboration review, which has to be confirmed by the SpB chair, and the collection of the author list, a final version of the paper with full author list and acknowledgments included and line numbers removed should be prepared. This version is circulated once more in CALICE for a clearly announced final pre-submission check, giving at least 3 days for reactions.

6. **Paper Submission:** After receiving an explicit confirmation from the SpB Chair, the paper is submitted to arXiv and the journal. Once the paper is accessible online, an announcement should be sent to the collaboration. For the submission to arXiv, please ensure that the CALICE collaboration and the full author list are given in the author field, so that the paper is properly attributed by automated search engines. Follow the form “CALICE Collaboration: Author One, Author Two, Author Three ...”. Do not hesitate to ask the SpB for help in case of problems.

   In addition to the submission to arXiv and the journal, a tarball with the tex source files and figure files (also including .C macros for root figures) has to be sent to the SpB chair for archiving. The .C macros are archived in a protected web space.

---

**Procedures for the publication of a CALICE Note**

For CALICE Notes, steps 1 – 3 are followed in the same way as for papers. At the completion of the review process and with the agreement of the SpB chair, the note is prepared for publication by adding the CAN number and the standard disclaimer to the cover page, and by removing the line numbers. The pdf of the note as well as a tarball with the tex source and figures (ideally including .C macros for root figures as well) is sent to the SpB chair. The tex source and figures are published on the twiki page, while the .C macros are archived in a protected web space.

Considering the timeframes given for the different steps, and previous experience, the minimum time needed from the point the first full version of the note is available to the editorial board until release of the note is 6 to 8 weeks. This has to be taken into account when planning for conferences.