(My) Clarification of "CALICE Notes"

- CALICE guidelines for results to be presented at conferences, key points
  - Intention, to ensure (high) quality. Applies (only) to
    - ⇒ Performance of prototypes in test beams
    - ⇒ Related data analysis
- Analyses must have been presented in Analysis/Calice General meeting
- All relevant material (plots, tables, …) must be included in CALICE "Technical Note"
  - Internal/private documents, not required to be contributed conference paper - but must be available to non-CALICE review speakers to show our results
  - Sent 1st draft to ~3 internal reviewers/editors min. 2 weeks before start of intended meeting
  - When/If reviewers satisfied → revised draft
- Whole Collaboration review…
  - Distribute revised draft to CALICE mailing list (with one working week for comments) [Or present results in talk at advertised CALICE meeting]
  - Resolve any concerns raised/answer comments
  - Send agreed final version (source files/figures) to Speakers Bureau Chair (David Ward) to assign document number, place on Calice internal web pages
  - Email to CALICE telling them another result is approved
- Help speakers to make use of the new results – especially non-CALICE reviewers!
  - Make "presentation ready" plots (large labels, ideally uniform style), e.g. .jpg not .eps, put on internal Speakers Bureau web page together with approved Technical Note
- Talks (by CALICE speakers) must be made available to Collaboration two working days before start of intended meeting

Questions on notes…

- I want to share every detail of the analysis within CALICE, but not with review speaker, e.g. s/w revisions, run numbers, "for historical reasons…"
  - Write an internal supporting note, referenced from Technical Note, but never distributed outside Calice
  - Web page on Speakers' Bureau page may be appropriate, but preferable to write separate note with fixed reference number

- I have an exciting plot, but do not want it to be misquoted / used out of context
  - Make sure you concisely annotate the plot itself, do not rely on figure captions, e.g. to explain that part of the detector was not used.

- How late can I give draft 1 to reviewers?
  - 2 weeks prior to meeting

- How late can I give distribute draft note to Collaboration?
  - 1 working week prior to meeting

LCWS07 Schedule Reminder

- **08 May** – distribute rough draft to reviewers 0/4
- **12 May** – present results at Kobe 3/4
- 14-21 May – editorial boards interact with authors ?/4
- 21 May – drafts approved by editorial boards, distributed to Collaboration ?/4
- 23 May – talks by CALICE speakers available to Collaboration ?/4
- 24-25 May – practise talks ?/4

Nig

Status of Analyses for LCWS

- Hope to have four Technical Notes approved by 30 May
  - ECAL / electrons (many groups)
    - ⇒ Talks yesterday by Valeria Bartsch, Hakan Yilmaz, George Mavromanolakis, Fabrizo Salvatore; at earlier meetings by Laurent Morin, David Ward, Cristina Carloganu, Marcel Reinhard, Michele Gianneli
    - ⇒ Draft note ~40 pages, expected to go to reviewers ~ this weekend
    - ⇒ Reviewers: Vaclav Vrba, Tohru Takeshita, Andy White
  - AHCAL – EM shower analysis (Nanda Wattimena/Niels Meyer)
    - ⇒ Talk yesterday
    - ⇒ Draft note (largely tables/plots) in preparation, expected …
    - ⇒ Reviewers: Misha Danilov, Paul Dauncey, Jerry Blazey
  - AHCAL – hadronic analysis (Marius Groll, Vasily Morgunov, Nicola D'Ascenzo)
    - ⇒ 2 independent analyses, of response, energy resolution, linearity ☺
    - ⇒ Differences ~10%, differences in selection cuts, samples, MC models, … Need to understood rapidly, harmonise
    - ⇒ V.M. "Deep" analysis, comparison with G4 + other MC
    - ⇒ Draft note (largely tables/plots) in preparation, expected …
    - ⇒ Reviewers: Pascal Gay, Jae Yu, Vasiliy Morgunov
  - "Combined" EMC+AHC+TCMT analysis – NIU
    - ⇒ Presented (not final results) at recent Analysis+s/w Meetings
    - ⇒ Draft note (~20 pages) expected to go to reviewers ~this weekend
    - ⇒ Reviewers: Erika Garutti, Henri Videau and Mike Green

Next Steps

- Data analysis effort has increased substantially since late 2006
- Now many people actively involved and familiar(ising) with all tools
- Bad that we all had to learn to use grid tools (one-off overhead in getting started)
- Good that we all had to learn to use grid tools (scalable, data distribution)
  - Roman was right all along
  - Cultivating more experts speeds up for new users a
- Valuable experience gained in analysing for LCWS
  - Not a perfect software system for analysis… but not bad either
- How to do better?
  - Suggest that those with experience of using the analysis software pool their thoughts/wish lists
  - Identify where largest gains can be made
    - ⇒ Specific, realistic, achievable proposal, discuss at Software&Analysis Meeting (post LCWS)
    - ⇒ Agree and implement
- NB:
  - Important to separate demands of "user" from requirements of "expert developer"
  - We do not have an army of people waiting to do analysis
  - Someone doing analysis does not remain "naïve user" for too long – would be wrong to over engineer a solution for her/him – keep in mind useful timescale for our R&D.

Background to CALICE Notes

- Slides presented by David Ward at DESY CALICE meeting, 13-Feb-2007

Guidelines for CALICE presentations

Recently approved by the Steering Committee

Nige Watson / BirminghamDav Ward

Guidelines for presentation of CALICE results

- Until the end of 2006, CALICE operated a liberal policy for presentation of talks at conferences and workshops, which involved no procedure for the approval of material to be presented. Since summer 2006, much of the focus of conference talks will move to analysis results based on the test beam data which should be regarded as the common property of the whole Collaboration. From the start of 2007 we therefore introduce procedures for approval of results and talks. These are intended not to be too onerous, but should ensure that consistent results of high quality are presented to the public.
- The guidelines about approval of results apply only to presentations which include the performance of the prototypes placed in the test beam, and the analysis of test beam data. Technical talks, on hardware R&D, are not subject to approval by the Collaboration.

Conference presentations

- The following remarks apply equally to seminars, talks or poster presentations.
- Members of CALICE may be invited to give talks or posters on behalf of the Collaboration by the Speakers' Bureau. Alternatively, they may make their own arrangements to give a talk; in this case they should take care to inform the Chair of the Speakers' Bureau.
- The current members of the Speakers' Bureau are David Ward (Chair), the Spokesman and the Chair of the Steering Board, assisted by Fabio Iervolino (Secretary).
- The only results permitted to be shown in CALICE talks are those which have been approved via the procedure outlined below. CALICE speakers are encouraged to include the CALICE logo in their talks. All results and figures should be labelled "CALICE Preliminary", or just "CALICE" in the case of published results.
- All CALICE speakers are required to make their slides available to members of the Collaboration in advance. The Collaboration informed by Email (to calice@listserv.cclrc.ac.uk), with ***at least two working days allowed for comments*** before the start of the meeting at which the talk is to be given.
- All CALICE speakers are recommended to give a practice talk. This is *mandatory* for students and post-docs, and *strongly encouraged* for more senior people. In the case of major meetings at which several CALICE talks are given, a CALICE-wide phone meeting should be convened for this purpose by the Physics and Analysis coordinators; for smaller meetings the leader of the group to which the speaker belongs is responsible for arranging a practice talk.
- Results to be shown in Review Talks (whether by CALICE speakers or otherwise) are subject to the same conditions as for talks given on behalf of CALICE. In other words, only CALICE material approved by the procedure outlined below may be shown. Of course a non-CALICE speaker can not be expected to give a practice talk or required to make their slides available.

- New results for presentation based on data recorded using the test beam prototypes must be approved by the Collaboration by the following procedure. **Results which have not been approved before the scheduled presentation at the conference cannot be shown.** In this context, **"**test beam results" is deemed to include essentially all material about the detectors (hardware, performance, calibration procedures etc.) once the detectors have been integrated into the test beam setup.
- A CALICE Technical Note should be produced outlining the analysis method, including tables of numerical results and/or figures as appropriate. The note should be clear enough that another member of CALICE can understand what was done and would be able, if they so desired, to reproduce the essence of the analysis.
- An analysis suitable for writing up in this form should normally have been already presented to the Collaboration at least once in either a CALICE general meeting, or analysis meeting.
- When you are ready to start writing a note, you should contact the Chair of the Speakers' Bureau, who will set up a small editorial group of CALICE colleagues (typically about three people), whose task will be to scrutinise the work, maybe suggest improvements, and (hopefully) report eventually that they believe it to be reliable.
- A draft note should be produced ***at least two weeks before the meeting*** at which the results are to be shown. The draft should be sent to the editorial group, who will liaise with the authors until they are satisfied with the work. A longer lead time is desirable otherwise there is no guarantee that your results will be approved in time.
- The whole Collaboration should then have an opportunity to comment on the note; this may be done by circulating the note allowing a working week for comments, or by presenting the work in a talk at an advertised CALICE meeting.
- Once comments from the Collaboration are taken into account, the final note should then be sent to the Chair and Secretary of the Speakers' Bureau to be stored on the web, and an email should be sent to the Collaboration to notify everyone.
- Other materials such as photographs, event display pictures, plots to illustrate data taking rates, event displays etc. subject to the same procedure, but in some cases a web page rather than a note might be appropriate, e.g. to contain a collection of pictures. The most important thing in such cases would usually be to document the material clearly. In this case the editorial process would probably be rather minimal.
- A more liberal attitude may be taken to results presented, for example, by students in national physical society meetings, so long as the student presents this as their own work, making it clear that this does not necessarily represent the Collaboration's official position. The Speakers' Bureau should still be consulted, and would normally encourage the student to present approved material only.
- Unapproved results may occasionally be presented confidentially if it is essential to help support national funding reviews. The Speakers' Bureau should be informed in advance such a case.

Publications

- When one or several members of CALICE are ready to write a paper based on CALICE beam data, the following procedure should be followed:
  - When you start writing a paper, you should contact the Chair of the Speakers' Bureau, who will set up a small editorial group of CALICE colleagues (typically about four people), whose task will be to scrutinise the work and its presentation, maybe suggest improvements, and (hopefully) report eventually that they believe it to be ready for publication.
  - Once the authors have a draft paper available, they should send it to the editorial group, who will liaise with the authors until they are satisfied with the work.
  - The paper should then be made available to the whole Collaboration for a period of two working weeks, for anyone to comment. The authors are expected to respond to the suggestions from colleagues, taking advice from the editorial group and Speakers' Bureau as appropriate.
  - Once all interested parties are satisfied, the paper should be sent to the Chair and Secretary of the Speakers' Bureau for submission to the journal.