

Proposed Changes in LSC Publication Policy

- Committee
 - » Jim Hough, Nergis Mavalvala, Dave Reitze, Kip Thorne
 - » Input from Alan Wiseman
- Charge
 - » to review LSC publication policy and modify to address shortcomings:
 - **When must a paper be reviewed by the LSC?**
 - **Review process identified as being excessively lengthy, 'onerous'**
- History
 - » 1 'face-to-face' meeting in Potsdam, Germany (September)
 - » 1 telecon (September)
 - » E-mail flurries

Highlights of the Major Modifications

- Authorship of ‘LSC-wide’ conference proceedings (observation papers)
 - » Old: LIGO 1 author list
 - » New: “John Doe for the LIGO Scientific Collaboration” in the byline
- Explicit description of what kind of paper triggers LSC review process
 - » Who determines whether or not to review?
 - Old: author of submitting paper
 - New: LSC institution group leader (signatory on MOU with LIGO Lab) is responsible for determining whether review is needed

Highlights of the Major Modifications (cont'd)

- ‘Event triggers’ for LSC review process
 - » Old: not explicitly stated; kind of arbitrary
 - » New: 3 criteria
 - “It involves data from any LSC instrument, be it the detectors or physical monitors.” Examples:
 - data from PEM channels
 - data from 40 m, Gingin, ETF
 - GEO astrophysical data analyzed in coincidence with LIGO
 - “It was significantly influenced by interactions in LSC committees, working groups, or collaboration meetings, or by other interactions with members of the LSC outside the authors’ research group(s).”
 - It has used LSC software or hardware resources. Examples:
 - DMT, LDAS, LAL
 - Interferometer configuration tools: Melody, Bench,...
 - LSC research programs: coatings, substrates

Highlights of the Major Modifications (cont'd)

- Even when not explicitly triggered or if doubts exist, you are encouraged to contact LSC spokesperson
- Old Procedures for Review
 - » LSC review panel
 - » LSC reviewers selected by spokesperson from panel (later relaxed)
 - » Review is blind
 - » Reviewers given 4 weeks
 - Sometimes honored
 - Sometimes not
 - » After revisions, final version of paper resubmitted for final check
 - Done for observation papers, not for technical papers

Highlights of the Major Modifications (cont'd)

- New Procedures for Review
 - » Guiding principle: LSC reviews are supposed to be friendly (but constructively critical!), designed to improve paper
 - » Guidelines for authors
 - When ms. is in 'publishable' form, submit to LSC spokesperson
 - Identify target journal
 - Submit list of potential reviewers
 - » Guidelines for reviewers
 - Strict **14 day** period for completing review
 - Criteria
 - Correctness
 - Author list appropriate?
 - Mandatory re-review? If so, **3 day** turn-around

Highlights of the Major Modifications (cont'd)

- New Procedures for Review (cont'd)
 - » Reviews are no longer blind
 - Spokesperson provides names of internal reviewers to author
 - » After 2 week period (and during revision period if present), papers are posted for LSC commentary
 - Need protected web site
- Talks
 - » Conference proceedings
 - Old: circulate to LSC council for comment
 - New: no need

Open Questions

- LSC publication policy covers ‘observational’ and ‘technical’ papers
- Changes proposed here are general
 - » Mostly addressing holes in review process and technical papers
- Observational papers are special
 - » Procedures drawn from LSC Data Analysis White Paper
 - Modified as 4 UL papers have gone through process
 - » Needs to be folded into publication policy
- LSC review vs LIGO Lab review
 - » Is there a difference? Should there be? Should they be folded together?
- Your input welcome! E-mails to committee...