Authorship Policy

Anders Knospe, Virginia Bailey,
Marzia Rosati, & Neeraj Gupta

March 24, 2023

Contents

- The following slides contain
  - A summary of the main points of the proposed policy.
  - Our responses to some of the feedback from earlier in the year.

- Material taken from presentation on March 24.

- Initial Qualification for Authorship: perform service to the collaboration (in something other than physics analysis) for a significant fraction of one's research time for 1 year
  - Shorter, but more intense, qualification period allowed for students & postdocs

- Maintenance of Authorship: fulfill your shift obligations
  - Students & postdocs cannot be punished if they have fulfilled their personal obligations, but their institution is behind.
  - Alternatives to in-person shifts **must be provided** for those who are unable to perform shifts at BNL.

- After end of data taking, members who have been authors for ≥ 36 months will remain authors indefinitely
  - Other members can qualify for indefinite authorship by continuing to spend a significant fraction of their research time on sPHENIX.

Policy: Exceptional Cases

- Technical personnel and collaborators who made a significant contribution but departed before data taking began will be recognized on the first *N* (number to be determined) physics papers.

- People may be added to the author list on an ad hoc basis if they have made a significant contribution to a particular paper.
    - Subject to approval by Spokespersons and veto by IB.
    - Can only be invoked once in any 12-month period.

- Authors may self-remove, but that must last for a period of 2 full years.
    - There are many opinions on this. More on the following slides….

Self Removal

- Some view our proposed self-removal period (2 years) as too harsh, while others don't want self-removal allowed at all.

- Our proposal is an attempt at a compromise between these opposing views: self-removal is allowed, but penalized.

- There will be plenty of opportunity to discuss this in the IB and elsewhere. Collaborators are welcome to introduce alternative proposals in the IB.

Qualification

- Initial Statement of Principles called for 50% of one's research time to be spent on sPHENIX service for 1 year to qualify for authorship.
  - We have rephrased this to a "significant fraction" of one's research time.
- We were also unclear about whether that was supposed to be a one-time or ongoing commitment.
  - We have clarified that the service requirement is a one-time commitment to initially qualify as an author.
  - Once established, authorship is maintained by fulfilling the shift obligation.
- Some people felt that the qualification period should be shorter for junior members.
  - New proposal allows juniors to qualify in a shorter time, but they must do the same amount of work as for the regular qualification period.

Additional Comments

- Why should authors continue being on the author list for two years after departing the collaboration when the norm from other experiments is one year?
  - sPHENIX is just starting and needs to incentivize contributions now.
  - Expect a lag between data taking and physics results.
  - One-year period could negatively impact juniors who spent a bunch of time building sPHENIX.

- Junior members of the collaboration should not be punished for their institution not fulfilling their shift quota.
  - Now accounted for on slide 3: Students & postdocs cannot be punished if they have fulfilled their personal obligations, but their institution is behind.

- What will the authorship requirements look like after sPHENIX has taken data?
  - See slide 3.

Additional Comments

- What about institutions who cannot send people to BNL to take in-person shifts for visa/funding reasons? What about individuals who cannot take in-person shifts for personal reasons (i.e. no childcare at BNL)?
    - Proposal **requires** that alternatives be made available.
- How will the final policy be ratified?
    - There will be a vote in the IB.
- We should limit the number of papers per year that one can claim exceptional authorship.
    - We have added such a limit. See slide 4.
- Do technical personnel need to complete the DEI training to be included in the technical personnel authorship list?
    - No. DEI training is a requirement for regular (physics) authorship.

expert shift?

On 2023/05/15 10:27, Anders Knospe wrote:

Hi, Itaru. My apologies. I was meaning to respond to your original message when you sent it, but I forgot. My responses below are my own personal opinion. But I think they accurately reflect the authorship policy. Other members of the committee can speak up if they disagree.

1. Although it has not been organized official "expert shift" for Run23, I assume each subsystems will organize the expert shifts within their team members. We wonder if this expert shift can be counted as a regular institutional shift quota?
AK: To me, this sounds reasonable, and I know that other experiments like ALICE do this. However, this is beyond the scope of the authorship policy. This question would be up to the people who are in charge of setting the shift quota. For the authorship policy, the question is simply how much of the shift quota has been fulfilled.

- *2. Reading through the draft, we interpreted the authorship is valid for *a year*, although the sPHENIX work report is required twice a year. Is our interpretation collect?*
  AK: The one-year period is to initially qualify as an author. During that time, there should be a report after 6 months to ensure that the potential author is on track to complete their promised work. After that initial one-year period, people just need to continue to fulfill their shift obligations to maintain authorship.

- *3. For give me to ask the same question I asked in IB meeting, I just want to have written proof from the committee in order to forward this information to other institution. The question is that "is it OK for sPHENIX point of view if only student's name are on the author list without stuff name from the same institute?". More concretely, we RIKEN hosting students from Rikkyo University to work in sPHENIX/INTT and they will take shifts, but their professors cannot afford to take shifts. These professors prefer not to have their names in sPHENIX papers rather than forcing students to take additional shifts for them.*

  AK: What I am about to write is my own opinion and cannot be taken as any sort of official statement of sPHENIX policy. To me, what you describe is entirely consistent with the current version of the authorship policy. There is nothing in the policy that ties a junior person's authorship to a senior person's authorship. The most recent version of the policy introduced language that allows people to be listed in the author list with an institution that is not an sPHENIX member (see Sec. 2.6). So I see no problem with what you are describing. But again, that is not an official statement of policy.