

# Short Summary of Comments on Recognition Summary Report

Andreas Haungs, Karl Jakobs and Marek Lewitowicz

07. January 2022

## I. General comments:

The report contains very valuable and carefully analysed information related to the recognition of individuals in large collaborations. In particular, it contains a list of issues and best practices.

For two communities (astroparticle and nuclear physics) this kind of survey and analysis were realised for the first time.

However, we feel that for the presentation of the final recommendations to the collaborations and communities a more concise document should be prepared. This should as well be approved by APPEC, ECFA and NuPECC.

Throughout the document, APPEC should be written with capital letters, only.

## II. More specific comments:

Page 4:

*“The answers to the questions include a spectrum of feedback from the collaborations but also show the opinion of a majority. It is noteworthy to stress that the responses exhibited very similar patterns between each community, and the major driver for differences seemed to relate not to the field, but rather to the size and the stage of completion of the collaborations.”*

This is an important conclusion but the differences related to the size of the collaborations (where the ratio of small to large collaborations are different for the three communities) should be emphasized more explicitly already at this stage.

One could already comment here on differences in the publication culture of large and small collaborations; we also appreciate that it is mentioned that there is awareness on recognition issues already in the large collaborations.

Page 5:

*“This makes the evaluation of individuals difficult for referees. This is an issue for referees inside our field, ....”*

We are surprised about the statement that there is an evaluation issue also for referees inside our field. Is this true? Can this be backup up? We think that in a very large fraction of cases referees inside our field are fully aware about the criteria, contributions of individuals and how to rank them.

Related to the third bullet: It is not clear if “technical” work includes software, computing and data curation activities.

Page 6, Publications:

*“The use of full alphabetical author lists is a widespread practice. It comes from a long-established tradition to recognize all stages of work within the publication, and to make sure that people involved in the technical work or early stages of an analysis chain get proper recognition.”*

This statement is not true for most of the nuclear physics collaborations outside of LHC as well as for astronomy-dominated collaborations in astroparticle physics. The PhD students or post-docs performing experiments and analyzing data are as a rule the first authors (including CERN collaborations like ISOLDE or n-tof). This fact is well documented in Appendix C but it should be repeated here as it concerns a large number of the collaborations participating in the survey.

*“The reference could be: “XXX thesis in preparation, Univ. of YYY”*

We doubt that unpublished theses (“in preparation”) can be referenced in journal publications. At least it should be made clear here whether this is suggested for journal publications or for other types of publications.

Page 6: Talks&Conferences

Since you list best practices, we would like to suggest to mention as well the attribution of talk using a ranking method based on individual contributions to the work of the collaboration.

Page 8:

Again, it should be more specified what you mean with technical work, in particular if it includes software, computing, data curation.

Page 9:

There are also numerous prizes for young scientists) awarded by other bodies than collaborations (committees including, EPS, IUPAP and NuPECC, labs, conferences etc.). They might be mentioned here as additional criteria in the evaluation of individual achievements. The collaborations should be encouraged to send applications for these prizes rewarding young collaborators.

The same applies to the ERC, MSC and other grants which are not mentioned in the report. A question related to how these prizes and grants are recognized by collaborations can be added in the survey.

Page 10 and 11:

Also in this chapter a short discussion on specific differences between large and smaller collaborations should be given.

On the publication of backup documentation we see two serious issues:

- (i) A wealth of information would require huge efforts to be reviewed inside the collaborations and put it in such a form that it can be published; this would bind large resources and would make the publication process even longer and more heavy! As also noted in the report, it is already felt that the publication process in large collaborations is already long and heavy today.
- (ii) It would to a large extent provide a duplication of results. Would one find journals to accept them? If on the other hand “online publication” (as a public link to backup information) is planned, this should be clearly said in the document;

- (iii) The argument of “tension with publicly funded research infrastructure” may not be valid, as the major results are published. In addition, e.g. in HEPDATA details on results are provided in electronic form. As usual, the collaborations must decide what the relevant results to be published are. Not every single plot that is produced deserves to end up in a journal and one needs to focus on the main results.
- (iv) We would also like to point out that some of the large collaborations explicitly allow that internal (backup documents) can be shared with selection committees etc. for job applications. We think that this could as well be listed under “best practice” as it mitigates the problem of publication of internal / backup documents.

Page 11:

*Technical papers on technology used in subsystems of large experiments are often published by sub-collaborations. More recently, this is the case for computing and software algorithms used in the experiments. The fact that this is not considered possible for publications of physics seems contradictory ...*

The discussion on physics publications with short author lists has been extensively carried out in the large collaborations and the conclusions were to stick to the alphabetical ordering. This is also confirmed by what is written on page 29 (first paragraph). So, we do not think that it is useful to open this discussion again.

Furthermore, it is written on p29: " ... Other collaborations consider and implement publication of technical papers with limited author lists, perhaps making use of partial data sets or Monte Carlo data."

So, also this is not decided yet, as it is written “considered”. So, based on this, we do not think that this should appear so prominently on page 11, unless you phrase it more carefully.

Page 11:

The title “Conclusions and recommendations” is somewhat misleading as the most important recommendations are indicated in Chapter 4b not in the Chapter 5. This chapter contains only some general conclusions.

Page 35:

*In total 32 collaborations from NuPECC were initially contacted, out of which 22 joined the working group. The questionnaire was answered by 9 collaborations, these answers form the basis of the following analysis*

This is definitely an issue for NuPECC requiring improvement in the next survey.

*“...as well as a small collaboration of NUSTAR@FAIR returned a questionnaire”.*

Well, NUSTAR is probably the largest nuclear structure collaboration in the world (>1000 members). The sentence should be modified.