

Proposal: Public archived short notes

to address the current **lack of transparency** in how experimentalists obtain recommendations from theorists that feed directly into experimental analyses and publications

- often via **private** email exchanges with experiment-selected groups of theorists who **may or may not respond** with recommendations or peer-review-like comments expressing (dis)agreement with recommendations put forward by other theorists
- Theorists often make a quick recommendation or comment without even a minimal **explanation to back it up and/or a pointer to a theory reference**
- What group of theorists made what recommendation on what basis for what experimental question at what time remains private to those theorists and experimentalists involved (except for email forwarding and quotations). This lack of transparency **prevents broader discussion and inclusiveness** and it can be **difficult to review the basis of recommendations at a later time**. This is not a sound scientific practice.
- Peer-reviewed publications or workshop proceedings are public and very well worked out, but obviously not the right means to answer smaller experimental questions on a shorter time scale (and there is apparently considerable time pressure for experimental Higgs studies).
- Proposal: “short notes” (one paragraph to a few pages) that state what **experimentalists and theorists have been involved, the question/topic addressed and the recommended solution with a minimal justification/reference**. The short note would receive a **unique ID** and be **archived in a public system** (similar to arXiv in that submissions cannot be fully deleted, but for short notes, which contain less information than a proper publication).

Proposal: Public archived short notes

- There would thus be [transparency, accountability and persistence](#) for such recommendations. Experimental notes and journal publications could even [include references to such short notes via their ID](#), which could provide a definite answer to questions like "Why did CMS use xyz as scale in their abc analysis?" (That's a real question from ATLAS.)
- The key difference to arXiv would be that short notes are much shorter and do not contain original research results. They would simply be a more formal way to provide brief theoretical input to experimental studies.
- (I believe a TWiki solution would not work for various reasons.)