



# CKM Book

R. Faccini  
Sapienza Univrsita' and INFN Rome



# Useful Links

- <http://ckm2008.roma1.infn.it> [workshop's home page]
- <http://ckm2008.roma1.infn.it/book/instructions.html> [instructions for the book]

# Structure

- 6 WGs (2-3 conveners each)
  - Responsible to collect contributions and merge them.
- Editorial board of 6 people
  - Follow WGs and insist on deadlines
  - Each member responsible for the global integration of one chapter handled by a WG
  - Responsible to write common parts
- Svn controlled repository (critical)
- Bibtex based bibliography (critical)



# Time line

- 13 Sep 2008 – End of wshop
  - 15 Oct 2008 – internal WG deadline for collecting contributions
  - 15 Nov 2008 – deadline for first pass WG contributions
    - Most of the chapters were written and started internal WG review
  - 12 Jan 2009 – deadline for first pass to all chapters
  - 18-21 Mar 2009 – retreat with conveners
    - Most of WG contributions finalized
  - March-July 2009: review from Editorial Board and finalization of common parts
  - June 2009: review within wshop participants
  - July 2009: submission to journal
  - Jan 2010 report from referee
  - Feb 2010 response to referee and approval
- AWAITING PROOFS ...

# Difficulties

- Authorlist
- Few late contributions:
  - Made clear from start with conveners that they had to write missing pieces if any
  - Rearrange contributions on general parts from editorial board members if needed (biggest delay...)
- Tidiness and uniformity
  - Detailed initial instructions <http://ckm2008.roma1.infn.it/book/instructions.html>
  - Svn and bibtex (one young master supervising them)
  - Strong responsibility on conveners: the impression is that I succeeded in convincing conveners that they were embarking into a big project that if successfully completed soon would bring profit for everyone

1. What were the main difficulties encountered from the perspective of:
  - obtaining contributions in a timely way [how did you try and avoid late submissions and was this effective?]
  - obtaining reasonable quality of work [i.e. to put this another way is there a certain way to phrase requests for work that you found people received better than others?]

# Other Questions

2. Did you provide instructions via the WG conveners, and if so what level of detail was conveyed, and did the conveners respond to this information?

**Instructions were conveyed centrally and can be found in <http://ckm2008.roma1.infn.it/book/instructions.html>**

3. What would you do again in repeating the process?

**Structure of responsibilities/editorial board**

4. What would you not do in the process if you were repeating it?

**nothing**

5. How do you motivate people to work toward the final goal?

**Novelty of experience and importance of outcome**

# More questions

6. How did you manage the feedback that you received on the (final) complete drafts of the book. Similarly, how was the individual section feedback managed (at WG level)?

**Always through responsables of the sections**

7. What did you learn about file formats (figures, latex packages etc) that we could benefit from thinking about from the outset?

**Irrelevant if one has a centralized symbols file.  
It is all taken care by copy editors**



# Final questions

8. Were there any technical problems encountered with the submission process to the journal/archive due to file formats, figures etc.?

**Difficult and heavy process (also with spires): size of figures, naming and ordering, ... better have a devoted person. And I am not yet at the end of the process**

9. Were there any costs associated with the publishing of your book?

**I will pay to get one copy per participant. Otherwise I would be payed (fee 100\$) for it**

10. Were there any copyright issues with PRL, PRD, PLB, etc. that needed to be dealt with?

**No, provided all figure come from papers of which at least one author signs also the report**