

PRL 106, 062001 (2011) PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS week ending 11 FEBRUARY 2011

Cross Section and Parity-Violating Spin Asymmetries of W^\pm Boson Production in Polarized $p + p$ Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV

A. Adare,¹¹ S. Afanasev,²⁵ C. Aidala,²⁴ N. N. Ajitanand,⁵⁶ Y. Akiba,^{50,51} R. Akimoto,¹⁰ J. Alexander,⁵⁶ H. Al-Tai'ani,⁴⁴ K. R. Andrews,¹ A. Angerami,¹⁵ K. Aoki,⁵⁰ N. Apadula,⁵⁷ E. Appelt,⁵¹ Y. Aramaki,¹⁰ R. Armendariz,⁵ E. C. Aschmuser,³ T. C. Aves,⁴⁶ B. Aounan,⁵ V. Baktsev,³ M. Bai,⁶ B. Banerjee,⁵¹ K. N. Barish,⁷ B. Bassalleck,⁴³ A. T. Baye,¹ S. Bathe,⁵¹ V. Baublis,⁴⁹ C. Baumann,³⁰ A. Bazilevsky,² R. Belmont,⁶⁰ J. Ben-El-Mechaieq,⁴⁰ R. Bennett,²⁷ A. Berdnikov,⁵³ Y. Berdnikov,⁵³ D. S. Blair,³⁰ J. S. Bok,⁶³ K. Boyle,⁵³ M. L. Brooks,²⁴ D. Broommeyer,⁴⁰ H. Buechler,² V. Bumazhnikov,²¹ G. Bunce,^{55,1} S. Butyk,³⁴ S. Campbell,²⁷ A. Caringi,²⁰ P. Casten,⁵⁷ C.-H. Chen,²⁷ C. Y. Chai,¹² M. Chiu,² I. J. Choi,^{22,60} J. B. Choi,⁶ R. K. Choudhury,³ P. Christiansen,³⁶ T. Chujō,⁶⁰ O. Chvala,⁶ V. Ciaciolo,⁴⁶ Z. Citron,²⁷ B. A. Cole,¹² Z. Conesa del Valle,³² M. Cormor,²⁷ M. Csánád,¹³ T. Csörgő,²⁸ S. Dairaku,^{51,50} A. Datta,²⁸ G. David,⁹ M. K. Dayananda,¹⁸ A. Denisov,²¹ A. Deshpande,^{51,57} E. J. Desmond,³ K. V. Dharmawardane,⁴⁴ O. Dietzsch,⁵⁴ A. Dion,²⁴ M. Donadelli,²⁴ L. D'Orazio,³¹ O. Drapier,¹⁷ A. Drees,⁵⁷ K. A. Drees,⁵⁷ J. M. Durham,⁵⁷ A. Duran,⁵¹ Y. V. Efremenko,⁴⁶ T. Engelen,¹² A. Enokizono,⁵⁷ F. Fleuret,¹² S. L. Fokin,³⁰ J. E. Frick,¹⁰ X. Gong,¹⁰ M. Gong,²⁰ Y. Gong,¹⁰ T. Gunji,¹⁰ L. Guo,³⁴ H.-A. Guo,¹⁰ R. Han,⁴⁸ C. Harper,⁴⁰ K. Hashimoto,¹⁰ R. S. Hollis,⁶ W. Holzmann,¹⁰ T. Ichihara,^{50,51} R. Ichimiya,³⁰ H. Iinuma,²⁷ Y. Ikeda,^{50,52,60} K. Imai,^{51,50} M. Inaba,⁶⁰ A. Iordanova,⁶ D. Isenbower,¹ M. Ishihara,⁵⁰ M. Isihara,⁶¹ A. Isupov,²⁵ D. Ivanischev,⁴⁹ Y. Iwanaga,²⁰ B. V. Jacak,^{57,1} J. Jia,^{5,56} X. Jiang,²⁴ B. M. Johnson,⁵ T. Jones,¹ K. S. Joo,⁴¹ D. Jovan,⁴⁷ J. Kamin,⁵⁷ S. Kaneti,⁵⁷ B. H. Kang,¹⁹ J. H. Kang,⁶³ J. S. Kang,¹⁹ J. Kapustinsky,³⁴ K. Karatsu,^{51,50} M. Kasai,^{52,50} D. Kaur,²⁵ A. V. Kazantsev,⁵⁰ T. Kempel,²⁴ A. Khatzadeev,⁵⁰ K. M. Kijima,²⁵ B. I. Kim,²⁹ D. J. Kim,²⁹ E. J. Kim,⁶ Y.-J. Kim,²² Y. K. Kim,⁵⁹ E. Kinney,¹¹ A. Kis,¹³ E. Kistenev,¹⁰ D. Kleirjan,⁶ P. Kline,⁵⁷ L. Kochenda,⁵⁷ B. Komkov,⁴⁹ M. Kono,²⁰ J. Kostler,²⁷ D. Kovacs,⁴⁹ A. Král,¹³ G. J. Kunde,²⁴ K. Kurita,^{52,50} M. Kuroawa,⁵⁰ Y. Kwon,⁶³ G. S. Kyle,⁴⁴ R. Lacey,²⁹ Y. S. Lai,¹² J. G. Lajoie,²⁴ A. Lebedev,²⁹ D. M. Lee,²⁹ J. Lee,¹⁶ K. B. Lee,²⁹ K. S. Lee,²⁹ S. H. Lee,⁵⁷ S. R. Lee,⁵ M. J. Leitch,³⁴ M. A. L. Leite,³⁴ P. Lichtenwalter,⁴⁰ S. H. Lim,⁶⁰ L. A. Linden Levy,¹¹ A. Litvinenko,²⁵ H. Liu,³⁴ M. X. Liu,²⁴ X. Li,⁶ B. Love,⁶³ D. Lynch,² C. F. Maguire,⁶¹ Y. I. Makdisi,⁴ A. Malakhov,²⁵ A. Manion,²⁷ V. I. Manko,³⁰ E. Mannel,¹² Y. Mao,^{48,50} H. Masu,⁴⁰ M. McCumber,²⁷ P. L. McGaughey,²⁴ D. McGlinchey,¹¹ C. McKinney,²² N. Means,⁵⁷ M. Mendoza,⁶ B. Meredith,²² Y. Miake,⁴⁰ T. Mibe,²⁷ A. C. Mignerey,⁵⁷ K. Miki,⁶⁰ A. Milov,⁶² J. T. Mitchell,³ Y. Miyachi,^{50,59} A. K. Mohanty,¹ H. J. Moon,⁴¹ Y. Morino,¹⁰ A. Morreale,⁶ D. P. Morrison,² S. Morschviller,⁴⁰ T. V. Moukhanova,²⁰ T. Murakami,²¹ J. Murta,^{52,50} S. Nagamiya,²⁷ J. L. Nagle,¹¹ M. Naglis,⁶² M. I. Nagy,²⁹ I. Nakagawa,^{50,51} Y. Nakamiya,²⁰ K. R. Nakamura,^{51,50} T. Nakamura,⁵⁰ K. Nakano,⁵⁰ J. Newby,¹⁰ M. Nguyen,²⁷ M. Nihashi,²⁰ R. Nouicer,² A. S. Nyman,³⁰ C. Oakley,¹⁸ E. O'Brien,³ C. A. Ogilvie,⁴⁶

Collaborative Writing

Ben Hooberman & Celia M. Elliott
Department of Physics
University of Illinois



© 2025 Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois
All rights reserved

The first step is deciding who the authors are going to be

Ethical considerations of sharing credit with those who contributed to the work

Choice of co-authors may affect the paper's real and perceived quality

Things to consider when selecting co-authors

Importance of the individual's contribution

Writing ability, availability, and interest

Prestige and recognition in the field

Co-authors may not necessarily be *co-writers*

2

Generally, have those who contributed most to the success of the project, especially those who have solved major technical problems should be co-authors; lesser contributors are mentioned in the acknowledgments section.

Ideally, authors are named in descending order of their relative contributions, but practices vary widely among research disciplines and groups. Unless the list is obviously alphabetical, most readers will assume that the first author made the major contributions to the work.

Some journals are now requiring a detailed statement of the contributions that each author made to the work being reported. See, for example, the "Contributions" section of "Ultrahigh-resolution optical trap with single-fluorophore sensitivity" (<http://www.nature.com/nmeth/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/nmeth.1574.html>).

Who should be authors of this paper?

**Ahrends (postdoc) and Anderson (graduate student)
who actually did the work**

**Arbeiter (engineer) who fixed a critical problem with
the apparatus**

**Bartholomew (professor)—formulated the key idea,
told A² what experiment to do, what to look for,
and what it meant when they found it**

**Chambers (department head and internationally
known theorist)— had a number of insightful
discussions with Bartholomew**

**Daniels (technician)—prepared and characterized
the super-pure thin films**

3

This example is entirely fictitious.

Deciding the lead author is nontrivial; do you make it the most senior person, or the person who contributed the most important idea, or the person who did most of the work? Think about how future authors will cite it. “The fabrication method pioneered by xxxx et al.” will sound ridiculous if you make one of the theorists (Bartholomew or Chambers) the lead author.

This paper reports on the fabrication of semiconducting thin films of CdSe to take exploit their tunable opto-electronic properties.

Chambers contributed several possible theoretical explanations to account for the unexpectedly long charge carrier lifetimes that were observed experimentally.

In addition, Ahrends stuck Anderson with most of the exacting work, but Ahrends needs to find a job and Anderson has several years of graduate school left. Chambers, who can be petty and vindictive, has an ego the size of an aircraft carrier. And Daniels, the only one of the group who doesn't have a Ph.D., has a permanent chip on his shoulder because he feels under-appreciated and overworked.

One solution to the problem might be multiple publications: Chambers can be lead author on a theoretical paper to *Phys. Rev. Lett.*; Anderson can be lead author on a paper to *J. Appl. Phys.*, Daniels can be lead author on a technical publication in *Optoelectronics* or a similar trade journal.

Acknowledgments*

Acknowledge contributions by professional colleagues who are not listed as authors—do not include titles or academic degrees

Acknowledge financial support in this section, or in a footnote on the first page of the text, depending on the journal's style

Do not include purely personal acknowledgments

N.B.* There is no **e between the **g** and the **m** in the spelling of *acknowledgment* in U.S. English

4

Why have multiple authors?

Subject is too large or too complex for one person

Subject requires a variety of viewpoints or expertise

Recognized “experts” add prestige and may assure wider readership

5

Complications sometimes arise with multiple authorship

**Opposing judgments about manuscript
length, emphasis, publication venue**

Differing writing styles

Disputes about assignment of credit

Time needed to resolve differences

Dilution of responsibility

6

Physicists use one of three approaches

“Plug-and-Play” method

Each author writes a section, which is assembled into a final draft

Exploits individual expertise and knowledge

Inconsistencies in style, tone, tense among sections

“Best ball” method

Everyone writes his own version of the whole article

Group selects the best from each

May still have inconsistencies in the final version

“Filter” method

Group creates a draft using either of the two methods

One person with “artistic control” writes the final version to ensure consistency of style and form ⁷

Some caveats:

The more people involved

The more time it takes.

The less any one person feels responsible for finishing.

The more coordination and integration is required.

Multiple authors may make it difficult to maintain consistent tone, style, word usage.

Joining individually written segments in one document can result in a disorganized, poorly written mess unless one person has editorial control.

Many authors preparing the entire document is usually least efficient and most time-consuming.

Team-Writing commandments



Name a lead author who has final editorial control

Limit the size of the team

Strive for a mix of “thinkers” and “doers”

Decide who has veto power

Discuss upfront how to resolve conflicts

8

Limit the size of the team—eliminate upfront members who cannot, or will not, contribute.

Consider thanking some contributors in the “acknowledgments” section instead of making them co-authors.

Steps to creating a collaborative paper

Identify the tasks that must be done

- Assign them to specific people**
- Set firm deadlines**

Establish a routing procedure

Agree on a protocol for recording comments as the manuscript circulates

Collect and circulate comments

Discuss and make changes to the document

Circulate the final draft for all authors' approval

9

Decide on routing and file naming

Ensure that someone retains an original of each version of the file

Ensure that the most recent version of the file is what is circulating

If team members are going to make revisions to the original document and save a new version, devise a file-naming strategy so that the changes can be tracked (be aware that some operating systems truncate file names)

10

Some operating systems (Windows 3.x) will open files with long file names but then will truncate them to the first six characters, followed by a tilde and a number. If you've devised a file naming strategy that includes important information in longer file names, that information may be lost if someone with a incompatible system opens the file.

Decide on a routing procedure

“Spoke” routing



“Ring” routing



11

“Spoke” routing

Document goes to all members of the group at the same time.
Members make their comments and return the document to the originator.
Faster turnaround.
Someone will have to incorporate all the comments into a single document for the next round.

“Ring” routing

- Document circulates to each member of the group successively.
- Each member revises the file, saves it under a new name, and passes it on to the next person in the group.
- File naming protocol very important.
- Considerably slower, as each person must wait for the ones earlier in the chain to complete their work.
- As the document moves, authors at the end of the chain may not have anything left to add to the document and will start commenting on the comments.

Decide on how you will comment

Commenting via email

Someone in the group
will have to collect and
distill individual
comments

Inserting comments

directly into the text
Original document may
become very hard to
read

Local Electronic Phenomena: From Solids to Molecules

~~The original idea of~~ Binnig and Rohrer's ~~original idea~~ was ~~actually~~ not to build a microscope, but rather to develop a technique for ~~performing spectroscopy~~ spectroscopic measurements ~~with of~~ electron tunneling on the nanometer scale using a positionable electrode. ~~[add ref. cme]~~ Tunneling spectroscopy, ~~has been~~ one of the traditional ~~tools-methods~~ of solid-state physics, ~~has been an important tool~~ since studies of planar metal-oxide tunnel junctions in the 1960's partially confirmed the ~~Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer~~ [according to the APS Style Guide, BCS does not have to be defined: *Nature may not concur* [cme]] theory of superconductivity for conventional metals. But ~~similar to like~~ other spectroscopic techniques, planar tunneling provides only spatially averaged information and can not directly ~~access~~ measure spatial variations of electronic phenomena in solids. The STM ~~invention~~, however, ~~has~~ added ~~the a new~~ critical ~~new~~ component—the ability to perform spatially resolved spectroscopy on the atomic scale. As recent work demonstrates, the STM's combination of image and spectroscopy ~~with the STM is providing~~ provides new perspectives of electronic phenomena, such as ~~such as~~ superconductivity and magnetism, which up to now have been ~~mostly examined primarily~~ characterized by techniques ~~with relying on~~ macroscopically average techniques. In its now ~~more more~~ established role as a spectroscopic tool, the STM spectroscopy is finding applications in a wide range of systems—from superconductors to nanostructures and single molecules.

- Overleaf is a web-based latex solution that can be used for collaborative writing (also useful for individuals)
- Options for track changes, comments, and tagging in git



Free

To recap:

Have clearly defined roles for each author

**Name one person who has overall
responsibility for the final product**

Establish (and enforce) deadlines

**Figure out how you're going to make
comments and track versions ahead of time**



cmelliot@illinois.edu

<http://physics.illinois.edu/people/Celia/>

14

Some operating systems (Windows 3.x) will open files with long file names but then will truncate them to the first six characters, followed by a tilde and a number. If you've devised a file naming strategy that includes important information in longer file names, that information may be lost if someone with a incompatible system opens the file.