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The following sentence of LEXFOR “Institute” explains that the institute determining the compilation responsibility (= institute coded under FACILITY in general) should be the first institute:

*As a rule, the institute determining the compilation responsibility is given first.*

An old LEXFOR (e.g., Ver. May 2001) also explains that

1. The first institute is the one containing the facility (except for an experiment performed by an itinerant group).
2. If two or more institutions of different service areas are involved, the institute to be coded first according to above rules shall determine the centre responsible.

It shows the first institute defined the compilation responsibility in the past.

But now we always relate the compilation responsibility with the institute code under **FACILITY**, and do not see a point to relate the first institute with the compilation responsibility anymore. I propose to delete the italicized sentence, and follow the sequence of the institutes on the primary reference under INSTITUTE (as it is done for AUTHOR).

This LEXFOR entry also explains determination of the compilation responsibility, but these policy matters are clearly written in the NRDC Protocol and should not be repeated in LEXFOR.

A revised LEXFOR “Institute” and an extraction from the NRDC Protocol are appended. **It does not propose any change in the compilation responsibility.**

N.B. The current NRDC Protocol refers to LEXFOR “Institute” for definition of the primary institute. However, the compilation responsibility is defined in the current NRDC Protocol without the concept of the primary institute, and it is not necessary to keep this concept in the NRDC Protocol anymore. This will be proposed in the next Centre Head meeting.
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**Institute**

The laboratories, institutes, or universities with which all authors are affiliated, is entered in coded form under the information-identifier keyword INSTITUTE. More than one institution may be entered for a given work. The sequence of the institutes should be the same as in the primary reference. (See EXFOR Exchange Formats Manual Chapter 7: **INSTITUTE**, for coding details). If a data set has several references with varying institutes, all institutes may be entered.

**Institutes not listed in the institutes dictionary**

If an institute is given in a reference which does not yet exist in the institute dictionary (Dictionary 3), normally a new dictionary code will be proposed according to the format described in the EXFOR/CINDA Dictionary Manual. Proposal of a new institute code is mandatory if this is the institute of the facility.

If the new institute is not the institute of the facility, it is possible to use the country code instead (*e.g.* 1USAUSA) with the institute’s name in free text. This option is recommended if the institute is not expected to produce more experimental publications in the future. If there are more than one institute codes given and not all of them are country codes, a country code must not be the first institute.

**~~Procedure if more than one institute is involved~~**

~~The institute(s) – together with the projectile type – determine also the centre responsible for compilation (“service areas”) as agreed by the NRDC. The following paragraphs explain the procedure if more than one institute is involved – which one to code first, and how to determine the compilation responsibility if the institutes are from different service areas.~~

~~If the institutions are from the same service area, they may be entered:~~

* ~~with the one containing the facility entered as the first institute (if at least one author is from this institute),~~
* ~~in the order in which they are given in the main reference,~~
* ~~with the institution from which one is most likely to obtain further information on the experiment as the first institute.~~
* If an itinerant group used the facility (i.e. no author of the facility’s institute is included), it is sufficient to code this institute under the keyword FACILITY (see EXFOR Formats Manual, p. 7.11).

**Compilation Responsibility if institutes from different service areas are involved**

~~If two or more institutions of different service areas are involved, the following rules shall determine the compilation responsibility. (As a rule, the institute determining the compilation responsibility is given first.)~~

* ~~The institute of the facility used, if at least one author is from this institute.~~
* ~~If an itinerant group used the facility, the main investigator of this group determines the centre responsible.~~
* ~~If facilities of different laboratories from different service areas are used, the institution from which it is most likely to obtain further information on the experiment should determine the center responsible. This will normally be the corresponding author, or, in case of doubt, the first author of the publication.~~
* In case of doubt ~~all such cases~~ the other affected center and NDS must be contacted before compilation to avoid duplication.

**Separation of entries by areas**

If separate experiments from different service areas with clearly separated results are reported in the same paper, the results should be compiled in separate entries. This applies also if the data were measured at one laboratory, and, subsequently, analysed at another laboratory and the laboratories are in different areas.

~~The separation is obligatory if data for different projectile types (neutron, charged particle, photon) are reported in the same publication.~~

In all such cases cross references to the other entry must be given using the REL-REF code O with a free text explanation (see also **REFERENCE**).

**~~Change of compilation responsibility due to delays~~**

~~If a centre, for any reason, cannot compile an experimental work within a given time limit agreed by the NRDC, NDS as the network coordinator may assign the compilation of this work to another network center.~~

**Extraction from NRDC Protocol “EXFOR Protocol”** (for comparison)

**Data Compilation Responsibility**

NDS will assign areas of responsibility for data compilation (areas of compilation). If a Centre, assigned to a particular area of compilation (e.g., neutron-induced nuclear reaction data from a country or countries), is not carrying out their responsibilities, i.e., compiling all new data for that area in a timely manner, the NDS coordinator will reassign all or part of those responsibilities to another volunteer Centre.

An area of compilation may be for a given projectile or set of projectiles, for a given country or group of countries, for a given data type or data types, or for any combination of these.

…

Neutron-induced nuclear reaction data (neutron data), charged-particle induced nuclear reaction data (charged-particle data), and photon-induced nuclear reaction data (photo-nuclear data) must be compiled in separate entries, with appropriate identification, even if they are reported in the same publication.

…

If two Institutes from different areas of compilation are involved, the primary Institute defines the Centre responsible (see LEXFOR, Institutes, for definition of primary Institute).

If several institutes of different areas of compilation are involved, the following rules determine the compilation responsibility:

1. The institute of the facility used, if at least one author is from this institute.
2. If an itinerant group used the facility, the main investigator of this group determines the Centre responsible.
3. If facilities of different laboratories from different areas of compilation are used, the Institute from which it is most likely to obtain further information on the experiment should determine the Centre responsible. This will normally be the corresponding author, or, in case of doubt, the first author of the publication.
4. If separate experiments from different areas of compilation with clearly separated results are reported in the same paper, the results should be compiled in separate entries. This separation is obligatory for different projectile types (neutron, charged particle, photon). In all such cases cross references to the other Entry must be given.