

Publication and Authorship

Decisions

- When and How to publish?
 - When you have a story to tell, but which story?
 - In part, the decision that it's the right time to tell your story is a maximization decision.
 - What are you try to maximize?
 - Number
 - » “salami science” and “least publishable unit”
 - Impact
 - Does it matter?

ICMJE* Authorship Criteria

- “Authorship credit should be based on
 - 1) substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data;
 - 2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content;
 - 3) final approval of the version to be published.
- Authors should meet conditions 1, 2, and 3”
- All authors responsible for content of paper.

* International Committee of Medical Journal Editors

Acknowledgments

- ICMJE:
 - Acknowledgments section: the place to include individuals who have contributed “materially” to the work but whose contributions do not justify authorship, e.g. “scientific advisors” or “clinical investigators”.
 - Recommends that written permission be obtained from anyone mentioned in acknowledgment; readers may infer endorsement of data and conclusions by virtue of acknowledgment.

Primary Publication

- First disclosure with sufficient information to enable peers
 - To assess observations
 - To repeat experiments
 - To evaluate intellectual processes (rationale, interpretation)
 - Available, permanent
- Generally regarded as improper to publish same results as primary publication more than once
 - “Self-plagiarism”

Sharing Research Materials

- For results of primary research published in life science and biomedical journals, it is standard practice for publisher to require authors to make research materials available, deposit data into database if appropriate, and deposit specimens into repository
- Sharing may involve Materials Transfer Agreement (MTA)
- Request for research materials should always made to authors of primary publication.

Public Access

- 2008 Requirement of NIH grants
 - PubMed Central (NLM)
- Public access requirement now extended to all federal sponsors
- Major foundation sponsors have also adopted public access requirements
- Copyright Issues/Author's rights
- SPARC* Author Addendum [<http://www.arl.org/sparc/author/>]

* Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition

Peer Review

Peer Review

- An honor
- Must be impartial
- Privileged communication – confidential
 - Not copied or shared
 - No assistance from others without consent of editor
- If you make the commitment to review; follow through!

Philosophy of review (Macrina, Chap 4)

- “The peer reviewer’s job has two aims:
 - (i) to help the editor make a good decision on the acceptability of the paper, and
 - (ii) to help the authors communicate their work accurately and effectively.”
- Not an adversarial role; rather an advocate for the authors.

Common criteria for evaluating merit (Macrina, Chap 4)

- Clear statement of the problem being studied, put in perspective of literature.
- Experimental techniques and research design should be appropriate to the study.
 - Appropriate tools and techniques
 - Clear description
- Clarity and effectiveness of data presentation
- Interpretation of data sound and clearly ordered
 - Arguments logically presented, speculation built on data in paper or existing literature
- Writing clear, easy to follow, grammatically correct
- Evaluate title and abstract after reading the paper