

AUTHORSHIP AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Wilfred CG Peh

Singapore Medical Journal,
National University of Singapore,
& Khoo Teck Puat Hospital, Singapore



LECTURE OUTLINE

- Introduction
- Authorship
 - criteria
 - corresponding author
 - group authors & collaborators
- Acknowledgements
- Summary



INTRODUCTION

- Requirements for authorship
- Important document by International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) [previously AKA “Vancouver group”]



INTRODUCTION ICMJE

- Current membership
 - 11 journals (Annals Intern Med, BMJ, Chinese Med J, JAMA, Dutch Med J, NEJM, New Zealand Med J, Lancet, Revista Medica de Chile, J Norwegian Med Assoc, J Danish Med J)



INTRODUCTION ICMJE

- Revisions panel (August 2013)
 - 11 member journals
 - US National Library of Medicine
 - World Association of Medical Journal Editors (WAME)



Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals*

Updated August 2013

I. About the Recommendations	A. Preparing a Manuscript for Submission to a Medical Journal
A. Purpose of the Recommendations	1. General Principles
B. Who Should Use the Recommendations?	2. Reporting Guidelines
C. History of the Recommendations	3. Manuscript Sections
II. Roles and Responsibilities of Authors, Contributors, Reviewers, Editors, Publishers, and Owners	a. Title Page
A. Defining the Role of Authors and Contributors	b. Abstract
1. Why Authorship Matters	c. Introduction
2. Who Is an Author?	d. Methods
3. Non-Author Contributors	e. Selection and Description of Participants
B. Author Responsibilities—Conflicts of Interest	ii. Technical Information
1. Participants	iii. Statistics
a. Authors	e. Results
b. Peer Reviewers	f. Discussion
c. Editors and Journal Staff	g. References
2. Reporting Conflicts of Interest	i. General Considerations
C. Responsibilities in the Submission and Peer-Review Process	ii. Style and Format
1. Authors	h. Tables
2. Journals	i. Illustrations (Figures)
a. Confidentiality	j. Units of Measurement
b. Timeliness	k. Abbreviations and Symbols
	l. Sectioning the Manuscript to the Journal

*“ICMJE Recommendations”: August 2013

- 16 page document

- www.icmje.org



AUTHORSHIP

General principles


- All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship
- All those who qualify as authors should be listed



AUTHORSHIP

General principles


- Each author should have
 - participated sufficiently in the work
 - to take public responsibility for the contents



AUTHORSHIP

Authorship contributions

- Authors may be asked to provide description of each one's role
- Author contribution declaration
 - recommended for journals to publish this information




Acute Peripheral Joint Injury: Cost and Effectiveness of Low-Field-Strength MR Imaging—Results of Randomized Controlled Trial¹


Authorship Contributions: Concept and design: [Author names]; Acquisition of data: [Author names]; Analysis and interpretation of data: [Author names]; Drafting of the manuscript: [Author names]; Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: [Author names]; Statistical analysis: [Author names]; Obtaining funding: [Author names]; Supervision: [Author names]; Substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and final approval of the version to be published. Authors should meet conditions 1, 2, and 3.

AUTHORSHIP

ICMJE criteria (2010 version)

The ICMJE has recommended the following criteria for authorship; these criteria are still appropriate for journals that distinguish authors from other contributors.


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



AUTHORSHIP

ICMJE criteria (2010 version)

- All 3 criteria must be met
 1. Substantial contributions to
 - study conception and design or
 - acquisition of data or
 - analysis and interpretation of data



AUTHORSHIP

ICMJE criteria (2010 version)

2. Drafting the article and revising it critically for important intellectual content
3. Final approval of the version to be published



AUTHORSHIP

ICMJE criteria (new: Aug 2013)

2. Who Is an Author?

The ICMJE recommends that authorship be based on the following 4 criteria:

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.



AUTHORSHIP

ICMJE criteria (new: Aug 2013)

4. Each author agrees to
 - be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy and integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved



AUTHORSHIP

ICMJE criteria (new: Aug 2013)

New item 4

- Addresses situations in which individual authors have responded to inquiries regarding scientific misconduct involving some aspect of the study by denying responsibility



AUTHORSHIP

ICMJE criteria (new: Aug 2013)

New item 4

- Each author needs to
 - understand the full scope of work
 - know which coauthors are responsible for specific contributions
 - have confidence in coauthors' ability and integrity



AUTHORSHIP

ICMJE criteria (new: Aug 2013)

New item 4

- If any questions arise regarding the study, onus on all authors to investigate and ensure resolution of issue
- Author has to accept that any problem related to paper is his problem



AUTHORSHIP

ICMJE criteria (new: Aug 2013)

New item 4

- Balances credit with responsibility
- Establishes expectation that editors may engage all authors in helping to determine integrity of the work
- In short: emphasizes accountability



AUTHORSHIP

Authorship not justified for

- Contributors who do not meet the 4 criteria for authorship
- Consider placing them under the “Acknowledgements” section



AUTHORSHIP

Corresponding author

- Recommendations (2013)
 - new section detailing the role and responsibilities has been added
 - term “guarantor” has been dropped



AUTHORSHIP

Uniform requirements (2010)

Some journals now also request that one or more authors, referred to as “guarantors,” be identified as the persons who take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, from inception to published article, and publish that information.

Increasingly, authorship of multicenter trials is attributed to a group. All members of the group who are named as authors should fully meet the above criteria for authorship/contributorship.

The group should jointly make decisions about contributors/authors before submitting the manuscript for publication. The corresponding author/guarantor should be prepared to explain the presence and order of these individuals. It is not the role of editors to make authorship/contributorship decisions or to arbitrate conflicts related to authorship.



AUTHORSHIP

ICMJE Recommendations (2013)

The corresponding author takes primary responsibility for communication with the journal during the manuscript submission, peer review, and publication process, and typically ensures that all the journal’s administrative requirements, such as providing details of authorship, ethics committee approval, clinical trial registration documentation, and gathering conflict of interest forms and statements, are properly completed, although these duties may be delegated to one or more coauthors. The corresponding author should be available throughout the submission and peer review process to respond to editorial queries in a timely way, and should be available after publication to respond to critiques of the work and cooperate with any requests from the journal for data or additional information should questions about the paper arise after publication. Although the corresponding author has primary responsibility for correspondence with the journal, the ICMJE recommends that editors send copies of all correspondence to all listed authors.



AUTHORSHIP

Corresponding author


- Takes primary responsibility for communication with journal including administrative matters
- Available to respond to queries and critiques post-publication, including provision of data



AUTHORSHIP

Group authorship

- Becoming increasingly common
- Many variations in how individual authors and research group names are listed in the paper's bylines



Group authorship

NCBI Resources How To

PubMed.gov PubMed Advanced

Display Settings: Abstract Send to:

Neuroscience 2013 Nov 14; doi: 10.1002/nbm.25031 [Epub ahead of print]

Classification of lesion area in stroke patients during the subacute phase: A multiparametric MRI study.

Adis M. Aizenstein, D. Japhak-Kimchi, T. Bornstein, N. Shoen, L. Halkin, H. Ben-Bashat, Journal of the ICMJE and ICMJE Collaborators

The Functional Brain Center, Tel Aviv Sourasky Medical Center, Tel Aviv, Israel; Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

Abstract

PURPOSE: Stroke imaging studies during the acute phase are likely to precede several vascular brain mechanisms, which have an important role in patient outcome. The aim of this study was to identify within the lesion area during the subacute phase (21 day) reactive tissue, which may have the potential for recovery.

METHODS: Twenty seven stroke patients from two cohorts were included. MRI performed during the subacute phase included conventional perfusion and diffusion imaging. In cohort I, unsupervised multiparametric classification of the lesion area was performed. In cohort II threshold based classification was performed during the subacute phase, and radiological outcome was assessed at follow-up scan.

RESULTS: Three tissue classes were identified in cohort I, referred to as irreversibly damaged, intermediary, and reactive tissue. Based on threshold values defined in cohort I, the reactive tissue was identified in 11/13 patients in cohort II, and showed tissue preservation/partial recovery in 9/11 patients at follow-up scan. The irreversibly damaged tissue was identified in 7/13 patients in cohort II, and predicted tissue necrosis in all cases.

CONCLUSION: Identification of reactive tissue following stroke during the subacute phase can improve radiological assessment, contribute to the understanding of brain recovery processes and has implications for new therapeutic approaches. Magn Reson Med. 2013. © 2013 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Copyright © 2013 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

KEYWORDS: brain response, lesion classification, reactive tissue, subacute phase

PMID: 24240644 [PubMed - as supplied by publisher]

Group authorship

NCBI Resources How To

PubMed.gov PubMed Advanced

Display Settings: Abstract Send to:

Sci Cancer Res. 2013 Nov 1. [Epub ahead of print]

Germine Variants and Advanced Colorectal Adenomas: Adenoma Prevention with Celecoxib Trial Genome-wide Association Study.

Yama J, Cavonius-Carmona LG, Chu JH, Zaubler A, ICMJE Collaborators, Sudo M, Matsuda K, Duntso M, Houlston RS, Steyer Q, Lipton L, Gibbs P, Martin NG, Montano-Gutiérrez Y, Yasuda J, Blain FN, Batten MJ, Takahama Y, Wakisaka ST, Tammela JJ, Bertassoni MM

Authors: A. Mattina, Department of Surgery, Division of Surgical Oncology, Center for Genomic Medicine, Channing Laboratory, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, Dana-Farber Cancer Center and Department of Biotechnology and Molecular Medicine, University of California, Davis, California, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, New York, RKIK Center for Genomic Medicine, Tokyo, Japan, Colon Cancer Genetics Group, Institute of Genetics and Biomedical Medicine, University of Edinburgh and HSC Public Health Genetics Unit, Edinburgh, Section of Cancer Genetics, Institute of Cancer Research, Sutton, United Kingdom, Ludwig Cancer Research Institute Laboratory, Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research, Royal Melbourne Hospital, Parkville, Genetic and Molecular Epidemiology Laboratories, and Family Cancer Laboratory, Queensland Institute of Medical Research, Brisbane, Centre for Eye Research Australia, University of Melbourne, Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital, East Melbourne, Australia, and Department of Medicine, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.


Abstract

PURPOSE: Identification of single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) associated with development of advanced colorectal adenomas. **EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN:** Discovery phase: 1,456 Caucasian patients (139 advanced adenoma cases and 1,267 controls) from the Adenoma Prevention with Celecoxib (APC) trial were included in a genome-wide association study (GWAS) to identify variants associated with postpolypectomy disease recurrence. Genome-wide significance was defined as false discovery rate less than 0.05, unadjusted $P = 7.4 \times 10^{-7}$. Validation phase: results were further evaluated using 2,175 familial colorectal adenoma cases and 5,036 controls from patients of European ancestry (COLOrectal Gene Identification consortium (CORGI), Scotland, Australia, and VQSG). **RESULTS:** Our study identified eight SNPs associated with advanced-adenoma risk in the APC trial (rs2837156, rs7276863, rs2837237, rs2837241, rs2837254, rs741864 at 21q22.2, and rs1381392 and rs17651822 at 3p24.1, at $P < 10^{-7}$ level with OR > 2). Five variants in strong pairwise linkage disequilibrium (rs7276863, rs2837237, rs741864, rs741864, and rs2837241, $r^2 = 0.8-1$) are in or near the coding region for the tight junction adhesion protein, *CLDN6*. An additional variant associated with advanced adenomas, rs1535989 [minor allele frequency, 0.11, OR, 2.09, 95% confidence interval (CI), 1.50-2.91], also predicted colorectal cancer development in a validation analysis ($P = 0.013$) using a series of adenoma cases or colorectal cancer (CORGI study) and 3 sets of colorectal cancer cases and controls (Scotland, VQSG, and Australia, $N = 9,211$). **CONCLUSIONS:** Our results suggest that common polymorphisms contribute to the risk of developing advanced adenomas and might also contribute to the risk of developing colorectal cancer. The variant at rs1535989 may identify patients whose risk for metastasis warrants increased endoscopic surveillance. Clin Cancer Res. 1:8. ©2013 AACR.

AUTHORSHIP

Group authorship

- All authors still need to meet criteria for authorship, regardless of byline format
- Additional role of corresponding author: identify authors and non-authors




AUTHORSHIP

Group authorship

When a large multi-author group has conducted the work, the group ideally should decide who will be an author before the work is started and confirm who is an author before submitting the manuscript for publication.

All members of the group named as authors should meet all four criteria for authorship, including approval of the final manuscript, and they should be able to take public responsibility for the work and should have full confidence in the accuracy and integrity of the work of other group authors. They will also be expected as individuals to complete conflict-of-interest disclosure forms.

ICMJE Recommendations: August 2013




AUTHORSHIP

Group authorship

ICMJE Recommendations (2013)

- National Library of Medicine
 - will index individual authors or collaborators
 - provided that there is a note indicating that the individual roles are listed elsewhere



AUTHORSHIP

Group authorship

Some large multi-author groups designate authorship by a group name, with or without the names of individuals. When submitting a manuscript authored by a group, the corresponding author should specify the group name if one exists, and clearly identify the group members who can take credit and responsibility for the work as authors. The byline of the article identifies who is directly responsible for the manuscript, and MEDLINE lists as authors whichever names appear on the byline. If the byline includes a group name, MEDLINE will list the names of individual group members who are authors or who are collaborators, sometimes called non-author contributors, if there is a note associated with the byline clearly stating that the individual names are elsewhere in the paper and whether those names are authors or collaborators.

ICMJE Recommendations:
August 2013



CONTRIBUTORSHIP

ICMJE Recommendations (2013)

- Introduces term “collaborators”
- “sometimes called non-author contributors” (confusing)
- members of a research group who have not met criteria for authorship but will be listed in MEDLINE



Group authorship with “Collaborators” link on the PubMed Abstract and Citation displays

Pubmed | PubMed | Advanced

Display Settings: Abstract | Send to: |

Stroke, 2013 Nov 27; 54(11):2544-54.

Shared Genetic Susceptibility to Ischemic Stroke and Coronary Artery Disease: A Genome-Wide Analysis of Common Variants.

Collaborators (18)

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE: Ischemic stroke (IS) and coronary artery disease (CAD) share several risk factors and each has a substantial heritability. We conducted a genome-wide analysis to evaluate the extent of shared genetic determination of the two diseases.

METHODS: Genome-wide association data were obtained from the METAGENIC2, Coronary Artery Disease Genetics with Replication and Meta-analysis (CARDIoGRAM), and Coronary Artery Disease (CAD) Genetics consortia. We first analyzed common variants reaching a nominal threshold of significance ($P < 10^{-5}$) for their association with IS and/or CAD. We then examined specific genetic variants across phenotypes for variants that reached a high threshold of significance. Finally, we conducted a joint meta-analysis on the combined phenotype of IS or CAD. Corresponding analyses were performed restricted to the 2167 individuals with the ischemic large artery stroke (IAS) subtype.

RESULTS: Common variants associated with CAD at $P < 10^{-5}$ were associated with a significant excess risk for IS and for IAS and vice versa. Among the 42 most genome-wide significant loci for CAD, 3 and 6 loci were significantly associated with IS and IAS, respectively. In the joint meta-analysis, 15 loci passed genome-wide significance ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) for the combined phenotype of IS or CAD and 17 loci passed genome-wide significance ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) for IAS and 16 loci passed genome-wide significance ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) for IS. We specifically analyzed the associated signals for IS and IAS and found evidence for association at $10q24$ (SNP3) ($P_{IS} = 10^{-11}$ and $P_{IAS} = 10^{-10}$), as well as at $6q24$ (SNP1) ($P_{IS} = 2 \times 10^{-11}$, $P_{IAS} = 7 \times 10^{-11}$), $6q27$ (SNP1) ($P_{IS} = 10^{-11}$ and $P_{IAS} = 10^{-11}$), $6q27$ (SNP2) ($P_{IS} = 10^{-11}$ and $P_{IAS} = 10^{-11}$), and $17q21$ (SNP1) ($P_{IS} = 10^{-11}$ and $P_{IAS} = 10^{-11}$).

CONCLUSIONS: Our results demonstrate substantial overlap in the genetic risk for IS and particularly the IAS subtype with CAD.

KEYWORDS: common artery disease; genetic; heterogeneity; pleiotropy; stroke; ischemic stroke

Group authorship with “Collaborators” link on the PubMed Abstract and Citation displays

Pubmed | PubMed | Advanced

Display Settings: Abstract | Send to: |

Stroke, 2013 Nov 27; 54(11):2544-54.

Shared Genetic Susceptibility to Ischemic Stroke and Coronary Artery Disease: A Genome-Wide Analysis of Common Variants.

Collaborators (18)

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE: Ischemic stroke (IS) and coronary artery disease (CAD) share several risk factors and each has a substantial heritability. We conducted a genome-wide analysis to evaluate the extent of shared genetic determination of the two diseases.

METHODS: Genome-wide association data were obtained from the METAGENIC2, Coronary Artery Disease Genetics with Replication and Meta-analysis (CARDIoGRAM), and Coronary Artery Disease (CAD) Genetics consortia. We first analyzed common variants reaching a nominal threshold of significance ($P < 10^{-5}$) for their association with IS and/or CAD. We then examined specific genetic variants across phenotypes for variants that reached a high threshold of significance. Finally, we conducted a joint meta-analysis on the combined phenotype of IS or CAD. Corresponding analyses were performed restricted to the 2167 individuals with the ischemic large artery stroke (IAS) subtype.

RESULTS: Common variants associated with CAD at $P < 10^{-5}$ were associated with a significant excess risk for IS and for IAS and vice versa. Among the 42 most genome-wide significant loci for CAD, 3 and 6 loci were significantly associated with IS and IAS, respectively. In the joint meta-analysis, 15 loci passed genome-wide significance ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) for the combined phenotype of IS or CAD and 17 loci passed genome-wide significance ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) for IAS and 16 loci passed genome-wide significance ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) for IS. We specifically analyzed the associated signals for IS and IAS and found evidence for association at $10q24$ (SNP3) ($P_{IS} = 10^{-11}$ and $P_{IAS} = 10^{-10}$), as well as at $6q24$ (SNP1) ($P_{IS} = 2 \times 10^{-11}$, $P_{IAS} = 7 \times 10^{-11}$), $6q27$ (SNP1) ($P_{IS} = 10^{-11}$ and $P_{IAS} = 10^{-11}$), $6q27$ (SNP2) ($P_{IS} = 10^{-11}$ and $P_{IAS} = 10^{-11}$), and $17q21$ (SNP1) ($P_{IS} = 10^{-11}$ and $P_{IAS} = 10^{-11}$).

CONCLUSIONS: Our results demonstrate substantial overlap in the genetic risk for IS and particularly the IAS subtype with CAD.

KEYWORDS: common artery disease; genetic; heterogeneity; pleiotropy; stroke; ischemic stroke

Pubmed | PubMed | Advanced

Display Settings: Abstract | Send to: |

Stroke, 2013 Nov 4; 54(11):2544-54.

Stroke Unit Care Benefits Patients With Intracerebral Hemorrhage: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.

Collaborators (18)

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE: Patients with any type of stroke managed in organized inpatient (stroke unit) care are more likely to survive, return home, and regain independence. However, it is uncertain whether these benefits apply equally to patients with intracerebral hemorrhage and ischemic stroke.

METHODS: We conducted a secondary analysis of a systematic review of controlled clinical trials comparing stroke unit care with general ward care, including only trials published after 1990 that could separately report outcomes for patients with intracerebral hemorrhage and ischemic stroke. We performed random-effects meta-analysis and tested for subgroup interactions by stroke type.

RESULTS: We identified 13 trials (3570 patients) of modern stroke unit care that recruited patients with intracerebral hemorrhage and ischemic stroke, of which 8 trials provided data on 2617 patients. Stroke unit care reduced death or dependency risk [OR, 0.81; 95% confidence interval (CI), 0.47 to 1.32; $P = 0.009$ (75%)] with no difference in benefits for patients with intracerebral hemorrhage (OR, 0.79; 95% CI, 0.61 to 1.00) than patients with ischemic stroke (OR, 0.82; 95% CI, 0.70 to 0.97; $P = 0.002$ (77)). Stroke unit care reduced death (OR, 0.79; 95% CI, 0.64 to 0.97; $P = 0.02$ (204%)) to a greater extent for patients with intracerebral hemorrhage (OR, 0.73; 95% CI, 0.54 to 0.97) than patients with ischemic stroke (OR, 0.82; 95% CI, 0.61 to 1.00), but this difference was not statistically significant ($P = 0.06$ (58)).

CONCLUSIONS: Patients with intracerebral hemorrhage seem to benefit at least as much as patients with ischemic stroke from organized inpatient (stroke unit) care.

KEYWORDS: hemorrhagic; meta-analysis; outcome; stroke; stroke units

PMID: 24087173 (PubMed - as above)

CONTRIBUTORSHIP

Non-author contributors

- Do not meet all 4 criteria for authorship and are not part of a research group
- Should be acknowledged



CONTRIBUTORSHIP

Non-author contributors

Examples

- Acquisition of funding
- General administrative support
- Writing assistance, technical editing, language editing & proofreading



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

General principles

- Contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

State specific contribution

- Clinical investigator
- Scientific advisor
- Collected data
- Provided and cared for patients



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

General principles

- Also acknowledge
 - financial support
 - material support
 - grant-awarding bodies



Acknowledgments: We thank Wibeke van Leeuwen and Caroline van Bavel for their support in collecting the data.

Acknowledgments: The authors are grateful to Mithat Gonen, PhD, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, for statistical assistance with performing clustered data analyses.

Acknowledgments: The authors thank Wilfried Andrä, PhD, from the Institute of High Physical Technology Jena for valuable discussions related to magnetic heating of tumors

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was supported by grant 92-S091 from the National Taiwan University Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

State specific contribution

- Persons who are acknowledged
 - should give written permission
 - otherwise their endorsement may be inferred



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

editing, and proofreading. Those whose contributions do not justify authorship may be acknowledged individually or together as a group under a single heading (e.g. "Clinical Investigators" or "Participating Investigators"), and their contributions should be specified (e.g., "served as scientific advisors," "critically reviewed the study proposal," "collected data," "provided and cared for study patients", "participated in writing or technical editing of the manuscript").

Because acknowledgment may imply endorsement by acknowledged individuals of a study's data and conclusions, editors are advised to require that the corresponding author obtain written permission to be acknowledged from all acknowledged individuals.

ICMJE Recommendations: August 2013



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A very special thanks to Dr [redacted] and Associate Professor Dr [redacted] for providing the supervision of this project and the editing of this article. Dr [redacted] had helped much in the statistical analysis and thus deserved a worthy mention. Last but not least I would like to thank my wife and my baby girl for their patience and tolerance during the entire period of the project.

Not appropriate!



SUMMARY

Authorship and acknowledgements

- Criteria for authorship should be met
- Others - consider listing under the acknowledgements section



SUMMARY

Authorship and acknowledgements

- Significant changes in the new ICMJE Recommendations (2013)
 - 4th criteria, corresponding authors, group authors and collaborators
 - authors and editors need to be familiar with this document

