

Submitted to EBPC: 8/15/2013
Approved: 8/15/2013
Revised: 12/16/2015
Revised: 1/19/2016
Revised: February 2017

PURPOSE:

Members of Evidence Analysis Workgroups, Lead Analyst and/or Academy staff will write and submit manuscripts to peer-reviewed journals on each Evidence Analysis Library (EAL[®]) project in order to disseminate the findings and increase exposure to external stakeholders. Submitting articles will be a required step in the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Evidence Analysis process for EAL[®] projects. The following policy provides guidance for initiating, writing and submitting a manuscript.

I Determination of Authors and Acknowledgements

A. Background and Rationale

Authorship of manuscripts using data from EAL projects is open to all members of the expert workgroup team including workgroup members, lead analyst and project managers.

The issue of authorship needs to be raised and discussed at project commencement as well as throughout the project and manuscript development. This will ensure that promised commitments have been honored as well as allow for adjustments due to changes in circumstance.

Clarity of authorship expectations is important due to the participation of a large number of professionals, staff and/or institutions involved in the research activity. The following guidelines on Authorship and Acknowledgement below are based on the Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts published by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors <http://www.icmje.org/> (ICMJE 2013). The descriptions provided here for those guidelines are for expository purposes and are not intended to supersede the ICMJE recommendations. Similar guidelines are intended for use for all research initiatives involving the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics' Research, International, and Scientific Affairs team.

B. Authorship

Listing exact contributions is recommended to assist with clarifying or resolving issues of intellectual authorship (Hoen 1998, Bennett 2003, Bates 2004). Authorship credit will be based

on substantial contributions to at least two (2) of the following components and should include number 1 or 2 and 3 or 4 below:

1. Conception and design of the manuscript
2. Analysis and interpretation of data
3. Writing draft of significant parts of the article
4. Critical revision of the article

In order to take the public responsibility for the work that is required of authors, each author must be responsible for the components claimed, be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for the other components, and provide final approval for the version to be published.

Consequently,

- Those who provided technical support such as entering data or referring patients or where intervention is part of the normal role MAY not qualify for authorship.
- Participation in data collection alone does not justify authorship but should be recognized through the acknowledgments.
- Contributions through completing drafts or documentation under significant direction would be recognized through the acknowledgments.
- Minor contributions such as proof reading or comments should also be appropriately recognized through the acknowledgments.

The level of interest of the EAL workgroup in authorship of the manuscript will be determined using a standard survey (Appendix 1).

First author

The first author generally has contributed the most intellectual input, which may include the manuscript writing (Bennett 2003, Klein 1999). The person who drafts a paper or the project organizer may not be first author *if* others have substantially contributed to more manuscript phases.

The first author will be determined prior to manuscript writing. The entire EAL workgroup will be offered the opportunity to serve as first author. If more than one individual from the workgroup is interested in first authorship, the order of preference will be the following:

1. Workgroup chair
2. Workgroup members who have been most actively participating in the EAL project
3. Other workgroup members
4. Lead analyst
5. Project manager (Academy staff)

Other authors

Workgroup members, lead analysts, project managers who have contributed to two (2) or more components of the manuscript development (outlined above) will be listed as authors.

The order of “other authors” may consider issues including:

- the amount of work contributed

- level of intellectual input
- alphabetical order may be considered when the basis of intellectual contribution cannot be delineated

The co-authors may propose the order of authors. In the event of differences of opinion, the first author will be entitled to decide the value of the contributions offered by others and consequently the order of remaining authors. (Appendix 2)

Corresponding Author

The corresponding author is generally the author who provides intellectual input and designs or approves the protocols to be followed in the study. They are responsible for the manuscript correction, proof reading, correspondence during the paper submission, handling the revisions and re-submission of revised manuscripts up to the acceptance of the manuscripts.

Academy staff will serve as the corresponding author. Only Academy staff that meet two (2) or more components of the manuscript development (outlined above) and meet the aforementioned description will be listed as an author or corresponding author on the manuscript.

C. Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements will include individuals who contributed the following:

- Evidence analysis workgroup members who were not involved in the manuscript development
- Analysts who participated in data collection
- Individuals that provided statistical advice
- Individuals that contributed thorough proof reading or editorial comments
- Individuals that participated in only one (1) phase as outlined in Section B
- Individuals that acquired or provided funding.

Permission should be sought for any acknowledgement as endorsement of the study findings or conclusions may be inferred (Klein 1999).

D. Ownership of Data

The Academy is the sole owner of all data generated from the EAL systematic review and guideline. Permission to use data must be submitted in writing to eal@eatright.org and must clearly indicate which data is being requested and how the data will be used before permission can be granted.

E. Additional Guidance and Dispute Resolution

When these guidelines are not able to resolve a question or dispute regarding authorship, contributors are encouraged to refer to the 2003 COPE report from the Committee on Publication

Ethics for additional guidance (Albert and Wager 2003). When applicable, the first author and corresponding shall be responsible for making reasonable efforts to resolve disputes.

II. Manuscript Timeline

When the first author is determined, a timeline for completion of a full manuscript draft will be established. The timeline will be unique to the manuscript; however it is recommended that the deadline not be more than 9 months from the EAL project completion. If the volunteer designated as first author does not produce the full draft or significant evidence of progression towards the manuscript draft by the deadline, other members of the workgroup will be solicited to take over the role of first author, with the understanding that the draft should be completed in a time period equal to $\frac{1}{4}$ the original time period. If no volunteers agree or the new first author does not produce the full draft or significant evidence of progression towards the manuscript by that deadline, the Academy will assign a staff member from the current list of co-authors to assume the role of first author again with a deadline for production of a draft $\frac{1}{4}$ the original time period.

III. Manuscript Development

The following steps will be followed to develop the manuscript:

1. EAL Guideline projects will be divided into a minimum of two manuscripts. One for the systematic review and one for the guideline. All guideline manuscripts will be submitted to the Academy journal.
2. Authors will determine how to best organize and divide data from standalone systematic reviews and systematic reviews from guideline projects. In some instances it may be appropriate to divide data into two separate manuscripts.
3. Authors may consider the Academy journal and other external peer reviewed journals for systematic review manuscript submissions. Authors will select journals that commonly publish the project content and is disseminated to the target audience.
4. Authors will review the author guidelines for the specified journal to ensure guidelines will be incorporated in the planning.

Articles to Consider For Reporting Methods

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1. doi: 10.1186/2046-4053-4-1

Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Gherzi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA, the PRISMA-P Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* 2015;349:g7647. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g7647

Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D and the CONSORT Group. CONSORT 2010 Statement: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomized trials. *J of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2010; 63:834-840.

Elm Ev, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, for the STROBE initiative. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observations Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet*. 2007; 370:1453-57.

5. Authors will designate writing tasks based on the outline and timelines for completion.
6. Drafts will be reviewed among authors and revisions made.
7. Completion of the final draft will be according to the timeline noted above.
8. Submission to a peer-reviewed journal will be completed and any needed revisions will be led by the first author and completed by authors.

IV. Manuscript Guidelines

- A. All manuscripts must have the EAL[®] information cited in the reference list. Citations should use the following format:
(topic as listed on EAL[®]). Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. Available at (web address). Accessed (month, day, year).

- B. All EAL manuscripts should reference the following for EAL systematic review methodology:

Handu D et al. Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Methodology for Conducting Systematic Reviews for the Evidence Analysis Library *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2016 Feb;116(2):311-8.

- C. All guideline EAL manuscripts should reference the following for EAL guideline methodology:

Papoutsakis C et al. Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Methodology for Developing Evidence-Based Nutrition Practice Guidelines. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2016 Sep 7. [Epub ahead of print]

Evidence analysis projects have citable content in the form of worksheets, evidence summaries, conclusion statements and recommendations. When including EAL[®] information in a paper each **conclusion statement** or **recommendation** should be:

- **published in its entirety**
- noted in quotation marks in the body of the paper or listed in a table
- preceded by the title: “EAL[®] Conclusion Statement” or “EALRecommendation” in bold letters followed by the designated grade (conclusion statements) or rating and label of condition or imperative (recommendations).

See the example below:

EAL[®] Conclusion Statement:

EAL[®] Recommendation: “If consistent with patient preference and not contraindicated by risks/harms, then soy (e.g., isolated soy protein, textured soy, tofu) may be included as part of a cardioprotective diet. Consuming 26-50g of soy protein per day in place of animal protein can reduce TC by 0-20% and LDL-C by 4-24%. Evidence is insufficient to establish a beneficial role of isoflavones as an independent component. **Fair, Conditional**”

D. Copyright: The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics has all rights, title and interest in and to the Work product, including the published version in any format, and all revisions thereto, including the copyright therein, in all forms and languages, (collectively, the “Work”), for the full term of copyright, and all renewals and extensions thereof throughout the world. The Academy shall have the sole right to grant to others the right to publish the Work or selections there from or translations thereof as the Academy may deem proper for the full exploitation of the Work.

References

1. Albert, T. and Wager, L. How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers. The Committee on Publication Ethics 2003. Accessed 16 April 2013. Available at <http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines>
2. Bates, T., Anic, A. , Marusic, M. Marusic, A. Authorship criteria and disclosure of contributions. Journal of the American Medical Association. 2004; 292: 86-88
3. Bennett, D. and Taylor, D. Unethical practices in authorship of scientific papers. Emergency Medicine. 2003; 15: 263-270.
4. Elm Ev, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotsche PC, Vandembroucke JP, for the STROBE initiative. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. Lancet. 2007; 370:1453-57.

5. Hoen, W., Alvoort, H. Overbeke, J. What are the factors determining authorship and the order of authors names. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 1998; 280: 217-218.
6. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals. www.ICMJE.org, accessed 23 March 2013.
7. Klein, C. and Moser-Veillon, P. Authorship: can you claim a byline? *Journal of the American Dietetics Association*. 1999; 99: 77-79.
8. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gotzsche PC, Ioannidis JPA, Clarke M, Devereaux PJ, Kleijnen J, Moher D. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ*. 2009; 339.
9. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman D, The PRISMA Group. Methods of Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. . *J of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2009; 62:1006-1012.
10. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D and the CONSORT Group. CONSORT 2010 Statement: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomized trials. *J of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2010; 63:834-840.

Appendix 1:

Name:

Project:

Take the EAL and Your Talents to a New Level

The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Evidence Based Practice Committee recognizes the importance of submitting peer-reviewed manuscripts based on the Evidence Analysis Library (EAL[®]).

We are encouraging the Members of Evidence Analysis Workgroups, project managers and lead analysts/analysts to write and submit manuscripts based on EAL[®] projects to the *Journal* and other recognized peer-reviewed journals. Submitting articles is not a required step in the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Evidence Analysis process for EAL[®] projects. However, I am looking for individuals that would like to work on publishing the great work that they have been involved with on their EAL project. This opportunity will allow you to enhance writing skills, recognition as a published author and knowledge in the topic of interest.

Additionally, as a result of these publications, the Academy will continue to gain recognition by other healthcare professionals and organizations as a leader in creating sound nutrition resources and RDs will continue to be promoted as the nutrition experts.

Note: The Academy is not able to provide financial support for EAL writing and presentations at meetings.

The following is a quick questionnaire to gain your interest. See author guidelines for more information (link to the guidelines we are using).

1. Are you interested in participating in the writing of a manuscript based on an EAL project?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

2. Authorship credit will be based on substantial contributions to at least two (2) of the following phases and should include number 1 or 2 and 3 or 4 below according to the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE):
http://www.icmje.org/ethical_1author.html Check all levels that you are interested in writing.
 1. Conception and design of the paper
 2. Analysis and interpretation of data
 3. Writing draft of significant parts of the article
 4. Critical revision of the article

3. Are you interested in writing (http://www.icmje.org/ethical_1author.html) as the Lead author?
4. No Time commitment: Writing takes a lot of time and the deadline for the manuscript project will be no longer than 9 months. Please indicate your availability for this task. I am available during:
 - a. Next 3 months
 - b. 3-6 months
 - c. 1-9 months
 - d. Other _____
5. When are you available to begin?
6. On average, how many hours can you contribute to this task per month: __ __

Appendix 2: Author contributions for EAL Project Manuscript: _____
First Author/Primary Investigator: _____

Aspects of the project with which each co-investigator has been involved or will be involved should be outlined below with a brief note. Complete as many as applicable, differentiating which aspects have already been accomplished from those which are intended using the “planned” and “completed” checkboxes.

Name: and Date commenced participation						
Conception, design, creation of project plan	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []
Analysis and interpretation	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []
Article drafts	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []
Critical revision of the article	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []	Planned [] Completed []
Involvement (1 st author decides final order)						
Final ordered author list						
Acknowledgements – others who helped along the way						

Definitions

- **Conception** is credited to the person who originated the idea/project
- **Design and creation of project plan** includes those who wrote the plan, had involvement in the development of data collection tools (e.g., questionnaires or excel spreadsheets) or provided meaningful feedback (to drafts, etc). Being involved in the general discussion at planning meetings is not included.
- **Analysis** includes the person or people who undertake the analysis. It also includes an alternative suggestion for analysis that is not trivial and that offers an insight of significant (positive or negative).
- **Interpretation** is the evaluation of study results leading to a substantial contribution to or alteration of the manuscript’s discussion
- **Article Drafts** participation involves the production of the initial draft
- **Critical revision of the article** requires that significant substance, a substantial concept or contribution, be included in the redrafted version; reading a draft and offering minor corrections is not adequate.