

		MHRN	MSN	SEARCH	BCSC	CVRN	CRN
HCSRN Project		Mental Health Research Network Funder: NIMH PI: Greg Simon Prime Site: Group Health	Mini-Sentinel Initiative Funder: FDA PI: Rich Platt Prime: Harvard Pilgrim Note: not considered research	Cancer Screening Effectiveness and Research in Community-based Healthcare (SEARCH) Funder: NCI PIs: Diana Buist, Chyke P. Tsai	Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium Funder: NCI PI: Diana Buist Prime Site: Group Health	Cardiovascular Research Network Funder: NHLBI PI: Alan Go Prime Site: KP N California	Cancer Research Network Funder: NCI PI: Ed Wagner Prime Site: Group Health
Policy name		MHRN Publications and Presentations Policy (final)	MSN Principles and Policies - 6.2: Publications and Presentations	SEARCH Publication Guidelines and Procedures (draft)	Guidelines for Internal BCSC Manuscript Development	Publications Committee: CVRN Policies and Procedures	Publications Committee: Policies and Procedures
Link to affiliated or ancillary project policies		<a href="#">link</a>	<a href="#">link</a>	<a href="#">link</a>	<a href="#">link</a>	<a href="#">link</a>	<a href="#">link</a>
Content Area Element	Version Date	8/22/2011	5/27/2011	6/3/2010	5/8/2010	8/14/2008	1/2005
Description of publication proposal idea submission, review and decision-making processes	(a) May encompass both the main outcome paper (primary publication), as well as any ancillary publications (methods papers, secondary analyses, etc.). (b) Depending on the nature and needs of the project, publications oversight and tracking responsibilities may be assigned to an existing committee (e.g., steering committee), a stand-alone committee (e.g., publications committee), or it may be an expectation that the lead author inform the overall Principal Investigator. (c) The Principal Investigator of the project may be designated special responsibilities, such as selection of first authors or identification of mentors for junior authors.	+	+	++	++	++	++
Description of pre-submission publication review requirements	(a) The funder and/or publication committee may require manuscripts to be put forward for review prior to submission for publication (some funding agencies may also require pre-review of presentations). (b) The timeline is often 14 to 30 days in advance of submission. (c) The pre-review may be to ensure proper acknowledgments are made; to catalog submissions for metrics reporting; as a check to ensure confidential or proprietary information is not disclosed; to ensure participating institutions, research centers and grant numbers are properly identified; or for scientific review or other reasons. (d) Rather than at pre-submission review, some funders may require a copy of papers after publication.	+	++	++	++	++	++
Authorship determination guidelines	(a) All persons designated should qualify for authorship and have participated sufficiently in the writing of the manuscript. (b) Authorship may be described by the journal or other standard authorship guidelines. (c) Order of authorship, though ultimately the decision of the senior author, if generally a joint decision of the co-authors. The order should reflect the relative contribution of each to the development of the manuscript.	++	+	++	++	++	++
Acknowledgements guidance	(a) Study funder(s) should be acknowledged in all manuscripts. This typically includes the agency, grant/contract number and title of the project. (b) The project may also proffer descriptive text for clearly and adequately acknowledging the project, proper identification of the institutions involved, and so on. (c) Each journal has its own requirements regarding acknowledgment of individuals who contributed to the study, but are not listed as a co-author.	+	-	++	++	++	++
Network affiliation guidance	Project specific policies may encourage or require authors to name the project as an affiliation within the acknowledgments.	+	+	+	++	++	++
Dispute resolution processes	(a) Disputes may arise over authorship and so on. A pre-defined pathway for settling disputes is useful, in case agreement cannot be reached independently. (b) The resolution panel should excuse any members with potential conflicts (e.g., from the same site as a disputant, co-author on the disputed paper, etc.) (c) Some projects create infrastructure to provide an appeals mechanism to a second body if the initial resolution of the dispute does not satisfy the parties.	+	-	++	++	++	++

- (no content on this topic)

+ (brief content on this topic)

++ (more developed content on this topic)