

Pain Medicine

Improving the Trustworthiness of Published Information

Journal:	Pain Medicine
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Letter to the Editor
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Hamilton, Cindy; Hamilton House, Marchington, Jackie; Caudex Medical Ltd Donnelly, Julia; Julia Donnelly Solutions Ltd Gertel, Art; MedSciCom, LLC
Keywords:	Ethics, Authorship, Ghost author, Guest author, Publication guidelines



Letter to the Editor: Improving the Trustworthiness of Published Information

Cindy W. Hamilton, PharmD, ELS, Assistant Clinical Professor, Virginia Commonwealth
University School of Pharmacy, Richmond; Hamilton House Medical and Scientific
Communications, Virginia Beach VA, USA

Jackie Marchington, PhD, CMPP, Director of Operations, Caudex, Oxford, UK

Julia Donnelly, PhD; Julia Donnelly Solutions Ltd, Derbyshire, UK

Art Gertel, MS, President, MedSciCom, LLC, Lebanon, NJ, USA

Word count: 775 of 1000 allowable words

Corresponding author: Cindy W. Hamilton, 844 Quail Point Cove, Virginia Beach VA 23454 USA; Phone/Fax: (757) 481-2799; Email: cindy@hamiltonhouseva.com

Disclosures: All authors declare that we: 1) have provided or do provide ethical medical writing services to academic, biotechnology, or pharmaceutical clients; and 2) are active in national and international not-for-profit professional associations that encourage ethical medical writing practices. No external sponsors were involved in the preparation of this manuscript, and no external funding was used.

Dear Editor,

We thank Dr. Schofferman and colleagues for warning readers about the many perils of ghost and guest authorship [1]. The exact prevalence of these unethical practices is difficult to determine partly because of the use of different definitions and lack of well-designed studies. Schofferman et al are to be commended for selecting standard definitions and for citing serial surveys suggesting that the prevalence has declined over time. Unfortunately, ghosting and other unethical authorship practices have not disappeared. As members of the Global Alliance of Publication Professionals (GAPP; www.gappteam.org), we appreciate their recognition of professional medical writers as "legitimate participants in scientific papers provided their role is transparent." We wish to expand on their commentary by adding recent references that may provide insight about how to exorcise the ghosts from published medical information.

Schofferman et al referred to authorship guidelines from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICJME) [2], which are used by more than 500 medical journals including *Pain Medicine*. As noted [1], "all who contribute substantially should be listed as authors, and all who are listed as authors should have contributed substantially." We wish to elaborate on these criteria because the new fourth criterion aims to better promote integrity. Accordingly, "authorship be based on the following 4 criteria:

- Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition,
 analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND

 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 [2]."

This new fourth criterion should help to prevent guest authorship. At the same time, this criterion can prevent some professional medical writers, statisticians, and others who make substantial contributions from fulfilling all four authorship criteria. In this situation, such individuals should be acknowledged along with their funding. This practice is evidence of adherence to ICMJE guidelines [2] rather than an indication of ghosting or other inherently unethical activity by individuals who may be employed or contracted by the company that sponsored the research.

Pain Medicine's author guidelines begin with a link to an author toolkit [3] produced by the Medical Publishing Insights and Practices (MPIP) Initiative, which is co-sponsored by the pharmaceutical industry and the International Society for Medical Publication Professionals (ISMPP). Since that practical resource was published, new guidelines have been established, such as the third in a series of good publication practices for communicating company-sponsored medical research [4]. These and other reporting guidelines are likely to continue to evolve and are the remit of a group known as EQUATOR (Enhancing the QUAlity and Transparency Of health Research; http://www.equator-network.org).

Staying abreast of guidelines is challenging, especially for authors whose primary responsibilities do not include manuscript preparation. Busy clinicians and research scientists may wish to enlist the assistance of professional medical writers to improve awareness of and

compliance with guidelines. This approach is supported by recent survey findings [5-7]. MPIP [5] studied four stakeholder groups: clinical investigators (n = 145), journal editors (n = 108), publication professionals (n = 132), and medical writers (n = 113). Higher percentages of publication professionals (97%), journal editors (89%), and medical writers (88%) were familiar with authorship criteria than were clinical investigators (49%). Similarly, more publication professionals (70%), journal editors (59%), and medical writers (51%) complied with these guidelines than did clinical investigators (28%) [5]. Findings were similar in a survey of nearly 500 participants representing different stakeholder groups conducted by another international group [6]. Conformity with reporting guidelines was one of the services most valued by authors who had collaborated with professional medical writers [7].

The recommendation by Schofferman et al to take a proactive stance against unethical authorship practices merits repeating. We encourage authors to partner with other stakeholders to promote the quality and reliability of published medical information, and to review our proposals for this partnership [8]. For example, authors should expect professional medical writers to be aware of current guidelines, and to follow a process that ensures substantial intellectual contributions by authors throughout manuscript preparation. To prevent ghost and guest authorship, the exact role of each author can be described in the manuscript, as suggested by Schofferman et al [1]. Furthermore, authors should demand full transparency, including disclosure of both substantial contributions and potential conflicts of interest from all individuals, including those who do not fulfill authorship criteria. By being aware of and committing to evolving guidelines, we can collaborate to improve the trustworthiness of published medical information.

References

- 1. Schofferman J, Wetzel FT, Bono C. Ghost and guest authors: you can't always trust who you read. Pain Med 2015 Mar;16(3): 416-20.
- 2. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals: writing and editing for biomedical publication.

 2014. Available at: http://www.icmje.org/index.html (accessed January 15, 2016).
- 3. Chipperfield L, Citrome L, Clark J, et al. Authors' Submission Toolkit: a practical guide to getting your research published. Curr Med Res Opin 2010 Aug;26(8): 1967-82.
- 4. Battisti WP, Wager E, Baltzer L, et al. Good Publication Practice for Communicating Company-Sponsored Medical Research: GPP3. Ann Intern Med 2015 Sept 15;163(6): 461-4.
- 5. Marušić A, Hren D, Mansi B, et al. Five-step authorship framework to improve transparency in disclosing contributors to industry-sponsored clinical trial publications. BMC Med 2014;12: 197-206.
- 6. Wager E, Woolley K, Adshead V, et al. Awareness and enforcement of guidelines for publishing industry-sponsored medical research among publication professionals: the Global Publication Survey. BMJ Open 2014;4(4): e004780.
- 7. Marchington JM, Burd GP. Author attitudes to professional medical writing support. Curr Med Res Opin 2014 Oct;30(10): 2103-8.
- 8. Hamilton CW, Gertel A, Jacobs A, Marchington J, Weaver S, Woolley K. Mythbusting medical writing: goodbye ghosts, hello help. Account Res 2015;23(3): 178-94.