



include

International Network for Cross-Linguistic
Research on Brain Health

Publication Guidelines



Include Network Publication Guidelines¹

1. Rationale

This document outlines **Include**'s guidelines on publications and related matters. When members use data from an **Include** database to generate a manuscript or presentation, they must abide by the following policies to ensure appropriate authorship and acknowledgements. These guidelines are based on principles put forth by [COPE](#), an organization that provides leadership in publication ethics, and on guidelines set forth by the [International Committee of Medical Journal Editors](#) and the [NIH](#). Publications comprise manuscripts and presentations, as defined below.

- **Manuscript:** any document (e.g., article, chapter, book, abstract) submitted to a professional peer-reviewed journal, textbook, periodical or publisher.
- **Presentation:** any published or unpublished study presented at scientific, professional, or public meetings either orally or in poster format, irrespective of the medium (live on-site talk, live online pre-recorded talk).

2. Policy

- Approval from the **Include** Coordinating Committee must be formally requested (prior to submission) for any manuscript or presentation if (1) more than 50% of its data originated from an **Include** dataset (not including data collected by the main authors), and/or if (2) the main topic under discussion is the **Include** Network proper. Proposed manuscripts or presentations should be submitted at least two weeks prior to the due date. In exceptional circumstances requiring expedite revision, approval by two Coordinating Committee members will be sufficient. Upon acceptance of the manuscript or presentation, a full reference and relevant files should be submitted to the **Include** Outreach Committee for dissemination purposes.
- For projects based on **Include** datasets, the Research Committee will track the progress of the proposed analyses. Unless otherwise agreed in writing, manuscripts and presentations will be expected to be completed within 18 months after investigators receive data.
- Authorship discussions are mandatory for any projects that involve **Include** members and should comply with the Authorship Guidelines below.
- When conflicts exist regarding **Include** publications, written summaries of the conflict submitted by those involved will be reviewed by a neutral third party. Any **Include** member who wishes to opt out of any automatic authorship listing may do so in writing to the lead author and the Coordinating Committee.
- All publications employing **Include** datasets must incorporate the following text in the acknowledgments section: "A substantial part of the data reported here was facilitated by the **Include** Network, which receives financial support from [CHECK WITH COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR DETAILS]. We thank contributors who collected samples used in this study, as well as patients and their families, whose help and participation made it possible."

¹ Input for this document was obtained from the UCSF Memory and Aging Center Publication Guidelines, the Authorship Guidelines of the Consortium to Expand Dementia Research in Latin America (ReDLat), and resources from the Alzheimer's Association.



3. Authorship guidelines

3.1. Intended uses of authorship guidelines

These authorship guidelines is intended to support **Include** members (typically, the first and corresponding authors) at the beginning of a study and throughout the manuscript or presentation writing process. Emphasis is placed on early engagement of key collaborators and on promoting consistency and fairness when making authorship decisions. In general, **Include** encourages members to collaborate with network members of different institutions, disciplines, and career stages.

3.2. Establishing collaborators and authors

3.2.1. Study conception. By reviewing the authorship table below, key authors may identify colleagues/co-authors with relevant subject matter expertise who could contribute to the study and might be invited to participate in planning the analyses and study design early in the development of the project. Early engagement will increase study quality, allow coordination of effort, and prevent delays due to design flaws that are identified later in the course of the study. Note that these provisions must be made when completing the Concept Sheets required to access and harness **Include** datasets (see [Data Management Guidelines](#)).

3.2.2. Manuscript or presentation writing. A second pass through the authorship table prior to drafting the manuscript or presentation will facilitate inclusion of relevant co-authors at a point when writing responsibilities can be allocated to each co-author. This may be particularly helpful to facilitate inclusion of junior team members (for example, by assigning drafting responsibilities for a section of the manuscript or presentation).

3.3. Authorship and funding acknowledgment

We follow ICJME recommendations concerning authorship. An individual will qualify as author if she or he:

- has made substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work OR the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- has participated in drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- has provided final approval of the version to be published; AND
- has agreed 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.
- Additional details can be found [here](#).

3.4. Checklist for building an appropriate author line and list of manuscript funding sources

In line with [ICJME](#) recommendations, **Include** advises first and senior authors to consider this checklist when creating lists of co-investigators/authors and when acknowledging funding sources. Note that these are mere examples rather than a rigid set of inclusion/exclusion criteria.



Tentative study title: _____

Planned first author(s): _____

Planned senior author(s): _____

Researchers completing this worksheet: _____

Tentative completion date: _____

Point to consider	Considerations
Substantial contributions to the conception, design, acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work (any one of the categories below suffices)	
1. Who came up with the idea for the manuscript?	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A member connects something heard in a lecture to a clinical observation and designs a group study.</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A member helped to spark an idea for a project, but declined to participate further.</p>
2. Who has provided intellectual input into the conception and design of the data elements to be incorporated into the manuscript?	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A researcher designs a testing protocol tailored to the population being studied and this data is incorporated into the manuscript.</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A member provides unrestricted philanthropic funds that support authors' effort related to the project.</p>
3. Who has performed or assisted with the analyses and interpretation of data included in the manuscript?	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A member performs statistical analyses of data and/or proposes conclusions based on comparison of the results with published scientific literature.</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A member provides a reference related to the project or solely participates in stimulus selection.</p>
4. What scientific, statistical, or technical subject matter experts would strengthen the study?	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A biostatistician helps the first author develop and implement the statistical plan.</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A member places a purchase order for reagents or retrieves charts that are used for analysis.</p>
5. What data sources have been used and who acquired that data?	
a. The source and proportion of data used in the project.	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A member helps with the evaluation of patients in the manuscript, then has early engagement in the process of data analysis.</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A member that schedules patients for testing.</p>
b. Neuroimaging	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A member implements a data processing protocol to facilitate analyses used in the paper.</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A member acquires scans as part of routine protocol.</p>



<p>c. Cognitive measures: Neuropsychological testing including tasks tapping language and other cognitive, socio-emotional, perceptual, interoceptive, or motoric domains.</p>	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A member advises on the appropriate analysis for the research question, cognitive test selection, or performs analyses of neuropsychological data.</p> <p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A member conceives of and designs a targeted testing battery; results are incorporated in the manuscript.</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A member performs routine bedside testing and the data is included in the manuscript</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> Members gathers data that is reported in the manuscript but not involve otherwise.</p>
<p>d. Genetic or biospecimen data</p>	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A member provides study subject genotype data reported in the manuscript.</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A member performs routine specimen handling.</p>
<p>e. Physicians who obtained history or performed examinations</p>	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A clinician provides interpretation and analysis in a participant's research visit summary that informs the discussion in a case report</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A clinician documents neurological examination findings or symptom checklists as part of the routine project protocol</p>
<p>f. Nursing or caregiver measures</p>	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A nurse works with the lead author to review and interpret caregiver measures that play an important role in the study.</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A nurse gathers routine functional assessment questionnaires that are reported in the manuscript.</p>
<p>g. Pathology</p>	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i> A pathology team member performs neuropathological diagnostic assessments that are reported in the manuscript.</p> <p><i>Likely insufficient for authorship:</i> A pathology research assistant performs stains as part of the routine postmortem assessment of a patient who is included in a manuscript that reports but does not focus on pathological diagnosis.</p>
<p>Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content</p>	
<p>Who has or will contribute to writing the paper?</p>	<p><i>Potential authorship:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A member provides either substantive comments on manuscript content or reviews the manuscript and verifies the accuracy of sections within their area of expertise. 2. A member drafts a portion of a methods section or provides tables and figures for the manuscript.
<p>Final approval of the version to be published</p>	
<p>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.</p>	



3.5. Defining key authorship roles

3.5.1. Who is a first author?

1. First authorship is attributed to the researcher who *leads the project's execution*, being involved in all the steps of the project, and who writes the first manuscript draft or the sections where the study's rationale and/or interpretations are laid out. The first author typically also leads subsequent revisions.
2. In certain circumstances, two or more collaborators may share first authorship. The ordering within this group of first authors is usually discussed amongst authors. In the event that a consensus cannot be reached, consider listing in alphabetical order.

3.5.2. Who is a corresponding author?

1. The designation of corresponding author should be made for the collaborator who will maintain communication with co-authors, PubMed Central, and publishing entities as part of the process of manuscript submission and with the scientific community after the paper is published. This is usually the senior author, but may in certain circumstances be the first author or another author.
2. As the corresponding author, this person is responsible for:
 - a. ensuring that all listed authors have approved the manuscript before submission, including the names and order of authors; AND
 - b. managing all communication between the journal and all co-authors, before and after publication; AND
 - c. providing transparency on re-use of material and mention any unpublished material (for example manuscripts in press); AND
 - d. making sure disclosures, declarations and transparency on data statements from all authors are included in the manuscript as appropriate.

3.5.3. What affiliation should an author provide?

The affiliation listed on a manuscript should reflect institutions that each researcher deems relevant to the work. If an author's affiliation has changed, then the publisher's policies may permit current affiliations to be acknowledged in a note.

3.5.4. What are the recommended practices for the co-author manuscript review period?

1. First and senior authors should aim to provide a period of at least two weeks for co-authors to provide comments/edits before submission.
2. While co-authors should strive to adhere to the requested timetable for edits, in the event that co-authors have not responded by the deadline, communication between authors is advised to determine the appropriate pre-submission steps (e.g., whether additional time is needed to complete the revision, authors wish to approve without providing edits, or co-authors do not wish to be included on the manuscript).
3. Final manuscript drafts should be sent to all co-authors prior to submission.



3.6. Acknowledgments

Include publications should follow the following considerations concerning acknowledgments of contributions and funding sources.

Point to consider	Considerations
1. Are there individuals who have made valuable contributions in the areas listed above, but who would not meet criteria for authorship?	When there are individuals who have devoted substantial time to the collection of data or administrative aspects, but who do not meet the basic criteria for authorship, these individuals may be recognized in the acknowledgement section with a statement such as: “The authors gratefully acknowledge the contributions of [INSERT FULL NAME OF CONTRIBUTOR(S)], who participated in [BRIEFLY MENTION TASK].”
2. Are there facilities or resources that have made valuable contributions that merit acknowledgment?	Required language to be included in Include publications is: “A substantial part of the data reported here was facilitated by the Include Network, which receives financial support from [CHECK WITH COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR DETAILS]. We thank contributors who collected samples used in this study, as well as patients and their families, whose help and participation made it possible.”
3. Which grants supported the infrastructure and/or authors involved in the study?	Co-authors should indicate all funding sources and specific grants they deem relevant.