

Stanford University School of Medicine

Guidelines for Preparation of Bibliography and Candidate's Statement Materials for Faculty Candidates Whose Scholarly Contributions Are Primarily Collaborative in Nature

Authorship practices in many disciplines follow a traditional pattern in which the first author listed is the primary author, and the last author listed is the senior author associated with the work. With the increasing prevalence of collaborative “team science,” it can be challenging for committee reviewers to determine the nature of individual substantive contributions to multi-author works when reviewing a CV.

In order to inform review committees better as they attempt to assess a candidate’s individual scholarly impact, while minimizing incremental workload for the candidate and administrative staff, the School of Medicine strongly recommends that certain candidates briefly annotate selected bibliographic entries and include in their candidates’ statements summary discussion of individual contributions to collaborative work.

For whom are bibliographic annotation, and candidate’s statement discussion of the nature of collaborative contributions, strongly recommended?

Any candidate for appointment, reappointment, or promotion in the Medical Center Line, University Tenure Line, Nontenure Line (Research) or Nontenure Line (Teaching) for whom the majority of scholarly contributions during the last five to seven years are works in which the candidate is neither the first nor the senior author, or whose individual substantive contributions to collaborative efforts may otherwise be difficult to discern from the bibliography.

For which bibliographic entries is annotation recommended?

Peer-reviewed journal articles and/or conference proceedings* published during the past five years on which the candidate is a middle author.

**For candidates whose most significant scholarly impact is in areas other than peer-reviewed journal articles or conference proceedings, annotation is recommended for works in the area(s) of high impact in which the candidate's individual contributions are not apparent from review of the CV.*

What format should be followed for annotation?

In most cases, a series of brief statements following the bibliographic entry will suffice. The following categories of contributions are adapted from the authorship requirements of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*:

Category 1

- Conception and design
- Acquisition of data
- Analysis and interpretation of data

Category 2

- Drafting of the manuscript
- Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content

Category 3

- Statistical analysis
- Obtaining funding
- Administrative, technical, or material support
- Supervision
- Other (specify)

In this context, a hypothetical bibliographic entry might read:

"Smith JA, Jones M*, Davis T. Efficacy of medication X in disease Y for population Z. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*: 9(2)1002-1009, 2007. **Participated extensively in trial design. Enrolled majority of patients from Stanford site. Participated extensively in data analysis and authored Methods section of manuscript.*

JAMA requires, and we would normally expect, that an author will have made at least one contribution in each of the three categories listed, as in the hypothetical example above. However, please understand that annotation of the bibliography (which is voluntary) will not be used to challenge the legitimacy of a candidate's authorship on a particular work. Rather, reviewers will use this information to make an informed evaluation of the candidate's contributions in the context of the answers provided.

In some situations, a brief "blanket" description of authorship practices may obviate the need to annotate individual bibliographic citations.

- Example 1: in some specific disciplines, the senior author is traditionally listed second in the bibliographic reference. For candidates who appear frequently as senior/second author, the CV might include a brief note explaining this, immediately preceding the bibliography.
- Example 2: for a candidate whose role is the same across multiple collaborative works, such as a candidate who participates extensively in the organization and performance of multi-center clinical trials coordinated by a national group, relevant bibliographic entries might reference a single footnote briefly describing the candidate's recurrent individual role in trial design, implementation, analysis, and authorship.

What type of discussion should be added to the candidate's statement?

In addition to standard recommendations regarding the candidate statement, (available at <http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/faaTools/instructionsForCandidateStatement.doc>), the School of Medicine recommends that candidates include specific summary description of the nature of their individual contributions to works in which they are neither primary nor senior author.

This might take the form of a general descriptive statement, supported by specific references, such as:

“My investigative activities include ongoing participation in several large multi-institutional clinical trials. While I am not typically the primary or senior author on manuscripts resulting from these trials, my contributions are typically substantial and include participation in trial design, data gathering, data analysis, authorship of sections of the manuscript, participation in final review of the manuscript, and presentation of the work at national meetings. Representative examples of these types of contributions may be found in my bibliography in peer-reviewed articles numbers 17, 19, 23, 24, and 27.”

If you have additional questions regarding these guidelines, please contact your departmental Faculty Affairs Administrator.