

CONDOR

Data Analysis, Publications, and Presentation Policies

as approved by the three CONDOR Executive Committees in January 2010



I. Overview

CONDOR, the Collaboration on Networked Dental and Oral Research, comprises three dental practice-based research networks funded by the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research (NIDCR). These networks are DPBRN (<http://www.dpbrn.org/home.asp>), PEARL (<https://web.emmes.com/study/pearl/index.htm>), and NWPRECEDENT (<https://workbench.axioresearch.com/NWPrecedent/index.htm>).

The purpose of the policies established herein is to encourage and facilitate important analyses while providing guidelines that assure appropriate use of CONDOR data, timely completion of manuscripts and abstracts, and adherence to the principles of authorship. It is recognized that some CONDOR publications and presentations will be based on data from a single study from all three networks, while others will not be based on data or results from any particular study but from CONDOR activities in general. The policies and procedures described herein apply to all CONDOR publications and presentations.

CONDOR has implemented policies involving the use of its data to: (1) ensure that lead investigators for specific studies have adequate opportunity to participate in the publication and presentation process for those studies; (2) ensure that other investigators know of ongoing research efforts and have the opportunity to participate in these efforts; (3) ensure that duplication of analyses is kept to a minimum; (4) permit the lead Coordinating Center to maintain the integrity of the official CONDOR database, which includes being informed of any problem areas in the data base; (5) ensure that publication or presentation of CONDOR data does not occur without the knowledge and approval of the CONDOR Directors' Committee; and (6) maintain the integrity of study data.

The CONDOR Directors' Committee has final say over all CONDOR publications and presentations. The CONDOR Directors' Committee has empanelled a CONDOR Publications and Presentations (P&P) Committee to facilitate the implementation of these policies and to deal with long-range planning issues. Among other items, these policies apply:

a) For each CONDOR study, one network Data Coordinating Center (DCC) is designated through consensus as the lead for developing a finalized dataset. Prior to being locked a final review of the dataset by all three DCCs will occur. The finalized dataset will be locked and copies of the locked dataset will be distributed to the other DCCs or they will be provided access to it. The lead DCC will remain the sole authority to make changes in the finalized dataset, if subsequently needed, in order to maintain its integrity. The other DCCs will notify the lead DCC of any problems in the finalized dataset, and the lead DCC will communicate to the other DCCs any subsequent changes required.

b) The data analysis required for publications in which the primary results of a CONDOR study are given will be the responsibility of the lead DCC for that study. However, for publications addressing secondary results, the analyses will be conducted by the network DCC of the investigator proposing the paper. Thus, investigators proposing secondary analyses will first require the consent and support of their own network.

c) When investigators in any network are interested in writing a paper on secondary results from a CONDOR study, they should first approach their own network about the concept and at least get preliminary approval from the network's Publications and Presentations Committee to propose it to the CONDOR P&P Committee. Approval from their own network would require consideration of priorities and workloads within the network, because the DCC of the proposing network would be the one expected to conduct the analysis.

d) When the concept is proposed to the CONDOR P&P Committee, that committee will determine if there is overlap with proposals made by investigators in other networks, and whether a call for interested collaborators should be made to the other networks.

e) When initial concept approval is given by the CONDOR P&P Committee, that signals to the proposing investigators to go back to their own network's publications process, and to use that process to develop a more-detailed manuscript proposal, working with their network DCC to develop an analysis plan. Thus, existing publications procedures in the three networks should be used for that purpose.

f) When the more-detailed manuscript proposal is developed and approved by the investigator's own network publications and presentations committee, it will be shared with the CONDOR P&P committee. The CONDOR P&P Committee may circulate it among the other networks to solicit any insight and feedback. For example, the analysis plan might propose the use of certain data elements that may be known by others from experience to be problematic.

g) When the manuscript is completed using the publications process within the initiating network, it will be sent to all three DCCs for review and comment and to the CONDOR P&P Committee for approval before submission.

CONDOR requests that individuals working on manuscripts involving CONDOR data, who are not CONDOR investigators themselves, work closely with at least one of the CONDOR investigators and follow all policies. This is to ensure that they have access to all information pertinent to analyses. This important information includes the dataset

documentation that is distributed by the lead DCC, along with the data. This detailed information includes the edits which have been performed, any problems in the dataset, and lists of calculated variables and their algorithms. This documentation also includes the forms that were used in collecting the data. Such individuals are also encouraged to obtain access to the manual of operations that describes the data collection process and quality control procedures used by the study.

II. CONDOR P&P Committee

The CONDOR P&P Committee oversees all CONDOR publications and presentations activities, with final adjudication of decisions by the CONDOR Directors' Committee. The CONDOR P&P Committee approves manuscript proposals and the submission of abstracts, as well as all publications and presentations before they are submitted for publication or presented in a public forum. Appeals of CONDOR P&P Committee decisions may be made to the CONDOR Directors' Committee. However, the expectation is that only rarely will decisions made by the CONDOR P&P committee be discussed at CONDOR Directors' Committee meetings in detail. Such occasions might be an appeal or other exceptional circumstances.

The CONDOR P&P Committee decides who assumes lead responsibility for a paper if there is more than one interested candidate. The CONDOR P&P Committee also may re-assign lead responsibility if reasonable progress on completing an abstract or manuscript has not occurred.

Composition of CONDOR P&P Committee

The voting members of the CONDOR P&P Committee are to include three categories: (1) Chairs of the P&P Committees of the three individual networks (3 members); (2) an at-large member from each network appointed by the respective Network Chairs (3 members); (3) a representative designated by NIDCR; and (4) at least one practitioner-investigator to be appointed by the committee chair. This at-large practitioner-investigator member is to be selected from the network of the person who is CONDOR P&P Committee Chair that year.

The Chair for the CONDOR P&P Committee will rotate annually among the three networks. The Network Chair for the network whose turn it is to serve in this capacity will designate who is to serve as CONDOR P&P Committee Chair. The transition date for this activity is to be January 1 of each year.

CONDOR P&P Committee meetings

The CONDOR P&P Committee will conduct its business either by conference call or by email on an as-needed basis, depending upon the volume of proposals requiring review. The goal is to act on a request within two weeks of when it is made. Committee decisions will be based on a simple majority of the voting members. Lead authors of manuscripts, proposals, abstracts, or presentations that are to be discussed during a CONDOR P&P Committee call are invited to either attend themselves or to provide a representative. Staff of the Chair of the CONDOR P&P Committee will arrange the calls and take minutes, to be forwarded to the CONDOR Directors' Committee. CONDOR P&P Committee members may not vote on their own requests.

III. General Publication Procedures

If possible, the word "CONDOR" should appear in the title of CONDOR manuscripts, peer-reviewed abstracts, and invited papers and presentations that report CONDOR studies. This helps in indexing and retrieval of publications and in gaining recognition for the study.

It is acknowledged that some manuscripts, peer-reviewed abstracts, and invited papers and presentations will have received CONDOR grant support, but are communicating broader topics and are not specifically reporting CONDOR studies. In these cases, the word CONDOR does not have to be included in the title, even though CONDOR grant support is to be acknowledged.

Use of approved names and abbreviations for CONDOR networks

The proper name for the network administratively based at the University of Alabama at Birmingham is "The Dental Practice-Based Research Network". References to "The Dental PBRN" or "DPBRN" are also appropriate. DPBRN comprises five regions, each of which has an approved name and abbreviation. When reference is made to these DPBRN regions, authors should use these names and abbreviations in all presentations and publications. They are: (1) the Alabama/Mississippi region (AL/MS); (2) the Florida/Georgia region (FL/GA); (3) the Minnesota region (MN), which comprises dentists employed by HealthPartners and dentists in private practice and community clinics in Minnesota; (4) the Permanente Dental Associates region (PDA), which comprises dentists in Oregon and Washington in the PDA

organization, in cooperation with the Kaiser Permanente Northwest Research Foundation's Center for Health Research; and (5) the Scandinavian region (SK), which comprises dentists in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.

The proper name for the network administratively based at New York University is the PEARL Network (Practitioners Engaged in Applied Research and Learning).

The proper name for the network administratively based at the University of Washington is the Northwest Practice-based Research Collaborative in Evidence-based DENTistry, or Northwest PRECEDENT. References to NW PRECEDENT or simply PRECEDENT are also appropriate.

Use of approved CONDOR slide template and poster template

For CONDOR slide presentations, presenters should use one of the CONDOR slide templates that has the CONDOR logo at the bottom right-hand corner of the slide. This template is available at the CONDOR Operations website or by sending an email to Valerie Winston at vwinston@mail.dopm.uab.edu. One can easily incorporate this template into existing slides in Microsoft Powerpoint®.

CONDOR posters should also use the CONDOR logo. A Microsoft Powerpoint® template that has been used to print posters is available at the CONDOR Operations website or by sending an email to Valerie Winston at vwinston@mail.dopm.uab.edu.

Use of approved presentations by others

CONDOR presentations can be used by others in CONDOR or affiliated with CONDOR pending permission by the original author and the CONDOR P&P Committee. The requester should clarify the intended audience and the purpose for using the presentations. Send communications to the author and the Chair of the CONDOR P&P Committee.

IV. Review process for Invited Papers and Presentations

It is anticipated that investigators associated with CONDOR will be invited as individuals to prepare papers or give presentations concerning findings or other aspects of CONDOR. When such invitations are received, the invitee should inform the inviter that acceptance will need to be approved by the CONDOR P&P Committee.

Unlike the process for submitting a manuscript proposal, for invited papers and presentations all that is required initially is an email that describes the paper or presentation, with a request for approval and background information for the request. If an inviter has special reasons for choosing the particular invitee (e.g., special qualifications, previous or other involvements with the organization), these should be submitted by the inviter or invitee to the CONDOR P&P Committee to assist it with the decision.

This email should be sent to the Chair of the CONDOR P&P Committee. For calendar years 2009 and 2010, the Chair is Dr. Van Thompson (vt11@nyu.edu). Please also copy Dr. Ron Craig at rgc1@nyu.edu on this email. The committee will aim to vote on the proposal within one week through an e-mail process and the results will be conveyed to the lead author. For calendar year 2011, the Chair will be Dr. Lloyd Mancl (llman@uw.edu). For calendar year 2012, the Chair will be Dr. Brad Rindal (donald.b.rindal@healthpartners.com).

The CONDOR P&P Committee will decide whether such an invited paper or presentation is appropriate. Among other factors, these decisions take into consideration possible conflicts with other planned data analyses or competition for use of other CONDOR resources within the time allowed for completion of the invited paper or talk.

Once approved, basic information about the invited papers and presentations will be logged on the CONDOR Operations website by the network that is responsible for administering the CONDOR P&P Committee that calendar year. Content of these presentations may be of value to other members of CONDOR in the future. Therefore, we encourage presenters at their discretion to provide an electronic copy of the presentation to be available to others.

V. Review Process for Peer-Reviewed Abstracts

Unlike the process for submitting a manuscript proposal, for peer-reviewed abstracts all that is required initially is an email that has the abstract attached, with a request for approval and background information for the request.

This email should be sent to the Chair of the P&P Committee. For calendar years 2009 and 2010, the Chair is Dr. Van Thompson (vt11@nyu.edu). Please also copy Dr. Ron Craig at rgc1@nyu.edu on this email. The committee will aim to vote on the proposal within one week through an e-mail process and the results will be conveyed to the lead author. For calendar year 2011, the Chair will be Dr. Lloyd Mancl (llman@uw.edu). For calendar year 2012, the Chair will be Dr. Brad Rindal (donald.b.rindal@healthpartners.com).

For abstracts, verification of the analyses is not performed by the DCC unless the data appear questionable. An abstract preferably should be submitted to the CONDOR P&P Committee at least two weeks prior to the presentation

date. This allows sufficient time for circulation to the committee. If the review can not be completed in time, it may be required to be withdrawn. If an oral presentation is not submitted for review in sufficient time, the presenter may be asked to withdraw from the program. Once approved, all abstracts will be logged on the CONDOR Operations website by the network that is responsible for administering the CONDOR P&P Committee that calendar year.

The uniqueness of abstract submission software for some organizations

In accord with CONDOR policy, it is important that the final author be “for the CONDOR Collaborative Group” when appropriate. Unfortunately, the abstract submission systems of some organizations are not constructed with corporate authors in mind. For example, with the International and American Associations for Dental Research, entering “for the CONDOR Collaborative Group”, will appear as “and F.T. CONDOR Collaborative Group”. The IADR/AADR has been notified of this limitation in its system. The IADR/AADR system does allow authors to select from author information already entered into the system. Therefore, for the ease of CONDOR contributors, one can search for “CONDOR Collaborative Group” in the IADR/AADR abstract database and this corporate author will appear. That way, CONDOR authors do not have to enter any other information for it. In the abstract, it will appear as “and F.T. CONDOR Collaborative Group”.

It is also important that the CONDOR grant numbers be cited. Some abstract submission systems have separate entry windows for this information, but the grant numbers nonetheless do not show in the published or electronically-available versions. For this reason, it is best if authors place this information in the text of the abstract itself. Although a full version of a citation might read “This research was supported by grants DE-xxxxx, [etc., list all 6 here] from the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, National Institutes of Health”, if brevity is required, an acceptable abstract citation would be “Support: DE-xxxxx, DE-xxxxx, [etc., list all 6 here]”. For DPBRN, these grant numbers should be cited: U01-DE-16746 and U01-DE-16747. For NWPRECEDENT, these grant numbers should be cited: U01-DE-16750 and U01-DE-16752. For PEARL, these grant numbers should be cited: U01-DE-16754 and U01-DE-16755.

VI. Proposing Manuscripts

Proposals for manuscripts may be initiated by any CONDOR investigator, with the proviso that lead investigators, being practitioner-investigators or others, for a specific study are to be given appropriate priority and ample opportunity to propose manuscripts for that study. Other investigators for that study should also be given appropriate opportunity and priority for participation in the publication and presentation of results for that study. The Manuscript Proposal Form in the appendix should be submitted to the Chair of the CONDOR P&P Committee.

The expectation is that manuscript proposals will be developed by the lead author with input from designated co-authors. After review by the co-authors and approval by the publications committee and Executive Committee of the lead author’s network, manuscript proposals should be submitted to the CONDOR P&P Committee chair who distributes the proposal for review by the committee through e-mail or at a committee meeting as deemed appropriate. The committee will vote on the proposal within one week through an e-mail process and the results will be conveyed to the lead author. Investigators are encouraged to conduct limited preliminary data analyses prior to making a formal paper proposal to test the feasibility of pursuing a given topic. Each publication that includes CONDOR data must include a CONDOR investigator as an author.

VII. Authorship Issues

The initiator generally assumes first authorship of the proposed manuscript, invited paper or presentation, or peer-reviewed abstract. The initiator is encouraged to contact other potentially interested individuals before the manuscript, paper, presentation, or abstract is proposed. At the time of proposal, other members of the CONDOR group are given the opportunity to be co-authors. The first author is encouraged to involve individuals with specific expertise or experience as necessary. Each manuscript must include at least one CONDOR practitioner-investigator, as designated by the CONDOR P&P Committee. CONDOR makes a point of engaging practitioner-investigators at every step of the research process, and this includes the publication process. For the purposes of this requirement, a practitioner-investigator is defined as a clinician who treats patients on a regular basis and who collects primary data on patients in CONDOR studies. The final decision will rest with the Publications and Presentations Committee. Given CONDOR’s “seven author” guideline discussed below, this means that the typical CONDOR paper would have two authors from each of the three CONDOR networks (for a total of six authors), plus a practitioner-investigator as a seventh author, unless a practitioner-investigator is already among the original six authors.

Suggested communication to potential authors

A goal of CONDOR is to involve practitioner-investigators in the dissemination of results of studies. This includes involvement in writing and authoring manuscripts. The purpose of this communication is to inquire about your interest in being a part of this process.

The expectations for authorship credit include the following:

1. substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data
2. drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content
3. final approval of the version to be published

Generally the first author puts together a first draft which is circulated to the other authors. After receiving the first draft, you would be asked to provide thorough, thoughtful and timely feedback. Probably all communications will be by email and will include attachments that you will have to review. The lead author for each manuscript will articulate the expectations regarding writing and editing responsibilities, including timelines for each step.

If you choose not to commit to the authorship expectations, you can be involved in the writing group where your contribution would be acknowledged in the publication, but you would not be listed as a co-author.

Co-Authorship

The criteria for named, non-corporate authorship will be those of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE, the "Vancouver Group"; <http://www.icmje.org>). These criteria are similar to those of other major organizations concerned with authorship, especially those written recently. Excerpts of these criteria follow.

“All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship, and all those who qualify should be listed. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content. One or more authors should take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, from inception to published article.

Authorship credit should be based only on 1) substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; 2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and 3) final approval of the version to be published. Conditions 1, 2, and 3 must all be met. Acquisition of funding, the collection of data, or general supervision of the research group, by themselves, do not justify authorship.”

Co-authors should become involved in manuscript development as early as possible. The lead author should seek involvement by soliciting help early on, e.g., by circulating to co-authors a paper outline with some table shells and/or a request for suggestions of additional table and figure shells. Early drafts should be circulated to all co-authors, with a deadline for responses. Though the time allowed for co-author response will vary, it is suggested that two weeks is a reasonable interval. The lead author is expected to play a pro-active role in seeking co-author involvement and in taking action if this involvement is not forthcoming. If during the completion of the manuscript or presentation it becomes apparent that the contributions of one or more co-authors do not merit authorship, the lead author should discuss the possibility of removing the names of individuals from the paper. Failure to respond in a timely manner to a request for comments, especially if unexplained or repeated, should be grounds for considering the removal of a co-author. In addition, each co-author should critically examine his/her role in the process and volunteer to remove his/her name if warranted. The first author should attempt to reconcile divergent views of the co-authors with his/her own. However, sometimes a co-author may elect to remove his/her name because of disagreements in the interpretation of the data or in the style of writing, even though substantial contributions were made.

Seven-Author Guideline

Some journals limit the number of authors on a manuscript. Moreover, it is difficult to work on a writing project with too many authors. Thus, CONDOR has established the policy of attempting to limit the number of named, non-corporate authors on a paper or presentation to no more than seven, with the eighth being the corporate author. Exceptions to this guideline are allowed in the case of papers that legitimately require additional expertise or mainstream results papers that require the input and acknowledgment of many investigators. The New England Journal of Medicine allows 12 authors in a multi-center study, while Annals of Internal Medicine allows a maximum of 10 authors. All practitioner-investigators, faculty investigators, and staff personnel involved with data collection or other significant

aspects of the study, and who are not a named author, will be acknowledged collectively as the last author in corporate form as “for the CONDOR Collaborative Group”, and will be listed at the web sites of the CONDOR networks accordingly. The use of "collective author" or "corporate author" investigator groups is widely accepted. For example, a recent PubMed search for corporate authors that included the words "Collaborative Group" or "Investigator Group" or "Study Group" yielded more than 13,000 entries from a wide range of journals and scientific disciplines.

A note of diligence for CONDOR authors regarding the CONDOR corporate author

Some dental journals, especially those that target dentists in daily clinical practice, have little experience with the use of corporate authors. Therefore, it is important that CONDOR authors remain diligent that the corporate author is maintained at each stage of the manuscript and publication process. For example, one publication from one of the CONDOR networks had completed its manuscript peer review and was then handed from the Editor to the Editor’s staff. The staff then did some editing on the manuscript and at that point one staff member removed the corporate author due to lack of familiarity with this concept. Once the lead author pointed out to the Senior Editor of that publication what had happened, and that this was a very important part of the publications policy, the corporate author was added back in the manuscript. However, this highlights the need for diligence among CONDOR authors so that the corporate author is not inadvertently removed.

A note of diligence regarding use of the words “CONDOR” in the title

It is also important to be diligent that the words “CONDOR” remain in the title at each stage of the publication process if possible. For example, one recent publication from one of the CONDOR networks had completed its manuscript peer review and the lead author was sent the final page proofs to review. The Editor had the correct title of the article (the title that had been used in all stages up to that point) in the email correspondence in which the page proofs were sent, but the editorial staff had removed the word from the title in the page proofs themselves. It is important to ensure that these words are added back in to be in compliance with the publications policy. Otherwise, they will not appear in the PubMed citations.

In general, manuscripts are initiated and completed as described below:

1. The lead author submits a proposal for review by the P&P Committee that has the approval of the lead author’s network publications and Executive Committees. In general, these proposals should include:
 - a. Title and list of proposed collaborators.
 - b. Scientific background and rationale
 - c. Research hypotheses
 - d. Data to be used
 - e. Brief description of methods of analysis
2. The P&P Committee checks for overlap with previously proposed manuscripts, and determines if a call for collaborators is needed.
3. If approval by the P&P Committee is given, the lead author is instructed to work with his/her network DCC and publications committee to develop the manuscript.
4. The final version of the manuscript is submitted to the P&P Committee for review/approval
5. After the manuscript is approved, the lead author submits approved manuscript to journal, with copies to the DCC.

Statement of Authors Form

The first author is responsible for having all co-authors sign the Statement of Authors Form prior to the manuscript being sent to the CONDOR P&P Committee. Co-authors should state their involvement with the manuscript. The original of the Statement of Authors Form is kept by the first author and a copy is sent to the CONDOR P&P Committee Chair c/o of the Publications Coordinator at the DCC. Completion of this form is required prior to manuscripts being approved by the CONDOR P&P Committee. A copy may be obtained by contacting the DCC.

VIII. Acknowledgement of NIDCR Support and CONDOR Review

All CONDOR publications, invited papers and presentations, and peer-reviewed abstracts that use CONDOR data must acknowledge NIDCR support by listing the grants cited in section V above.

It is also recognized that some work does not use CONDOR data, but should have one or more CONDOR grant numbers cited. This might occur when a publication, paper, presentation, or abstract is done because of CONDOR even though actual CONDOR data are not used. For example, if an author does a manuscript that discusses CONDOR or does analyses of practice-based research data because these analyses are preliminary to and/or supportive of current and/or planned CONDOR efforts, or time devoted to this activity is funded at least partially from one or more CONDOR grants, then the CONDOR grant(s) should be cited. NIH and most university personnel effort reporting guidelines would require such citations anyway.

X. Other General Publication Policies

1. When special databases are provided by the lead DCC or created by the lead investigator's DCC for special analyses, the DCC will keep copies of these.
2. The CONDOR P&P Committee will regularly review paper assignments to determine if they are sufficient. The questions to be answered are:
 - A. Are enough topics being covered?
 - B. Are selected topics of sufficient importance to justify continued support?
3. Industry Funding
The recipient agrees not to enter into any verbal or written agreement or contract with industry or private individuals that will provide funding for analyses of CONDOR data without prior review and written approval of the CONDOR Directors' Committee.
4. Graduate Student Dissertations
The use of CONDOR data for doctoral or masters' level theses is encouraged, although some aspects of graduate student work with CONDOR data need special consideration. In particular, students are generally new investigators who are usually not familiar with CONDOR data. This section of the publication policies attempts to balance the opportunity to involve promising new investigators with preserving the opportunity for established CONDOR investigators to publish study findings.
Publications and presentations resulting from theses are subject to all CONDOR publication policies, including the requirement that the CONDOR P&P Committee approve all paper proposals, all completed papers before journal submission, and all presentations before they take place. This includes seminars open to the public that are part of a thesis defense.
The distinction between approval of a dissertation proposal and approval of specific manuscript proposals resulting from a thesis is important. A specific request for thesis approval should include not more than one paper proposal and the elements specified below, with additional proposals to be entertained by the CONDOR P&P Committee later, as the thesis matures. Although prompt submission of subsequent paper proposals is strongly encouraged, the student should note that approval of the thesis does not constitute approval of any manuscript proposal other than the one included in the thesis proposal. The request to use CONDOR data in a graduate dissertation should include the following elements:
 1. The name of at least one CONDOR investigator who has agreed to serve on the student's dissertation committee and as a co-author of the first publication.
 2. Communication from the thesis advisor which should include the following information: (1) endorsement of the thesis and paper proposal; (2) statement of willingness and availability to discuss the work with CONDOR investigators; (3) commitment to abide by CONDOR publications policies; (4) a timeline for completion of the thesis; and (5) a plan for manuscript submission of manuscript(s).
 3. Brief description of rationale, background, main hypotheses, analytic approach for the thesis.

5. Adherence to NIH Public Access Policy

The NIH Public Access Policy implements a federal law that states:

The Director of the National Institutes of Health shall require that all investigators funded by the NIH submit or have submitted for them to the National Library of Medicine's PubMed Central an electronic version of their final, peer-reviewed manuscripts upon acceptance for publication, to be made publicly available no later than 12 months after the official date of publication: Provided, That the NIH shall implement the public access policy in a manner consistent with copyright law.

It is important that all CONDOR publications comply with this policy.

Frequently asked questions about this policy are available at <http://publicaccess.nih.gov/FAQ.htm>. These are some key elements: Authors own the original copyrights to materials they write. Consistent with individual arrangements with authors' employing institutions, authors often transfer some or all of these rights to the publisher when the journal agrees to publish their paper. Some publishers may ask authors to transfer these rights when the paper is first submitted to the journal. Authors should work with the publisher before any rights are transferred to ensure that all conditions of the NIH Public Access Policy can be met. Authors should avoid signing any agreements with publishers that do not allow the author to comply with the NIH Public Access Policy. As an example, the kind of language that an author or institution might add to a copyright agreement includes the following: "Journal acknowledges that Author retains the right to provide a copy of the final peer-reviewed manuscript to the NIH upon acceptance for Journal publication, for public archiving in PubMed Central as soon as possible but no later than 12 months after publication by Journal."

Data Distribution Policy and Agreement

After a thesis proposal is approved, both the student and the advisor must review the CONDOR Data Distribution Policy and complete and sign a CONDOR data distribution agreement, and only then will the CONDOR DCC prepare an analytic dataset that will be sent to the advisor, for both the advisor and the student's use for approved thesis work.

APPENDIX

Instructions for Completing CONDOR Manuscript Proposal

1. Follow the format on the form below.
2. Provide complete contact information for the first author. If a CONDOR investigator will serve as the representative (contact person), state this on the proposal and provide complete contact information for that person.
3. The PI of the originating site or CONDOR investigator participating in the writing group must review and approve the proposal prior to it being submitted to the CONDOR P&P Committee.
4. Submit the proposal to the Chair of the CONDOR P&P Committee with a request for approval.
5. The Manuscript Proposal Form is available as a Microsoft Word document that can be obtained by contacting Valerie Winston of the DPBRN DCC (vwinston@mail.dopm.uab.edu) or accessed at the CONDOR Operations web site.

**Manuscript Proposal, CONDOR
(Date of request)**

I. Full Title: _____

II. Abbreviated Title: _____

III. Writing Group (list individual with lead responsibility first)

Lead author: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____ E-mail: _____

Address:

Co-authors:

IV. Background and CONDOR study number/title and primary DCC site

V. Main questions that this manuscript will address

VI. CONDOR data to be used (Required: Study(s); Recommended: variable types, names)

VII. Timeline

References (if applicable)
