

Affordable Medicines Facility – Malaria (AMFm) Independent Evaluation

Dissemination Principles – Final version 1 December 2012

Overarching principles:

The IE collaboration¹ is committed to communicating the IE results to a wide range of policy and academic stakeholders, and also to making good use of the data that we have all worked so hard to collect and analyze by conducting additional analysis that answers important policy questions.

We are committed to ensuring that outputs (whether conference presentations or papers) recognise appropriately and inclusively the inputs of all the IE partners. There are likely to be different types of outputs that involve different levels of input from the partners, and therefore a process is needed to make decisions about how these are taken forward, and how contributions are recognised in terms of authorship.

1. Types of outputs considered by this document:

We anticipate that there will be both conference presentations and publications submitted to peer-reviewed journals. Presentations may be at both national and international conferences. The same principles should apply to all forms of dissemination. (This document does not cover handling of media coverage.)

Papers considered by this document may include:

- Overall papers that present OS and/or secondary data on HHS results and success metrics
- Other papers that look at different aspects of OS cross-county data, e.g., diagnostics, BCC impact on knowledge and awareness
- Country level papers that describe OS before and after in more detail
- Country level papers that look at other issues in OS, e.g., breakdown of results by transmission zone or use of GIS mapping, etc.
- Remote areas study paper(s)
- Exit/FGD study paper(s)
- Papers that combine OS data from the overlapping sets of ACTwatch and IE countries
- Methodological papers that look at impact of conducting the IE analysis in different ways

Papers drawing primarily on ACTwatch data collected outside of the IE collaboration fall outside of the scope of these principles, specifically:

- These principles do not cover papers presenting primary data from ACTwatch household surveys. (Secondary data from ACTwatch household surveys could be included in papers presenting secondary household survey data from a number of sources across IE countries, in which case ACTwatch authors would be appropriately represented.)
- These principles do not cover outlet survey papers led by ACTwatch that focus on the ACTwatch countries not included in the IE. (Where papers cover outlet survey data from ACTwatch countries both within and outside the IE, the principles outlined here would apply.)

¹ “IE collaboration” refers to the IE team, plus the DCs. “IE team” refers to ICF and LSHTM. Note that the term “DCs” should be avoided in IE outputs – rather all members should be referred to as “collaborators”.

2. Sharing of analysis files:

The DCs and IE team all have access to baseline and endline analysis files for the countries they were involved in. The IE team will also make available the analysis files (in Stata and R) for conducting analyses of “changes over time”, and will provide advice on how to implement these procedures.

3. Authorship principles

The following principles can be used as a starting point for authorship discussions.

Named authors need to meet criteria to qualify as authors – according to the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (the “Vancouver Group”) this means:

- 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.

Authors should meet conditions 1, 2, and 3. (See <http://www.icmje.org/>). (Note that if authors review the article and do not have any suggestions for revisions, they can still meet condition 2.)

Other points that should be considered:

- We should generally be inclusive with respect to authorship decisions and make sure that everyone’s contributions and hard work are fully represented, but inclusion should be based on the Vancouver Group requirements.
- Contributors listed on baseline and endline OS reports can also be used as a starting point as a means to identify who may merit authorship.
- Multi-country papers including all countries (including the main AMFm impact paper) should include all IE collaboration members as authors.
- On country specific papers one would expect the relevant DC and the IE team to be authors but it might be “overkill” to list all IE names. An option here is to list some or all of the IE team members as a group authorship for these papers e.g. DC1, DC2, DC3 and the IE team. If one or more individuals from the IE team had played a major role in the paper, they could also be named e.g. DC1, DC2, IE1, DC3 and the IE team.
- We must also ensure appropriate inclusion of those who worked on county case studies on process/context, where those data are used
- Additional authors not on reports may be added if their contributions are merited by for example playing a role in additional analysis, paper writing, framing of the paper, literature reviews etc.

Principles for first authorship:

- That first authors should have the largest role in the work presented, lead on writing the first draft and be the guarantor of the work.

- That first and last authorship should be distributed across people in the IE collaboration and across collaborating institutions where possible
- First author takes the lead on co-ordinating the team's response to the referee's comments, revising the paper with help from other team members, writing the response to the journal, and submitting the revised paper.

Principles for last author:

- last author should have largest role in overall leadership for and supervision of the work in the paper

4. Process for reviewing publication and presentation plans:

- A Dissemination Committee has been established, with one member from ICF, LSHTM, ACTwatch, Tanzania, Ghana and Niger. The committee will nominate a chair/secretary who will keep records of their deliberations.
- The role of the committee will be to manage proposals for papers submitted by members of the collaboration, and ensure that principles of authorship are adhered to. The Committee is not an all powerful permission-granting body, nor just there to receive information about publication plans. Rather it is to provide an opportunity for everyone to be aware of planned publications / presentations, and to allow any issues to be raised e.g. on authorship, if individuals feel they have something to offer a proposed paper; or if overlap between proposed papers can be harmonized. The committee can also review progress on proposed papers and make suggestions to facilitate this where appropriate.
- For each paper, the proposed first author will draft a one-page outline, covering the title, objectives, methods, and which data would be used, type of analysis and results, suggested journal, and suggested authorship
- The first set of paper proposals was reviewed by the committee in August, 2012. Henceforth, the committee will be responsive and react to proposals on a rolling basis.
- In the interests of moving quickly, if any committee member doesn't respond within 2 weeks, we assume they approve.
- The first author should share a full draft of paper with all authors for comments (giving at least 2 weeks for response), and all authors should approve the final version. When papers or other outputs are circulated, it will be stated that if no response is received within a specified timeframe (eg. 2 weeks), it will be assumed that they have no objections to the output.
- Niger colleagues can request translation of any committee correspondence if this is felt to be required.
- Abstracts for international conferences should also be submitted to the committee. Draft presentations should be circulated to authors.
- For local presentations (within your institution or within a DC's country) it would not be necessary to go through the committee

5. Acknowledgements in outputs:

- A standard wording will be agreed for acknowledgements in papers that reflects funding, and drawing on ACTwatch methods. Other paper-specific acknowledgements could then be added to that. ACTwatch are happy for the ACTwatch Group to be included in acknowledgements (rather than authorship) in papers for non-ACTwatch countries.
- A standard acknowledgement slide will be developed for use at the end of presentations.

6. Making the data publicly available:

The Global Fund contracts specify that there are contractual obligations to make all OS data funded by the Global Fund publicly available before any publications (this does not cover surveys funded by BMGF). The IE collaboration is supportive of developments to provide public access to the data in due course. However, there is a consensus among the IE collaboration that making all data sets publicly available before any publication is not necessary, and may be problematic due to the resource requirements. A note on these issues will be submitted to the Global Fund.

Confirmation of acceptance of principles:

I confirm that my organization accepts these principles of dissemination and will observe them in relation to outputs arising from the Independent Evaluation. I am happy for these principles to form the basis for a future amendment to our contract with the Global Fund which will govern future publications arising from the Independent Evaluation.

Signature:

Name:

Organisation:

Date: