

# The Oxford PharmaGenesis publication policy

## Ethical, accurate and timely publications

### BACKGROUND

- Effective communication of clinical research is important for advancing patient care. We believe that professional medical writing support can help to ensure ethical,<sup>1</sup> accurate<sup>2-5</sup> and timely<sup>6</sup> publication of research, whether supported by industry, academia or other bodies.<sup>7</sup>
- Our research with independent investigators has shown that professional medical writing support improves the reporting of clinical trials in peer-reviewed journals in terms of both compliance with reporting guidelines and the quality of writing.<sup>3,8</sup>
- When assisting authors with communication of the results of company-sponsored research, we will aim to:
  - follow the Joint Position Statement on the role of professional medical writers,<sup>9</sup> Good Publication Practice 3 (GPP3) guidelines<sup>10</sup> and International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) recommendations<sup>11</sup>
  - consult appropriate reporting guidelines (e.g. CONSORT<sup>12</sup> and others collated by the EQUATOR Network)<sup>13</sup>
  - ensure that the authors and sponsors are aware of their obligations under these guidelines<sup>10-14</sup>
  - keep up to date with advances in medical communications ethics and best practices.
- In line with the above guidelines and our company philosophy, the aim of the Oxford PharmaGenesis publication policy is to provide clear ethical guidance on our involvement in the preparation of:
  - articles and supplementary content for publication in peer-reviewed journals
  - abstracts, posters and oral presentations for scientific and medical congresses.

### ACKNOWLEDGING MEDICAL WRITING SUPPORT

- Medical writing support will be acknowledged in manuscripts and congress presentations, including the:
  - nature of the support
  - name of the lead writer(s) involved and their highest relevant qualification(s) and, if appropriate, Certified Medical Publication Professional credentials
  - writers' affiliation with Oxford PharmaGenesis
  - source(s) of funding.
- We encourage transparency of contributions to publications through the use of tools such as the Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID).<sup>15</sup>
- A draft acknowledgement statement is provided below, although the final version may be subject to specific journal/meeting or client requirements.

*The authors thank [name, ORCID identifier and qualifications] of Oxford PharmaGenesis [PharmaGenesis office name, city, country] for providing medical writing support funded by [sponsor name], in accordance with Good Publication Practice 3 (GPP3) guidelines (<http://www.ismpp.org/gpp3>).<sup>10</sup>*

### ACKNOWLEDGING THE CONTRIBUTION OF PATIENTS

- The unique contribution of patients involved in clinical research will be acknowledged in manuscripts and congress presentations.<sup>16,17</sup>
- A draft acknowledgement statement is provided here, although the final version may be subject to specific journal/meeting or client requirements.

*"We thank all the patients [and their families] who kindly participated in this study."*

## AUTHORSHIP

- In accordance with the ICMJE guidelines,<sup>11</sup> to qualify for authorship, contributors should meet all four of the following criteria:
  - making substantial contribution to the conception or design of the work, or to the acquisition, analysis or interpretation of data for the work
  - drafting or critically revising work for important intellectual content
  - giving final approval of the version to be published
  - taking accountability 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.
- Because ICMJE guidelines<sup>11</sup> state that authors should make a “substantial intellectual contribution” to the research and manuscript, we encourage the use of “on behalf of the [number of] study investigators” when groups of more than 10 investigators are involved (as highlighted in GPP3).<sup>10</sup>
  - Exceptions may include clinical practice guidelines, expert consensus statements and meeting proceedings.
- In some circumstances, a professional medical writer may qualify for authorship.<sup>18</sup> When appropriate, this will be raised with the other authors as early as possible. Examples of such circumstances include:
  - writing of systematic reviews when the medical writer has also taken the lead in designing the review (e.g. development of search terms and inclusion/exclusion criteria plus conduct of the searches)
  - when the medical writer has also made a significant contribution to the conception or design of the study, or to the acquisition, analysis or interpretation of study data.

## ACCESSIBILITY

- To maximize the accessibility of published research, we recommend:
  - publishing in journals that are indexed in MEDLINE/ PubMed and/or Embase
  - including clinical trial registration numbers in abstracts for indexing and disclosure tracking<sup>19</sup>
  - publishing in journals that enable their content to be made freely accessible, either immediately or after a delay of no more than 6 months.
- To maximize the accessibility of our own research, we commit to publishing the research we fund open access under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence with no additional restrictions.<sup>20</sup>

**Above all, we aim to deliver the highest quality medical writing and project management support to provide the most value to our clients, healthcare professionals and patients.**

## REFERENCES

1. Woolley KL, Lew RA, Stretton S *et al.* Lack of involvement of medical writers and the pharmaceutical industry in publications retracted for misconduct: a systematic, controlled, retrospective study. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2011;27:1175–82.
2. Jacobs A. Adherence to the CONSORT guideline in papers written by professional medical writers. *The Write Stuff* 2010;19:196–9.
3. Gattrell WT, Hopewell S, Young K *et al.* Professional medical writing support and the quality of randomised controlled trial reporting: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2016;6:e010329.
4. Gattrell W, Maisonobe P, de Abada M. Outcome reporting, funding source and medical writing support in publications evaluated in the COMPare project. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2017;33(Suppl 1):27 [poster 9].
5. Mills I, Sheard C, Hays M *et al.* Professional medical writing support (PMWS) and the reporting quality of randomized controlled trial (RCT) abstracts among high-impact general medical journals. [version 2; referees: 2 approved]. *F1000Research* 2017;6:1489.
6. Shah S, Nair S, Patil A *et al.* Role of medical publication professional in timely dissemination and transparent reporting of clinical data. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2016;32:S12 [poster 27].
7. Hamilton CW, Gertel A, Jacobs A *et al.* Mythbusting Medical Writing: Goodbye, Ghosts! Hello, Help! *Account Res* 2016;23:178–94.
8. Evuarherhe O, Gattrell W, White R, Winchester CC. Professional medical writing support and the quality, ethics and timeliness of clinical trial reporting: a systematic review. *bioRxiv* 2018; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/501403>.
9. AMWA, EMWA, ISMPP. AMWA–EMWA–ISMPP Joint Position Statement on the role of professional medical writers, 2017. Available from: [http://www.ismpp.org/assets/docs/Initiatives/amwa-emwa-ismpp%20joint%20position%20statement%20on%20the%20role%20of%20professional%20medical%20writers\\_january%202017.pdf](http://www.ismpp.org/assets/docs/Initiatives/amwa-emwa-ismpp%20joint%20position%20statement%20on%20the%20role%20of%20professional%20medical%20writers_january%202017.pdf) (Accessed 24 January 2017).
10. Battisti WP, Wager E, Baltzer L *et al.* Good Publication Practice for Communicating Company-Sponsored Medical Research: GPP3. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;163:461–4.
11. ICMJE. Recommendations for the conduct, reporting, editing, and publication of scholarly work in medical journals. Boston, USA: International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, 2018. Available from: <http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf> (Accessed 18 December 2018).
12. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMJ* 2010;340:c332.
13. Equator Network. Enhancing the quality and transparency of health research. Oxford, UK: Centre for Statistics in Medicine, University of Oxford, 2016. Available from: <http://www.equator-network.org/> (Accessed 03 July 2017).
14. Clark J, Gonzalez J, Mansi B *et al.* Enhancing transparency and efficiency in reporting industry-sponsored clinical research: report from the Medical Publishing Insights and Practices initiative. *Int J Clin Pract* 2010;64:1028–33.
15. ORCID. Open researcher and contributor ID (ORCID). Bethesda, USA: ORCID 2017. Available from: <https://orcid.org/> (Accessed 04 July 2017).
16. Rivero-Arias O. Is a simple “Thank you” too much to ask? *BMJ* 2009;339:b3683.
17. Bhatia R, Anthony B. Clinical trials: do the patients get the thanks they deserve? *Curr Med Res Opin* 2015;31(Suppl 9):S19 [poster 5].
18. Gristwood T, Farrow P, Hill C *et al.* When should medical writers be listed as authors? *Curr Med Res Opin* 2014;30 (Suppl 1):S22 [poster 29].
19. Powell-Smith A, Goldacre B. The TrialsTracker: automated ongoing monitoring of failure to share clinical trial results by all major companies and research institutions. *F1000Research* 2016;5:2629.
20. Ellison TS, Koder T, Schmidt L *et al.* Open access policies of leading medical journals: a cross-sectional study. *bioRxiv* 2018; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/250613>.