

MSCC Publication, Authorship, and Acknowledgment Policy

Purpose. To ensure transparent, fair credit for contributions by the Methodological and Statistical Consulting Core (MSCC) and to align expectations for student and faculty projects.

1. Principles

- Authorship follows contribution, not courtesy. MSCC uses the ICMJE criteria and the CRediT taxonomy to assess substantive contributions (e.g., study design, analytic strategy, interpretation, and drafting/revising the intellectual content).
- Discuss early. Authorship/acknowledgment expectations should be discussed at the start of a project and revisited as contributions evolve.
- Documentation. Major projects should include a brief written agreement (email or MOU) stating roles, credit, and any conditions for data access or funding.

2. Student Projects (theses, dissertations, practica)

- The MSCC provides consultative guidance only (no data cleaning/coding/analysis).
- Default credit: Acknowledgment (see wording below).
- Authorship: Not expected for routine consultation; considered only if MSCC contributions meet authorship criteria (e.g., substantial, iterative intellectual input and involvement in drafting/revising the manuscript). Even then, this must be approved by the student's mentor and disclosed to the program in accordance with school policy.

3. Faculty-Led, Funded, or Manuscript-Directed Projects

- When MSCC contributes substantive intellectual work (e.g., co-developing analysis plans, modeling strategy, interpretation, substantial manuscript drafting/revisions), co-authorship is appropriate under ICMJE/CRediT.
- If MSCC provides limited guidance (e.g., one or two advisory meetings, light feedback), acknowledgment is appropriate.
- When MSCC faculty contribute substantively to funded projects, scope of work, effort, authorship expectations, and compensation (e.g., percent effort or consulting line) should be prospectively defined and budgeted. Authorship decisions for resulting manuscripts will follow ICMJE criteria and CRediT role definitions based on documented contributions.

4. Roles That Usually Qualify vs. Usually Don't

- Usually qualify for authorship (with manuscript involvement)
 - Designing analytic approach or novel methods
 - Substantial, ongoing interpretation shaping the scientific conclusions
 - Drafting key analysis sections, figures/tables rationale, or major revisions that change the intellectual content of a manuscript.
- Usually acknowledgment only
 - One-off consults, routine feedback, pointing to references or coding patterns
 - High-level suggestions without sustained involvement
 - Administrative help (scheduling, form templates).

5. How We Decide (Simple Flow)

1. At intake: PI indicates intended outputs (paper/grant) and anticipated MSCC role.
2. Mid-project check: If MSCC involvement is becoming substantive, agree on draft authorship/CRediT roles.
3. Before submission: Confirm final author list and CRediT statements.

6. Suggested Wording

- Acknowledgment (general):
“We thank the Methodological and Statistical Consulting Core (MSCC), Department of Community and Global Health, Claremont Graduate University, for methodological guidance on study design and analytic strategy.”

- Acknowledgment (student thesis/dissertation):
“The author acknowledges the Methodological and Statistical Consulting Core (MSCC), Department of Community and Global Health, Claremont Graduate University for consultative feedback on analytic planning and interpretation.”

- CRediT example for authorship (when appropriate):
Methodology: MSCC Consultant Name
Formal analysis: MSCC Consultant Name (advisory)
Writing—review & editing: MSCC Consultant Name.

7. Dispute Resolution

- If credit is unclear, the Director will facilitate discussion with the PI/advisor using ICMJE/CRediT criteria and meeting notes. If needed, escalate per departmental research policies.

Implementation of this policy is supported through intake and project documentation forms that capture planned outputs, credit expectations, and key contributions.