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SCS Scholarly Activity & Spartan Medical Research Journal
The Statewide Campus System (SCS) of the Michigan State University College of Osteopathic Medicine (MSUCOM) shall actively contribute to the advancement of knowledge through research and scholarly activities, and shall facilitate such similar activities by SCS member institutions. One key vehicle for the dissemination of scholarly activity products shall be ongoing issues of the Spartan Medical Research Journal (SMRJ).

Purpose:
As part of its efforts to meet American Osteopathic Association standards for Osteopathic Post-graduate Training Institutions (OPTIs) stating that "Each OPTI shall require each member institution to establish policies and guidelines that govern scientific research activities in accordance with local, state and federal guidelines", the SCS establishes the following policies and guidelines covering research and scholarly activity by SCS faculty and staff.

Basic Policies:
The recognized educational objectives of MSU, MSUCOM and the SCS include, as equally important goals, the discovery of new knowledge through research and scholarly activity as well as the dissemination of existing knowledge. The SCS first encourages faculty/academic staff members and students/trainees to engage in scholarly activity, including that sponsored internally or by such outside agencies as foundations, professional associations, government and private industry. In addition the MSUCOM and SCS will continue to encourage all affiliated medical students, residents, fellows and faculty to submit their post-project manuscripts to the SMRJ Editorial Office. It is only through continued and expanding scholarly activity that the excellence of teaching programs can be maintained and improved, and the function of the SCS and SMRJ as contributors to the body of knowledge can be fulfilled.

Major Guidelines:
• Science and medical knowledge advanced through the creativity of scholars working singly or in groups, and scholarly activity projects proposed and developed by SCS faculty/staff and consistent with MSUCOM and SCS goals will be encouraged.
• The SCS will make available, in addition to those facilities and resources provided by MSU (library, computer laboratory, statistical consulting, etc.), resources to support research and creative efforts of its faculty/staff, as well as of faculty and
students/trainees at member institutions. These include training in research methodology, training in evaluation of research literature, consulting by SCS staff, internal research funding support, and recognition of faculty/staff and student/trainee scholarly activity efforts through opportunities for professional presentations and publication.

• All sponsored scholarly activity projects should be consistent with the policies and missions of the SCS, SMRJ, MSUCOM and MSU. Cooperative research programs cutting across academic units also are encouraged.

• Research projects should be managed so as to avoid disruption of established research and teaching/training programs of MSUCOM, the SCS and SCS member institutions.

• In seeking or accepting funding support for research, care should be exercised to ensure compatibility with the functions and purposes of research at MSU, MSUCOM and the SCS.

• The SCS should retain for its scholars the right of first publication into SMRJ and other graduate medical education/clinical journals. The imposition of restriction on publication of research results is incompatible with the basic concept of an educational institution. Also in regard to publishing rights, the SCS and SMRJ, as components of MSU, adopt the Statement on Publishing Agreements of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation as endorsed by the University (see http://www.cic.net/docs/default-source/library/authorsrights.pdf)

• No SMRJ publication, statement, or activity, either on behalf of the SCS, MSUCOM or MSU, or by an individual in their official capacity, shall endorse any commercial product, or advocate any specific commercial method or device, either directly or by implication.

• By reference here, the current University policies regarding researcher conflicts of interest are incorporated in this document (see http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/potentialconflicts.htm).

• The entire cost of sponsored research projects should be carefully determined, and sufficient funding obtained, from internal or external sources, to cover all such costs.

• Scholarly activity projects must conform to established University policies on patent rights. (See http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/patents.htm)

• Protection of a scholarly activity environment for free and unfettered pursuit of knowledge is an important responsibility of the SCS and the University. Infringement on this freedom must be restricted to those factors that are clearly essential to the protection of individuals and the public at large (see http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/AcademicFr
There exist federal or state laws, regulations and guidelines in several areas that are designed for the protection of individuals and the public. In addition, the University community itself, of which the SCS is a part, acts through advisory committees and academic governance bodies to ensure that individual research and scholarly projects incorporate appropriate safeguards.

Research projects that involve the use of human subjects, animals, or hazardous substances such as toxic compounds, infectious agents, explosives, radioactive isotopes or recombinant DNA, etc., must conform to current University policies and guidelines (consult the University's Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies and see http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/useofhazards.htm).

In particular, any scholarly activity project undertaken by SCS faculty/staff that involves the use of human subjects must undergo review for a determination of approval or exemption by an MSU Institutional Review Board (IRB). In cases where SCS faculty/staff are involved as collaborators in research projects undertaken by entities outside the University (e.g., SCS member institutions), they will ensure, the research has been appropriately reviewed and approved by either the MSU IRB or the local institutional IRB. Any research involving human subjects undertaken by students/trainees at SCS member institutions shall be appropriately reviewed and approved by either the MSU IRB or their local institutional IRB. By reference here, the current MSU policies and procedures regarding human subject protection are incorporated in this document. (See http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/protection.htm).

Additional guidance regarding research policies may be found in the MSU Faculty Handbook (http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/).
Statewide Campus System Authorship Policy Scope
This policy applies to all appointed specialists and faculty in the Michigan State University College of Osteopathic Medicine Statewide Campus System (SCS) working on internal projects and “joint” projects with other SCS-affiliated system faculty, residents/fellows and personnel.

Purpose
The intent of this document is to serve as a set of general guidelines for issues surrounding authorship as project-related groups construct a piece of work for public distribution. This Policy is intended to provide a fair, systematic process for: a) first identifying criteria for authorship, b) determining authorship order, as well as c) suggested criteria for acknowledging someone as a “contributor,” rather than as an author.

Policy:
I. Authorship on Internal and Externally-developed products
According to the MSU Guidelines on Authorship Policy,1 a person shall qualify as an Author provided one or more of the following conditions are satisfied:
1. Participation in conception and design of the project or review, analysis or interpretation of any project data.
2. Participation in the drafting of the poster, presentation or manuscript or in the editing of the same product.
3. Final approval of the version of the product to be submitted/published/presented.
4. Ability to explain and defend appropriate portions of the project design in public or scholarly settings.

Ia. Lead Authorship
The Lead Author is defined as the person who leads a project effort and makes a major contribution to a multi-authored product. The Lead author takes the lead of discussing the contributions, recognition and order of all authors that participate in the study. All authors, regardless of position, have a voice in this discussion. Ideally, author arrangement is agreed to proactively, formally, and in writing prior to the initiation of the project.1
Ib. Responsibilities of Every Author
Every author listed on a poster, presentation or publication is responsible for:
   1. approving the final version of the product, including designation of the Lead Author and order of authors; and
   2. Verifying the integrity of the project that was performed. Every author must strive to hold him/herself accountable.\(^1\)

Ic. Internally-generated SCS team products
The SCS leadership has first decided to adopt the *MSU Policy on Authorship*.\(^1\) Initial authorship decisions will ideally be determined at the conception of individual subproject activities and formation of working groups. People wishing to join a working group should contact the designated lead author of each project. Those contributing somewhat to a poster/presentation/manuscript product but who did NOT have a substantive contributing role during, or after, the project, (e.g. assistance with writing strategies, technical editing, proofreading) will be listed in the acknowledgment section (if the journal accepts such acknowledgments).\(^1,2\) No one is to publish data without review by the project leader and other paper authors or their designee(s) before it is submitted.

Id. Joint SCS-healthcare system products
An SCS member who has been asked to substantively edit, develop, analyze data, or problem-solve phases of project phases should negotiate with the primary project personnel how: a) the SCS is to be acknowledged and b) whether the SCS consultant/analyst who has contributed substantively to the completion of the project should be acknowledged OR listed as the final presenter/author.
One suggested criterion that a project team is encouraged to consider concerns whether the project could have been realistically completed without the contribution(s) of the SCS member. If the project would not have been realistically completed without the contribution(s) of the SCS member, they should generally be listed as final author/presenter.

Ie. Authorship Grievance Process
If an authorship group is unable to resolve any such issues informally, any member in the SCS or project team who wishes to grieve any authorship decision will prepare a written grievance to be first routed to the SCS Associate Dean Dr. Jon Rohrer, PhD, DMin, at: 517- 432-2853, 965 Fee Road, Room A336, East Lansing, MI, 48824, jon.rohrer@hc.msu.edu or through the SCS website at scs.msu.edu. The SCS Associate Dean receiving the complaint will review the grievance and address the complaint in writing within 14 calendar days of the receipt of the written complaint, acknowledging or denying the relief requested in the grievance letter.

Spartan Medical Research Journal Article Selection Policy
The Spartan Medical Research Journal (SMRJ) of the Statewide Campus System (SCS) in the Michigan State University College of Osteopathic Medicine (MSUCOM) shall observe the following policy concerning how article submissions of all types are considered for possible review and acceptance into a SMRJ issue. For the purposes of this document the term Editor encompasses all Editor title variations and is limited to individuals who have final acceptance responsibility.

The SMRJ observes and operates in accordance with the "Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals" established by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) (http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf) and endeavors to adhere to all ethical guidelines contained therein.

Article Selection Criteria
Relevance to medical knowledge is the primary criterion for selecting articles for possible review and publication into a SMRJ issue. Articles that are relevant, archival, and fall within the journal’s coverage policy regarding types of articles described in the “SMRJ Information for Authors” file will be considered for possible review and publication. Each submitted article will be reviewed within the context of the PubMed and Medline reference databases to determine its relevance to current osteopathic and allopathic medical knowledge.

Relevance
The SMRJ Editor may consider a submission that includes any of the following may elements as adequately relevant for peer-review and/or publication:

- the scientific study of patient and healthcare provider behaviors and practices
- content in any of the subfields of human medicine, graduate medical education (GME), and other areas of contemporary healthcare
- non-medical content of interest to physicians and GME professionals in different subfields (e.g., quality improvement, implementation science, medical practices and standards, statistical and data management in project design and analysis, clinical case report summaries of atypical patient care scenarios, etc.)
- content in related fields that has medical knowledge or GME implications
Types of Articles Selected
The following types of articles written in the English language are generally considered:
- Original contribution reports of research and quality improvement projects
- Literature reviews and clinical summaries
- Clinical Practice essays and reports
- Brief reports of project results
- Case reports and case series
- Medical education reports and essays
- Special Communication and reports
- Letters to the Editor concerning previous SMRJ articles and pertinent medical practice and GME issues
- Errata, corrections, and retractions
Spartan Medical Research Journal Ethical Guidelines Policy

For a peer-reviewed journal, the publication of articles plays an essential role in the development of a coherent network of knowledge. It is, therefore, essential that all editors, authors, and peer reviewers conduct themselves in accordance with the highest level of professional ethics and standards when submitting, reviewing and publishing Spartan Medical Research Journal (SMRJ) submissions. For the purposes of this policy, the term Editor encompasses all Editor title variations and is limited to individuals who have final submission acceptance responsibility and serve as guardians of the journal’s ethics.

The SMRJ observes and operates in accordance with the "Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals" established by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) (http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf) and endeavors to adhere to all ethical guidelines contained therein.

Editor’s Responsibilities

- The editor should acknowledge receipt of submitted manuscripts within five working days of receipt and ensure an efficient, fair, and timely review process.
- The editor should ensure that submitted manuscripts are processed in a confidential manner, and that no content of the manuscripts will be disclosed to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, and the publisher, as appropriate.
- The editor should recuse himself or herself from processing manuscripts if he or she has any conflict of interest with any of the authors or institutions related to the manuscripts.
- The editor should not disclose the names and other details of the peer reviewers to a third party without the permission of the reviewers.
- The editor has the right to make the final decision on whether to accept or reject a manuscript with reference to the significance, originality, and clarity of the manuscript and its relevance to the journal.
- The editor should by no means make any effort to oblige the authors to cite his or her journal either as an implied or explicit condition of accepting their manuscripts for publication.
- The editor should not use for his or her own research any part of any data or work reported in submitted and as yet unpublished articles.
- The editor should respond promptly and take reasonable measures when an ethical
complaint occurs concerning a submitted manuscript or a published paper, and the editor should immediately contact and consult with the author and may require a written formal retraction or correction from the author.

Reviewers’ Responsibilities

• Any reviewer who feels unqualified to review the assigned manuscript or affirms that he or she cannot meet the deadline for completion of the review should immediately notify the editor and excuse himself or herself from the process of reviewing this manuscript.
• The reviewer should inform the editor and recuse himself or herself from reviewing the manuscript if there is any conflict of interest. Specifically, the reviewer should recuse himself or herself from reviewing any manuscript authored or coauthored by a person with whom the reviewer has an obvious personal or academic relationship, if the relationship could introduce bias or the reasonable perception of bias.
• The reviewer should treat the manuscript in a confidential manner. The manuscript should not be disclosed to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.
• The reviewer should approach the peer-review job objectively. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable.
• The reviewer should not use for his or her own research any part of any data or work reported in submitted and as yet unpublished articles.
• The reviewer should immediately notify the editor of any similarities between the manuscript under review and another paper either published or under consideration by another journal. The reviewer should immediately call to the editor’s attention a manuscript containing plagiarized material or falsified data.

Author's Responsibilities

• The author should not submit concurrent manuscripts (or manuscripts essentially describing the same subject matter) to multiple journals. Likewise, an author should not submit any paper previously published anywhere to the journals for consideration. The publication of articles on specific subject matter, such as clinical guidelines and translations, in more than one journal is only acceptable if approved by the Editor.
• The author should present a precise and brief report of his or her research and an impartial description of its significance.
• The author should honestly gather and interpret his or her research data only after some form of institutional review board (IRB) review and approval of the project. The manuscript will need to attest to the project’s IRB approval and describe the major human subjects protections observed during the project.
• Publishers, editors, reviewers, and readers are entitled to request the author to provide the raw data for his or her research for convenience of editorial review and public access.

• The author should guarantee that the works he or she has submitted are original. If the author has used work and/or words by others, appropriate citations are required. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

• The author should indicate explicitly all sources that have supported the research and also declare any conflict(s) of interest.

• The author should give due acknowledgement to all of those who have made contributions to the research. Those who have contributed significantly to the research should be listed as coauthors. The author should ensure that all coauthors have affirmed the final version of the paper and have agreed on its final publication.

• The author should promptly inform the journal editor of any obvious error(s) in his or her published paper and cooperate earnestly with the editor in retraction or correction of the paper. If the editor is notified by any party other than the author that the published paper contains an obvious error, the author should write a retraction or make the correction based on the medium of publication.
Spartan Medical Research Journal Peer Review Policy

For a peer-reviewed journal such as the Spartan Medical Research Journal (SMRJ), the practice of peer review is to ensure that only good science is published. Peer reviewers play a vital role in maintaining the high standards of all accepted SMRJ manuscripts are peer reviewed following the procedure outlined below. For the purposes of this policy, the term Editor encompasses all Editor title variations and is limited to individuals who have final submission acceptance responsibility and serve as guardians of the journal's ethics.

The SMRJ observes and operates in accordance with the "Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals" established by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) (http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf) and endeavors to adhere to all ethical guidelines contained therein.

Peer Review Process

1. Initial manuscript evaluation: The Editor first evaluates all submitted manuscripts. Manuscripts rejected at this stage are insufficiently original, have serious scientific flaws, have poor grammar or English language, or are outside the aims and scope of the SMRJ. Those submissions that meet the minimum criteria are normally securely routed to two expert peer reviewers.

2. Type of Peer Review: The SMRJ Editor will generally employ a single blind reviewing process, where both the peer reviewers remain anonymous to authors throughout the process.

3. How peer reviewers are selected: Whenever possible, peer reviewers from a maintained SMRJ reviewer database are matched to the submission according to their expertise. The SMRJ Editor regularly updates the peer reviewer database.

4. Peer reviewer evaluations: Peer reviewers are expected to evaluate whether the manuscript is: a) original, b) methodologically sound, c) follows appropriate ethical guidelines, d) has results that are clearly presented and support the conclusions, and e) correctly references an adequate number of previous relevant work. Language correction is not an expected part of the peer review process.

5. Peer review timeline: The time required for the review process is dependent on the response of the referees. Should the peer reviewers’ reports contradict one another or an evaluation is unnecessarily delayed, a further expert review will be sought. In rare cases for which it is extremely difficult to find a second expert peer
to review the manuscript, decisions at this stage to accept, reject or ask the author for a further revision may be made on the basis of one reviewer’s report. A composite file concerning the Editor’s decision will be sent to the corresponding author with recommendations made by peer reviewers, which will usually include verbatim comments by the referees.
Revised manuscripts might be returned to the initial referees who may then request another revision of a manuscript.

6. **Final post-review decision:** A final decision to accept or reject the manuscript is made by the Editor and sent to the author along with any further recommendations made by reviewers.

**Manuscript Decision Appeals**
An author who disagrees with a decision to reject a submitted manuscript for SMRJ may file a written appeal to the Editor stating reasons for their disagreement. Within one week of receipt, the Editor will submit a response back to the authors and may route the manuscript in question to additional reviewers with expertise in the subject area who were not involved in the initial review.

When applicable, secondary reviewer feedback will return their reviews to the Editor within two weeks of receipt of the manuscript. The Editor will then take the recommendations of this additional feedback into consideration in making a final decision on the acceptability of the manuscript.
Spartan Medical Research Journal
Journal Content Access and Copyright Policy

As an open-access journal, the Spartan Medical Research Journal (SMRJ), will make all articles freely available to read online from the time of publication through the Michigan State University Statewide Campus System (SCS).

The SMRJ observes and operates in accordance with the "Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals" established by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) (http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf) and endeavors to adhere to all ethical guidelines contained therein.

Open Access and Article Processing Processes

1. The final version of all SMRJ journal issues and articles will be immediately posted by the editorial team on the SCS webpage at: https://scs.msu.edu/smrj/ pursuant to institutional and subject repositories standards
2. The SMRJ open access policy practices are in line with all US funder policy
3. Authors are not charged with any article processing charges or other publication fees.

Permission Requirements

- Authors are responsible for obtaining written permission from publishers and authors to adapt or reprint previously published tables, illustrations, and other graphic elements. Authors must submit such signed permissions from publishers and authors once their manuscripts are accepted for publication in SMRJ. Likewise, authors must submit signed permission from anyone explicitly named in their studies, including named sources for unpublished data and individuals listed in the acknowledgments.
- Authors serving in the US military must obtain armed forces' approval for their manuscripts and provide military or institutional disclaimers when submitting manuscripts.
- Failure to submit appropriate permission forms may delay publication.
- Investigators are encouraged to make arrangements for retention of primary data in an accessible form for at least ten years following publication of their manuscript.
- No commercial sales of content included within SMRJ is in any way, shape or form permitted.
Copyright Parameters

Shortly after manuscript acceptance, authors will receive an e-mail from the editor requesting them to sign and return a copyright agreement form. *SMRJ* is copyrighted by the Michigan State University Board of Trustees, and will follow the 2007 (or any later versions) of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) Statement on Publishing Agreements ([http://www.cic.net/docs/default-source/library/authorsrights.pdf](http://www.cic.net/docs/default-source/library/authorsrights.pdf)), as endorsed by the MSU Academic Council in September 2007. Under this agreement, authors maintain non-exclusive rights to their publication, and six months after original publication will have the right to make digital versions of their publication available in other forums.
Spartan Medical Research Journal Errata & Corrigenda Policy

The Spartan Medical Research Journal (SMRJ) of the Statewide Campus System (SCS) in the Michigan State University College of Osteopathic Medicine (MSUCOM) shall observe the following policy concerning changes or additions to accepted articles. For the purposes of this document the term Editor encompasses all Editor title variations and is limited to those individuals who have final acceptance responsibility.

Changes/Additions to accepted articles

All content of published SMRJ articles are subject to the editorial review process, organized by and under the auspices of the Editor. Should the authors wish to add to their article after acceptance, they must submit a request to the Editor and the new proposed content will be reviewed.

If the new material is additional to the accepted article, it must be submitted for peer review as a new manuscript, referring back to the original;
If the new proposed content should replace the original content of the accepted article, the Editor may consider the publication of an Erratum or a Corrigendum.

Erratum

An erratum refers to a correction of errors introduced to the article by the publisher. All publisher-introduced changes are to be highlighted to the author at the proof stage and any errors are ideally identified by the author and corrected by the corresponding author and SMRJ Editor before final publication. Authors who notice a subsequent post-publication error should contact the Assistant Editor or Editor of the SMRJ team.

Corrigendum

A corrigendum refers to a change to their article that the author wishes to publish at any time after acceptance. Authors should contact the Editor of the journal, who will determine the impact of the change and decide on the appropriate course of action. SMRJ will only instigate a corrigendum to a published article after receiving approval and instructions from the Editor.