

Guidelines on Publications Produced as Consensus Documents for the USCLC Alone or in Conjunction with Other Societies

1. Consensus guidelines produced from USCLC sponsored workshops or meetings

- a. Authorship, including order of authors: The individual who raised the idea, organized the program/session and recruited speakers should be given option of being first author. Speakers should be asked if interested in being core authors. Other authors determined from input to publication. Order of authors based on amount of work and input on the draft of paper.
- b. BOD approval: By at least a 2/3 vote of all members. If disapproval, authors may publish without USCLC endorsement.

2. USCLC consensus publications produced by USCLC with or without collaboration with other societies and unrelated to prior material presented at workshops or meetings

- a. Determination of subject matter:
 - i. The idea for a project/paper addressing a need within the field of cutaneous lymphoma can be presented by any member of the USCLC to the BOD. The BOD will discuss the data supporting such a need and determine if this is of value to move forward as a society related paper. If this project includes use of Registry data, this project idea will be forwarded to the Registry Committee for further review.
 - ii. If the USCLC BOD determines that the subject matter would be worthwhile to address as a multi-society paper or project, then the President or his/her designee, in conjunction with the presenter, will approach the other society(s) to see if there is interest in moving forward together. If this project includes use of Registry data, this project idea will be forwarded to the Registry Committee for further review.
- b. Determination of authors and order of authors
 - i. For USCLC only publication (excluding Registry related publications)
 - a. The initial person who presented the idea for the paper should be given the option of being first author unless it is clear that someone else has done far more groundwork on this or the presenter does not have the time or interest to put into being first author.
 - b. The BOD of the USCLC can make suggestions for authors but should look beyond the BOD themselves for the most appropriate experienced people
 - c. The first author can suggest co-authors, taking into account the recommendations of the BOD
 - d. Order of authors determined by who has done most work and requires tracking by first author. Senior author may be the person who has published most in area who is helping to oversee project or the person who has done the second most work in the project and elects this position over second author.
 - e. Final approval: 2/3 vote USCLC BOD
 - ii. For USCLC joint society(s) publication (excluding Registry related publications):

- a. The initial person who presented the idea for the project/paper should be given the option of being first author unless it is clear that someone else has done far more groundwork on this or the presenter does not have the time or interest to put into being first author/project manager or the project will involve more work by others who should be given rights of refusal of first author.
- b. If the other Society wishes to consider participation in this project/paper, the BOD of each society should send an invitation to all members of their society who have published on this topic previously to see if they are interested in being an author: this list can be determined by sending a general query to the membership or reviewing the literature on the topic for persons who previously published on the topic. Up to 6 people should then be chosen jointly by the first author and society(s) BOD to be considered as the core authors to help the first author in making the initial draft: these should be representative of the various societies involved in the publication. All others who said they were interested in being authors, including all involved in the project at all levels, who were not chosen as key authors should be sent drafts of the paper and if they respond and make substantial input into the paper (defined as additional information or revisions that substantially enhance content of paper) or contributed significantly in the collection of data for the paper, can be continued as authors in the order of their input into the paper. Responding as “fine” or “no changes” to a request for review is not considered as having any input in the paper and thus these people would not be considered authors.
- c. Final approval: 2/3 vote BOD each Society part of the Consensus project

3. Publications/Guidelines produced by other group or person but endorsed by the USCLC

- a. Procedure for approaching the USCLC: Any individual or Society can send the USCLC BOD a publication that is completed and either not yet submitted or has been published for consideration of USCLC endorsement.
- b. Determination of approval.
 - i. The BOD can approve or disapprove or can appoint a Task Force to review the paper and the literature on the topic to determine if the USCLC should endorse the paper.
- c. Final approval by the BOD: By at least a 2/3 vote of all members

4. Publications/Projects/Guidelines initiated by other Societies

- a. Procedure for approaching the USCLC: the BOD of the initiating society should send the Officer(s) of the USCLC the basic project plan for consideration
- b. The BOD of the USCLC should review the plan and if interested in participating, inform the inviting Society and suggest USCLC members to participate. The USCLC members would be determined by general information decimated to all members and volunteers considered for involvement. All efforts should be made to involve some members outside BOD and young members particularly.
- c. The initiating society will work with USCLC BOD to determine how USCLC members can best participate.

- d. Authorship should be discussed upfront and rules for authorship order discussed and agreed upon by each society BOD. Authorship should in general be based on amount of work done drafting the paper and work contributed to collection of data. All societies should have representative core authors that help to draft the paper. All others who said they were interested in being authors, including all involved in the project at all levels, who were not chosen as key authors should be sent drafts of the paper and if they respond and make substantial input into the paper (defined as additional information or revisions that substantially enhance content of paper) or contributed significantly in the collection of data for the paper, can be continued as authors in the order of their input into the paper. Responding as “fine” or “no changes” to a request for review is not considered as having any input in the paper and thus these people would not be considered authors.
- e. Final approval for each Society endorsing publication should come from each Society’s BOD with 2/3 approval needed.
- f. The final order of the societies on the consensus document should start with the initiating Society