

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF ZOOLOGICAL MEDICINE CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTANCE OF PUBLICATIONS BY THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

June 2017

(Previous revisions 2010, 2013, 2016)

A. NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS

1. The minimum requirement is five (5) publications including up to four (4) well written case reports and at least one (1) original investigation based on the author's experience in zoological medicine or other related fields of study.

B. AUTHORSHIP OF PUBLICATIONS

1. The applicant must be the first author. In cases where there are two first authors, only one of the first authors can submit the publication for inclusion in the credentialing application. The publication must have resulted from the applicant's research (MS or PhD) or practice of zoological medicine (Veterinary Student, Intern, Resident or postgraduate).

C. PUBLICATION TYPE

1. Each manuscript must be published in a refereed journal. A refereed journal is defined as one governed by policies and procedures established and maintained by a standing editorial board that requires each manuscript submitted for publication to be critically reviewed and approved by at least one recognized outside authority on the subject.
2. Book chapters and proceedings are not acceptable.
3. Review articles are not acceptable unless the author(s) has documented expertise in the area and is contributing material beyond a review of the literature.
4. What is your diagnosis type publications are not acceptable.

D. MANUSCRIPT ACCEPTANCE

1. The manuscript must be **fully accepted for publication** prior to the deadline for applying for the certification examination. "Fully accepted" means that a letter from the editor indicates that the manuscript has been accepted for publication without further review, editing which changes the meaning of the content of the manuscript. Additional changes involving typesetting, formatting and style are acceptable.

E. RELEVANCE TO ZOOLOGICAL MEDICINE

1. If a candidate is unsure if a publication will be considered relevant to zoological medicine by the Credentials Committee, it is suggested that he/she write a letter of defense to the

Credentials Committee explaining why the publication is relevant to zoological medicine. This explanatory letter should be attached to the publication in question so the Credentials Committee can use it in their deliberations.

2. If a publication's relevance to zoological medicine is in question, the Credential's Committee may ask a candidate to write an explanatory letter in defense of the publication.

F. MEANINGFUL CONTRIBUTION TO THE LITERATURE

An acceptable manuscript must make a meaningful contribution to the literature of zoological medicine. Specifically, the Credentials Committee will evaluate the following points:

1. Case reports must include extensive literature review and assimilation of background information regarding the case described. If very few occurrences of a particular condition in a species have been reported, then even a few cases can add meaningfully to the body of knowledge. In contrast, adding cases to the literature concerning a condition that is well-known and adequately described is not considered a meaningful contribution (e. g., the reporting of a common neoplasia in a new species without additional information is not considered a meaningful contribution to the literature).

For a case report to make a meaningful contribution to the literature, it must:

- a. Present a novel diagnostic approach, diagnostic technique, a novel therapeutic approach, medication or treatment technique that significantly expands the clinical repertoire for the readership. or
 - b. Present a previously unreported disease process (novel pathogen or metabolic derangement, novel virus-induced neoplasia, etc.) or the clinical case presents a common disease that is being reported in an unexpected, novel taxa (West Nile virus in crocodiles, for example), or
 - c. Present the identification of a previously described condition in a new species that has significant management implications for the sustainability of that species, or
 - d. Present evidence that challenges the currently accepted understanding of a disease process (ie. Adds a dimension or raises doubts on existing tenets) or contributes significantly to expanding the body of knowledge of an emerging disease.
2. The design and description of the original investigation(s) must be sufficient to assure that adequate information has been obtained to allow evaluation of the results and substantiation of the conclusion(s). The original investigation must include some statistical analysis of results. Well-designed retrospective studies may be acceptable for credentialing. Publications may be rejected for poor study design.

3. The information in the publication must not have been published previously, other than in abstract or proceedings form. Any previous publication of the information must be declared in the application.

4. If several publications contain substantially the same information, only one will be accepted for evaluation. Publications can focus on the same subject, but not be the same in content.