CRediT Taxonomy

Implementation at CellPress
Timeline

- Began in **May 2015**
- Initial decision to first paper: **3 months**
- 16 research journals + 1 society title
Considerations

- Optional versus mandatory
- Low-tech versus tech-heavy
- Resources and workload
- Whether to allow the 3 degrees of contribution
- Clarity of communication
- Types of papers to include
- Approach for society titles
Cell Press approach

Lean approach
- Optional
- Low-tech

Engage community
- Blog posts
- Work with CASRAI and other organizations

Gauge uptake and response
- Track uptake
- Conduct surveys
Involvement

**Senior Management:** High-level support

**Marketing:** Blog

**Editorial:** Support and communication

**Editorial Operations**
- Familiarity
- Author support
- Editorial messaging

**Production:** Author communication

**KEY ADVOCATE**

Persuasion:
1. Lots of information
2. No extra work
Implementation

• Blog post

Giving authors the CRediT they deserve

Posted by Deborah Sweet  | Published June 03, 2015, 09:00

• Information for Authors

Author Contributions Section: To make author contributions transparent, all research articles should include an Author Contributions section. Please describe the contributions concisely and use initials to indicate author identity. We encourage you to use the CRediT taxonomy, which offers standardized descriptions of author contributions. An Authors Contributions section is not required for front-matter articles.

• Author communication

Author Contributions: CRediT Taxonomy
Lastly, Cell Press has recently decided to endorse the Project CRediT taxonomy of contributor roles in Author Contributions sections. Use of this is optional; however, if you are interested, please review the taxonomy overview available at http://www.cell.com/pb/assets/raw/shared/guidelines/CRediT-Taxonomy.pdf and provide your copyeditor with any necessary changes. Also, if you have any thoughts about the value of this taxonomy, please let me know. We are keen to know what authors think about the use of the standard taxonomy versus the more traditional, descriptive approach.
Results

CRediT Adoption at Cell Press

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q3 2015</th>
<th>Q4 2015</th>
<th>Q1 2016</th>
<th>Q2 2016</th>
<th>Q1 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers that Use CRediT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author Contributions section becomes mandatory
Author feedback

The first time you used CRediT, did you find it easy or difficult to apply the taxonomy?

  87% “very” or “moderately” easy

How useful did you find CRediT in accurately reflecting the contributions of all authors?

  76% “extremely” or “very” useful

Would you use the taxonomy in future papers?

  43% “definitely” | 56% “probably”
What we learned

Pros and cons to an optional approach:
• Pro: Less work to test, responsive approach
• Con: Difficult to prioritize development

Need feedback from a range of users

A key advocate is vital to success
Future plans

Surveys

Infrastructure support
• Submission system role capture → manuscript
• XML capture
• Online display enhancement

Long-term goal: Enable role search across papers
THANK YOU