**Meeting Minutes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meeting: | SPAN Steering Committee Meeting |
| Date/ Time: | 6/30/21 12am-1pm PT |
| Present: | Patrick Lyden, Jessica Lamb, Enrique Leira, Andreia Morais, Andrew Goh, Anil Chauhan, Basav Sanganahali, Cenk Ayata, Dan Thedens, Nirav Dhanesha, David Hess, Fahmeed Hyder, Jarek Aronowski, Jelena Mihailovic, Kris Dhandapani, Kris Wood, Lauren Sansing, MB Khan, Rakesh Patel,Pradip Kamat, Mariia Kumskova, Rakesh Patel, Takahiko Imai, Marcio Diniz, Francesca Bosetti, Jim Koenig, Ryan Cabeen, Lee, Karisma Nagarkatti |

**Agenda Items**

1. **SPAN Stage 2** 
   1. Stage 2 randomizations have begun and surgeries start next week.
   2. Dr. Lyden asked all PIs to work hard to reduce data entry errors
   3. Updated SOPs have been uploaded on SPAN website [www.spannetwork.org](http://www.spannetwork.org)
   4. Each site to upload a 1-minute Corner Test video and a 1-minute Grid Video using the new IDA Uploader 2.0
      1. Reminder: Videos need to be placed in a folder for the application to recognize the mp4 file.
   5. Investigators are asked to complete Corner Test certification to record/score baseline video
   6. Grid Certifications will be distributed once Grid Scoring has been decided on in below agenda item
   7. For MRI image acquisition, sites are asked to use Stage 2 Pilot memo until MRI group meets on 7/06 and distributes the new SOP 35 MRI Acquisition protocol
2. **MRI/TTC Pipeline Validation** 
   1. Investigators who will outline TTC using online outline tool
      1. Yale-Ali Herman
      2. AG- Kristofer Wood
      3. JH- Ewa Kulikowicz
      4. UTH- Andrew Goh
      5. U Iowa-Nirav Dhanesha
   2. Ryan working on outline tool. Once finalized each site investigator will receive credentials for accessing the online tool.
3. **Grid Scoring** 
   1. How to score total steps
      1. Dr. Ayata (MGH): not statistically significant, may need to count all steps
      2. Dr. Kumskova (UIOWA): It is important to add the left rear steps. It is almost identical counting right rear and multiplying by 4 and counting all steps.
      3. Dr. Aronowski (UTH): we should initially continue experiment in Stage 2.
   2. Assignment to Sites
      1. 2 Videos count totals steps using Method A or B
      2. Method A: Count rear foot for 5 min
      3. Method B: Count steps for each foot (front left, front right, rear left, rear right) animal takes for 5 min.
      4. Dr. Lyden presented results. For one animal that took less steps and made more foot faults, Method A and Method B were in agreement. For animal that took many steps, the two Methods were not in agreement.
   3. Consensus Decision: First 100 animals, count all four limbs to calculate total steps. CC will analyze the data and feedback to sites.
4. **SPAN Paper Discussion**- Paper was emailed to SPAN PIs
   1. Authorship: Publication policy (included as an attachment) states that, in concept, everyone is welcome, but we will follow guidelines set by ICME (please see <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html> ) . The latest ICME recommendations are attached. Contribution must be more than generating data or writing the grant. If you were involved in something (designing, collecting data, writing grant) and then you take the manuscript and edit it this qualifies you as a name author. The ICME uses the following criteria: The ICMJE recommends that authorship be based on the following 4 criteria:
      1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
      2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
      3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
      4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.
   2. Authors are in alphabetical order except first and last few. It is up to the PIs discretion which investigators from the site are involved. Require active involvement in the paper and a contribution in SPAN (design, data collection, analysis, etc.). Alternative: SPAN Investigators, some journals only permit one co-author per site.
   3. Dr. Leira : Though we are replicating clinical trials, this is different from clinical trial publications. We should give authorship to those folks. Academic credit on the front page.
   4. Dr. Sansing: We have pushed our trainees to put in many long hours and ideas for this project. We should open this opportunity up to them as well. Academic credit on the front page.
   5. Dr. Hess: I agree
   6. Fahmeed: I agree, at least the first paper should be more inclusive than exclusive. Intellectual contribution comes in many forms.
   7. Dr. Bosetti: Most Journals have these requirements unless there is an intellectual contribution one should not be named an author. Dr. Bosetti disagrees that everyone should be on the paper.
   8. Dr. Bosetti: Based on Dr. Lyden’s comments PI’s can determine the intellectual contribution, but it is not a given based on seniority
   9. Site PI determines authorship worthy contribution to SPAN, give the investigator the manuscript and have them send in edits.
   10. Acknowledgments
       1. Adding sentence about investigators working during COVID
   11. What is the landscape of the next few papers?
       1. This paper is the foundation. All basic questions you have about this experiment are answered in the first paper.
       2. Primary paper: Methods paper and endpoint
       3. Secondary paper: Hypotheses
       4. Tertiary paper: Specific papers
   12. Feedback:
       1. More description on how to construct an animal network, with constant feedback to create the protocols as we go.
       2. Show how the network was envisioned and how it was implemented. The biggest take away, unlike what would have been a clinical trial, but we discussed the possibility of having the community interact with the data. Potential for creating multiple papers (video and MRI data) if that is accessible that could be huge.
       3. Research resource type of paper. we share SOPs, how do we do corner, how do we validate these things, how do you do the MRI pipeline, etc.
       4. Paper describing the process. What is in the paper is the end result but not the process of how we got there. Agreeing on protocols, agreeing on the images, and getting to an idea. This is unique and is interesting. Methods should say in the stages what we did.
       5. Paper should tell a story. There should be a growth timeline. Maturation timeline concept.
       6. Suggestion: Site should collate responses from investigators and send input to Dr. Lyden.
       7. Sites are requested to provide as much text as you can.
   13. Tertiary papers
       1. If you would like to do a project, identify a person, mentor that person and ask us for data. Send a proposal with a hypothesis, what analysis will be done, data dictionary is sent, we create the data and send it to them
   14. Journal
       1. Science Translational Medicine
5. **Decisions**
   1. Grid Scoring: Consensus decision to count all four limbs to calculate total steps for the **first 100 animals**. CC will analyze the data and feedback to sites.
   2. Authors are in alphabetical order except first and last few. It is up to the PIs discretion which investigators from the site are involved. **Require active involvement in the paper and a contribution in SPAN (design, data collection, analysis, etc.)**. Reference Publication Policy and ICME guidelines.