

Table E-1: Perceptions of Authors' Contributions

		Author 1	Author 2	Author 3	Author 4	Author 5	None	Unsure
Study Conception and Design	(A)	18 (86%)	4 (19%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	6 (29%)	0	2 (10%)
	(B)	14 (67%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	15 (71%)**	0	3 (14%)
Acquisition of Data	(A)	14 (67%)	10 (48%)	5 (24%)	5 (24%)	6 (29%)	1 (5%)	4 (19%)
	(B)	14 (67%)	8 (38%)	6 (29%)	5 (24%)	4 (19%)	0	5 (24%)
Analysis and Interpretation	(A)	17 (81%)	6 (29%)	3 (14%)	2 (10%)	9 (43%)	0	3 (14%)
	(B)	14 (67%)	5 (24%)	4 (19%)	3 (14%)	12 (57%)	0	4 (19%)
Drafting of the Manuscript	(A)	19 (90%)	5 (24%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	5 (24%)	0	1 (5%)
	(B)	18 (86%)	2 (10%)	3 (14%)	3 (14%)	10 (48%)	0	1 (5%)
Critical Revision of Manuscript	(A)	17 (81%)	8 (38%)	4 (19%)	4 (19%)	11 (52%)	0	2 (10%)
	(B)	11 (52%)*	4 (19%)	4 (19%)	4 (19%)	17 (81%)*	0	2 (10%)
Statistical Analysis	(A)	4 (19%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	3 (14%)	2 (10%)	3 (14%)	11 (52%)
	(B)	3 (14%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	3 (14%)	0	3 (14%)	12 (57%)
Obtaining Funding	(A)	7 (33%)	0	0	0	5 (24%)	3 (14%)	6 (29%)
	(B)	3 (14%)	0	0	0	9 (43%)	3 (14%)	8 (38%)
Administrative Support	(A)	6 (29%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	5 (24%)	4 (19%)	8 (38%)
	(B)	3 (14%)	0	0	0	10 (48%)	4 (19%)	7 (33%)
Supervision	(A)	10 (48%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	10 (48%)	2 (10%)	3 (14%)
	(B)	4 (19%)*	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	17 (81%)*	2 (10%)	2 (10%)
Most Prestigious Position	(A)	18 (86%)	0	0	0	1 (5%)	0	2 (10%)
	(B)	17 (81%)	0	0	0	5 (24%)	0	0
Second Most Prestigious Position	(A)	1 (5%)	9 (43%)	0	0	8 (38%)	0	3 (14%)
	(B)	3 (14%)	4 (19%)	0	0	12 (57%)	0	2 (10%)
Author who Contributed the Most Work Overall	(A)	20 (95%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (5%)
	(B)	17 (81%)	0	0	0	2 (10%)	0	2 (10%)

(A) First Author is corresponding author. \*  $p < 0.05$  when compared with (A), \*\* $p < 0.01$  when compared with (A)

(B) Last Author is corresponding author.

Table E-2: Perceptions of JBJS Editorial Board Members

---

“If the first author is not the individual who actually wrote the manuscript, that fact should somehow be discussed (footnote or asterisk).”

“Chairmen and senior faculty should not be listed as authors unless they substantively contributed to a study.”

“Our program demands that staff define their contribution according to set criteria. Journals could also do the same.”

“We must generate some consensus and collect views/positions from those in other subspecialties and fields.”

“British Medical Journal system is cumbersome but comes closest to dealing with issues of respective contributors.”

“If a resident in training publishes his/her research, he should always be listed as first author.”

“I think study conception is the biggest/most important intellectual contribution and should be acknowledged.”

“This generates significant confusion. Outside orthopaedics, the first and last authors are most important. It seems in orthopaedics that the second author is given more significance than the last.”

“Whatever the order, the significance of the order should be understood by all. It is not the order but the meaning of that order that is critical.”

---