1. 2013 CSG meeting – presentations now online

The 2013 annual meeting of the Cochrane Skin Group, which was held at The University of Nottingham, King's Meadow Campus, Nottingham, England, in December, was a great success.

The speakers presentations are available to download here:

http://skin.cochrane.org/csg-annual-meeting-2013

2. Thank you Jo Leonardi-Bee

We would like to thank Jo Leonardi-Bee (top left in the picture above) who has been a stalwart Statistical Editor for the Skin Group for the past 10 years. She has not only helped with our protocols and reviews but has given us great stats talks at our Annual Skin Group meetings. Last August Jo was made Director of Postgraduate Teaching in the new School of Medicine at Nottingham University and has now decided to step down from her role within the Skin Group. However, she will continue to be a member and has assured us we can call on her in times of need.

Hywel, Finola, Laura and Liz at the editorial base
Now and again, I come across that unsavory aspect of publication called *honorary (or passenger) authorship*, i.e. senior colleagues adding their names to papers simply on the grounds that they are senior and have allowed their juniors to do the work in their department. It is human nature, and it reminds me of the story of the Little Red Hen, which is as true in adult life as it is in the nursery rhyme. You can find a wonderful 3-minute recording of it in YouTube by Pie Corbett here [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JdvJZD-cplg](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JdvJZD-cplg).

Previous research in 2002 (Mowatt G et al. *JAMA*. 2002;287(21):2769-2771) has shown that honorary and ghost authorship might have occurred in around 40% of Cochrane reviews, but I suspect that figure is a lot less now. But *it still goes on, especially for junior lead reviewers who are not in a strong position to challenge senior colleagues who do very little*. Perhaps that may apply to me one day, so juniors, please don't be afraid to question my contribution on Cochrane reviews and to simply acknowledge me rather than include me as an author if I have not done very much. I don’t want to stir up a revolution here, as it needs to be appreciated that different people bring different skills to a review. The fact remains that a small part of the team does most of the hard graft on a review in selecting studies, abstracting data and drafting the basic text. But sometimes, having a content expert on board in very helpful in order to ensure that the context and conclusions are sound.

I do hope that we don’t have any Little Red Hens in our skin group. It is very much for Cochrane teams to sort out any within-team disputes about authorship amicably and sensibly, but if you need any guidance, Cochrane advice – found in section 4.2.2 Authors of the Handbook – is very clear: ‘Ideally, the order of authors should relate to their relative contributions to the review. The person who contributed most should be listed first.’
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