

CNBP Authorship Policy
Policy Adapted from the University of
Adelaide Authorship Policy (June 2012)

Overview

The CNBP adopts the principles embodied in the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* (http://www.arc.gov.au/general/research_integrity.htm), including the requirements for the attribution of authorship in research publications. This Policy is designed to ensure CNBP compliance with the Code.

In addition this document outlines obligations as per the CNBP Participation Agreement which all named Centre Partners Organisations have signed.

To be an author, it is essential to have made a substantial scholarly contribution to the published work. While specific practices may differ from discipline to discipline, there are a number of overarching ethical principles and procedures to which all researchers are expected to adhere. These formal procedures are also intended to minimise potential disputes over authorship issues.

Scope and Application

This Policy applies to all staff, students, AIs, CIs and PIs of the CNBP who are involved in the conduct of research associated with the CNBP. This policy is aimed to complement the existing Authorship Policies of CNBP associated institutions. In this regard, we accept the Code definition of research as 'original investigation undertaken to gain knowledge, understanding and insight'.

PRINCIPLES

1. Determining Authorship

1.1 Although attribution of authorship depends to some extent on the discipline involved, in line with the Code and the 'Vancouver Protocol' on Authorship and Contributorship, authorship must be based on a substantial contribution to at least two of the following three activities:

- Conception and design of the project;
- Analysis and interpretation of research data;
- Drafting significant parts of the article or critically revising it so as to contribute to the interpretation.

1.2 Authorship must not be offered purely on the following grounds:

- Holding a position of authority (e.g. head of a research group or a supervisory role);
- Facilitating the acquisition of funding;
- Providing routine assistance in some aspects of the project;
- Providing a technical contribution, data that has already been published or materials obtained from third parties, but no substantial input to the project or publication.

In this context, 'honorary' authorship is not acceptable.

1.3 We recognise that there can be significant intellectual property involved in the provision of materials and know how for the research. Where this intellectual property has been a critical part of the work, this may be considered grounds on which to offer authorship.

1.4 Each individual author must be able to take public responsibility for the part of the work they contributed.

1.5 Publication may not proceed, if any of the authors have legitimate reservations concerning the theory, data or its interpretation underpinning critical parts of the work.

1.6 All individuals and organisations that contributed to the research outcome (e.g. research assistants, technical writers, funding bodies, the University, the CNBP), must be properly acknowledged within the publication.

PROCEDURES

2. Authorship Protocols

2.1 There are the following authorship roles for a paper

2.1.1 corresponding author: This author will manage communication about the work with the publisher.

2.1.2 executive author: This author will take formal responsibility for the determination of authorship and order of authors in accordance with the authorship policy of the CNBP and that of the executive author's institution. In addition, the executive author will take formal responsibility for the integrity of the work and manage the repository of the publication.

2.2 In circumstances where there is more than one author, a corresponding author and an executive author must be appointed. Depending on the field, corresponding and executive author might be the same person. Depending on the field, the corresponding author is the first author or the senior author (group leader). In most cases, the executive author will be the senior author leading the work.

- 2.3 As an acknowledgement of the CNBP and institutional contribution to the delivery of research outcomes, authors must cite their CNBP and institutional affiliation or affiliations in any publication.
- 2.4 In compliance with the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research*, an 'Authorship Declaration' should be completed by the author of a publication or, where there are multiple authors, by the corresponding author. This must be done before the publication is presented in a public forum.
- 2.5 In accordance with the *ARC Open Access policy* (http://www.arc.gov.au/applicants/open_access.htm), any peer reviewed journal publication, arising from an ARC supported research project, must be deposited into an open access institutional repository within a 12 month period from the date of publication.
- 2.6 All authors must declare (as part of journal submission) any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to their research project.
- 2.7 Publications can only proceed once all written consent has been obtained by all parties to whose intellectual property rights could be prejudiced or compromised by the publication. Failure of the consenting party to respond within 10 days will constitute written approval for this clause.
- 2.8 Details of all publications accepted for publication must be reported to the Chief Operating Officer and the Centre Director

3. Authorship Responsibility: Executive Author (where there are joint authors)

- 3.1 At an early stage of the research project, discuss authorship of a research output with all other researchers involved, and review whenever there are changes in participation. Authorship is to be offered to all people, including research trainees, who meet the criteria for authorship listed in this Policy.
- 3.2 Appoint a corresponding author.
- 3.3** Determine the order of authorship in discussion with all other researchers involved.
- 3.4 Acknowledge all individuals and organisations that contributed to the research outcome, (e.g. research assistants, the CNBP, the University, etc.). Where individuals are to be named, obtain their written consent, where practicable.
- 3.5 Ensure that all authors have approved the version to be published, unless circumstances are such that this is not possible. If an author is deceased or cannot be contacted following reasonable efforts, the publication may proceed provided that there are no grounds to believe that this person would have objected to being included as an author.
- 3.6 Lodge a copy of the publication with each University's institutional repository, in accordance with their guidelines.

4. Dispute Resolution

4.1 It is acknowledged that, on occasions, disputes over authorship may arise. Where researchers are unable to reach mutual agreement on an issue of authorship, the following procedures apply:

4.2 Any person involved in the dispute may seek advice from the CNBP Director, CNBP COO, Node Leader or their relevant University Research Integrity Advisor.

4.3 Continuing disputes over authorship are to be referred for attempted resolution to the Executive Dean of the corresponding author. Disputes involving co-authors from other institutions are to be handled by the institution of the corresponding author.

4.4 If the dispute remains unresolved within 30 days of referral under clause 3.2, it will be referred to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Research) at the University of Adelaide for determination (as the administering institution). The DVC & VP(R) may engage an external arbitrator or mediator to assist in this process, although the final decision remains with the University of Adelaide.

4.5 Outcomes from the dispute process may include the following options:

- agreement is reached by all valid authors (as defined in Principle 1.1);
- individuals who do not meet the authorship criteria will not be included as authors of the publication, but may have their contributions acknowledged in the publication;
- where valid authors cannot agree on content, the publication might be divided in such a way that some sections can be published separately, or not published at all; or
- where disputes concerning publications arise over matters not directly related to the inclusion or exclusion of an author, content or interpretation of data, a reasonable decision may be made that permits the paper to be published and the dispute to be suitably acknowledged.

4.6 Any determination made as part of a dispute resolution will not be considered grounds for findings of research misconduct. However, proceeding to publication without agreement or formal determination of authorship may be considered a breach of the Code or a case for research misconduct.

5. Dispute Resolution Responsibility

5.1 *Centre Director*: Attempt resolution of authorship disputes.

5.2 *University of Adelaide, Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Research)*: Where it has not been possible to resolve authorship disputes at the faculty level, make a determination on what action will be taken.

DEFINITIONS

Authorship is granted to any individual who has made a substantial scholarly contribution to the published work.

A **Publication** is defined as the formal dissemination of research findings in a public forum whether in hardcopy, electronic, web-based or other tangible forms. It includes refereed and non-refereed books and journals, web-pages, conference presentations, creative works, technical papers, etc. It does not include a student thesis.

Written consent includes original hand-written signatures, emails, fax, scanned documents or electronic identification as appropriate.

Breaches of the Code involves actions or omissions that constitute breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, but lack the seriousness of consequence or wilfulness to constitute research misconduct. However, repeated or continuing breaches of the Code may constitute Research Misconduct.

Research Misconduct means fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or deception in proposing, carrying out or reporting the results of research, failure to declare or manage a serious conflict of interest, and avoidable failure to follow research proposals as approved by a research ethics committee, particularly where this failure may result in unreasonable risk or harm to humans, animals or the environment. It also includes the wilful concealment or facilitation or research misconduct by others.

RMO File/Document Number	
Policy Custodian	COO, Kathy Nicholson
Responsible Officer	COO, Kathy Nicholson
Endorsed by	Dir, Mark Hutchinson
Approved by	EMC
Related Documents and Policies	
Date Effective	7 June 2017
Next Review Date	7 June 2019
Contact for queries about the Policy	COO, Kathy Nicholson