

Collaborative Research and Authorship Policy

Policy Code: RES-002 **Version:** 2.0 **Effective Date:** 20 June 2014

Purpose:

Scholarly integrity and the responsible conduct and reporting of research are essential for maintaining public trust in the research enterprise, and for community benefit from research discovery. This Policy outlines the principles and guidelines which inform the College's approach to collaborative research and the appropriate attribution of authorship.

Definition of "College" – *In the higher education sector, the Australian College of Natural Medicine Pty Ltd (ACNM) trades as Endeavour College of Natural Health, and WellNation. For the purpose of this Policy, any reference to 'College' or 'the College' should be considered a reference to each or any of these respective trading names.*

- Scope:**
- All permanent staff
 - All contract academics
 - External researchers

Policy Statement

The outcomes of research may be disseminated in a variety of ways but enduring forms, such as journal articles, are particularly important and to be an author for such a form is commendable. Scientific and scholarly publications, defined as articles, abstracts, presentations at professional meetings and grant applications, provide the main vehicle to disseminate findings, thoughts, and analysis to the scientific, academic, and lay communities. For academic activities to contribute to the advancement of knowledge, they must be published in sufficient detail and accuracy to enable others to understand

and elaborate the results. For the authors of such work, successful publication improves opportunities for academic funding and promotion while enhancing scientific and scholarly achievement and reputation. At the same time, the benefits of authorship are accompanied by a number of responsibilities for the proper planning, conducting, analysis, and reporting of research, and the content and conclusions of other scholarly work.

Authorship is an explicit way of assigning responsibility and giving credit for intellectual work. Authorship practices should be judged by how honestly they reflect actual contributions to the final product. Authorship is important to the reputation, academic promotion, and grant support of the individuals involved as well as to the strength and reputation of their institution. The College is committed to following the principles and practices of appropriate attribution of authorship as outlined in the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* developed by the National Health and Medical Research Council and the Australian Research Council.

This Policy applies to all College permanent staff members and contract academics.

The College in its sole discretion reserves the right to modify the [Collaborative Research and Authorship Policy](#) at any time.

Principles for Collaborative Research and Authorship

Principle 1: Academic integrity and transparency are paramount

Researchers should be able to justify their conduct to one another, to publishers, and the broader community. They should deal fairly and respectfully with each other.

Principle 2: Researchers have a responsibility to publish their findings. This is because:

- a. Knowledge production is the primary purpose of research, so failing to publish undermines the research enterprise;
- b. Non-publication fails the funder of research, usually the taxpayer; and
- c. Ethical justification of involvement for human participants or animals in research necessitates an expectation that some benefit or good will be produced, most obviously through publication.

Researchers should consider not only whether they have a moral obligation to publish, but whether they may have a moral obligation to publish or disseminate the results of their research in ways that can provide benefit to a wide range of audiences.

Principle 3: Responsibilities are shared in a research team. These responsibilities differ according to one's experience, seniority and role.

Responsibility for publication in collaborative research is shared among team members. However the seniority and experience of those team members determine the nature of their responsibility.

Senior researchers have a greater responsibility in their research teams, by virtue of their experience and their position in the research community. This entails a responsibility to mentor junior researchers, assisting them to become independent productive authors. Senior researchers should:

- a. Take responsibility for ensuring that authorship is discussed in their teams (see [Principle 4](#));
- b. Contribute their own original analysis and writing, increasing project productivity, creating authorship opportunities for other team members, and providing leadership;
- c. Support junior researchers to improve their own work, thus contributing to the development of their capabilities and independence as researchers;
- d. Identify and respect the original contributions of junior researchers, conscientiously avoiding any unwarranted authorship claims on a junior researcher's original work; and
- e. Mentor junior researchers in practical aspects of authorship including managing team dynamics, submitting for publication and relating to editors and reviewers.

Junior researchers also have responsibilities within research teams. Junior researchers should:

- a. Recognise that fulfilling their publishing commitments is critical to the present and future viability of their research team;
- b. Seek the support they need to permit timely completion of research work and submission of manuscripts; and
- c. Work diligently toward the preparation of specific manuscripts as agreed with the research team.

Principle 4: Authorship should be explicitly negotiated from the beginning of the project and throughout a project

Difficulties with authorship generally arise when expectations differ between team members. Research team leaders should initiate discussions about authorship from the very beginning of a project and throughout a project. A team should either agree to

implement these guidelines as written, or should agree on and record an alternative set of principles and processes. Expectations about each team member's contribution to research and publication should be made explicit.

Principle 5: Each author on a manuscript should have a reasonable warrant for authorship

The College generally supports the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) guidelines for authorship and contributorship: in particular, the notion of 'warrant' for authorship on a publication. The tradition of 'silent' or 'gift' authorship for people who have made no meaningful contribution contravenes the ICMJE guideline; College publications should not include silent authors.

The following are generally considered warrants for authorship:

- a. Substantial contribution to the conception and design, data collection, and / or data analysis and interpretation for that publication, plus
- b. Contribution to the drafting and / or revision of the manuscript.

The following are not generally considered sufficient warrants for authorship:

- a. Acquisition of funding;
- b. Data collection, although qualitative data creation may constitute a warrant if it makes a significant conceptual contribution to the project;
- c. Giving feedback on a draft manuscript without contributing to conceptualisation, analysis or interpretation;
- d. Payment for services rendered as a researcher or consultant (payment does not exclude warrant, but is not sufficient for warrant);
- e. Being a supervisor of an author on the publication; or
- f. Being the Head of Department in which the author or authors are employed.

There may be other grounds for deciding that a team member has a reasonable warrant: if so, the reasons should be clearly articulated within the team.

Principle 6: Publications need a Lead Author

Generally, preparation of a manuscript is best led by one person. In this Policy, that person is referred to as the Principal Author (PA). One is PA for a particular manuscript, not for a whole project.

Principle 7: Principal Authorship is best shared amongst team members on a research project

When a team plans many manuscripts from one project, principal authorship of these manuscripts should be shared among team members. Having one PA for all papers

makes the project team vulnerable if the PA does not deliver, and makes the PA vulnerable to exploitation or unrealistic expectations from other team members.

Conversely, all members of a team should have equitable access to PA opportunities, in accordance with their abilities and interests.

Principle 8: Principal Authors are lead authors, and are responsible for practical production tasks

The PA is responsible for leading the writing of a manuscript, and for practical aspects of the publication process.

Principle 9: Principal Authors adjudicate warrants for authorship

The PA is responsible for adjudicating warrants for authorship on a manuscript. This includes:

- a. Deciding who is named as an author on the publication and in what order authors are listed;
- b. Deciding whose contribution is acknowledged; and
- c. Fielding any claims or challenges relating to authorship, and dealing with any disputes arising from them.

These principles are relevant to all discussions of authorship in academic research centres including those related to publishing reports of original, scientific research; conference presentations; intellectual products: words or images; in paper or electronic media; whether published or prepared for local use; in scientific disciplines or the humanities; and whether intended for the dissemination of new discoveries and ideas, for published reviews of existing knowledge, or for educational programs.

Authorship Roles and Responsibilities

Lead Author

Unless agreed otherwise, the PA is also the lead author. The lead author assumes overall responsibility for the manuscript, and also often serves as the managerial and corresponding author, as well as providing a significant contribution to the research effort. A lead author is not necessarily the principal investigator or project leader. The lead author is responsible for:

- a. Approval: Providing the draft of the manuscript to each individual contributing author for review and consent for authorship. The lead author should obtain from all co-authors their agreement to be designated as such and their

approval of the manuscript. A journal may have specific requirements governing author review and consent, which must be followed.

- b. Integrity: The lead author is responsible for the integrity of the work as a whole, and ensuring that reasonable care and effort has been taken to determine that all the data are complete, accurate, and reasonably interpreted.

Co-authors

All co-authors of a publication are responsible for:

- a. Authorship: By providing consent to authorship to the lead author, co-authors acknowledge that they meet the authorship criteria set forth in section 1 of this Policy. A co-author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take responsibility for appropriate portions of the content.
- b. Approval: By providing consent to authorship to the lead author, co-authors are acknowledging that they have reviewed and approved the manuscript.
- c. Integrity: Each co-author is responsible for the content of all appropriate portions of the manuscript, including the integrity of any applicable research.

An individual retains the right to refuse co-authorship of a manuscript if he / she does not satisfy the criteria for authorship.

Acknowledgements

Individuals who may have made some contribution to a publication, but who do not meet the criteria for authorship, such as staff, editorial assistants, medical writers, or other individuals, can provide a valuable contribution to the writing and editing of publications. Since those contributions do not meet the criteria for authorship under this Policy, those individuals should be listed in an acknowledgement and / or contributor-ship section of the work.

Attribution of Research Output Affiliation

In order that College achievements and investment in research receive appropriate acknowledgement and contribute to all relevant measures of performance the College must be attributed as the institution of affiliation by all College staff, students, and by contract academics and affiliates where appropriate. This should be the case whenever the work was conducted at the College, even if an author / creator has subsequently left the institution, as the meaningful institutional support of both past and current university employers can count for some reporting purposes and is good research practice.

Unacceptable Authorship

Guest, gift, and ghost authorship are all inconsistent with the definition of authorship, and are unacceptable and a violation of this Policy.

Guest (honorary, courtesy, or prestige) authorship is defined as granting authorship out of appreciation or respect for an individual, or in the belief that expert standing of the guest will increase the likelihood of publication, credibility, or status of the work.

Gift authorship is credit, offered from a sense of obligation, tribute, or dependence, within the context of an anticipated benefit, to an individual who has not contributed to the work.

Ghost authorship is the failure to identify as an author, someone who made substantial contributions to the research or writing of a manuscript that merited authorship, or an unnamed individual who participated in writing the manuscript. Ghost authorship may range from authors for hire with the understanding that they will not be credited, to major contributors not named as an author.

Research Funding

All authors, in manuscripts submitted for review and publication, must acknowledge / disclose the source(s) of support for the work. Support includes research and educational grants, salary or other support, contracts, gifts, and departmental, institutional and hospital support.

Financial Conflicts of Interest

Authors shall fully disclose, in all manuscripts to journals, grant applications, and at professional meetings, all relevant financial interests that could be viewed as a potential conflict of interest or as required by the University and / or journal. All such financial interests must also be reported internally as required by the University's conflict of interest policies.

Order of Authorship

Many different ways of determining order of authorship exist across disciplines, research groups, and countries. Examples of authorship policies include descending order of contribution, placing the person who took the lead in writing the manuscript or doing the research first and the most experienced contributor last, and alphabetical or random order. While the significance of a particular order may be understood in a given setting, order of authorship has no generally agreed upon meaning.

The College encourages the use of descending order of contribution when determining attribution of authorship. However, the discretion of the research team and the principal author is respected in this issue.

Processes for managing these responsibilities are outlined in the [Process for Assigning and Managing Authorship and Process for Managing Disputes about Authorship](#) documents.

Definitions: A **student** is an individual person who is formally enrolled to study at the College. The individual person is that who appears on the College's documents such as enrolment, admission and payment documents, and who is assigned an individual student ID.

Related Procedures

[Attribution of Publication Affiliation Procedure](#)

Further Information

Related Policies: [Office of Research Funding Policy](#)

Benchmarking: Australian Research Council
Harvard Medical School
Monash University
National Health and Medical Research Council
University of Sydney
Washington University

Supporting Research and Analysis: Not applicable

Related Documents: [Grant Proposal Assessment Instructions](#)

Related Legislation: Not applicable

Guidelines: [Assigning Authorship and Authorship Dispute Guideline](#)
[International Committee of Medical Journal Editors \(ICMJE\)](#)

Policy Author:	Associate Director Research
Policy Owner:	Associate Director Research
Contact:	Associate Director Research rebecca.reid@endeavour.edu.au
Recommending Body:	Research Management Committee Meeting date: 21 May 2014
Approval Body:	College Council Meeting date: 20 June 2014
Policy Status:	Revised
Responsibilities for Implementation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Research • Research Management Committee
Key Stakeholders:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic staff • Director of Education • Office of Research staff • Students