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Authorship

Why be an author?

- Most visible form of credit
  - acknowledgments
  - appropriate reference citations
- Important for settling disputes and dealing with allegations of research misconduct
- To identify who is responsible for the work and its interpretation
- Funding agencies consider authorship success in the allocation of research grants
- Evidence of creative contributions that warrant promotion/tenure
- To attract new trainees and willing collaborators
- To define intellectual property rights.

Central to the structure of science

Authorship v. Acknowledgment v. Citation
Authorship

Who gets to be an author

- Participate sufficiently in the work so as to take public responsibility for its content
- Willing (and able) to respond to questions about the work
- Made substantial contribution to all of the following:
  - conception and design; or
  - acquisition of data; or
  - analysis and interpretation of data; or
  - drafting the article; or
  - revising it critically; and
  - final approval of the version to be published

(Wilson, NCSU, 2002)
Authorship
Who does not get to be an author

The following are not sufficient to justify authorship:

- Participating solely in acquisition of funding
- Participating solely in collection of data
- Supervising the overall activities of the research group
The primary author (i.e., first author) is generally chosen based on an evaluation of contribution to the conception, planning and execution of the study. Generally done after the work has been performed, but before the paper is written.

- Originality of contribution
- Major intellectual input
- Major feature of manuscript
- Greatest overall contribution

- Alphabetical?
- Contributions
- Last author
- Corresponding author
- Who settles disputes?
Responsible Authorship

Who regulates?

- No federal regulations - Other than copyright law and federal definitions of research misconduct, nearly all aspects of authorship and publication are covered only by guidelines and unwritten standards
- Journals and Professional Societies have developed authorship policies and guidelines
- Academic institutions SHOULD develop authorship policies and guidelines

Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE)

In 1978, a group of editors proposed uniform guidelines for publication medical journals, including specific criteria for authorship. These guidelines for publication are periodically updated; the most recent update was February 2006. These guidelines may be accessed at:

http://www.icmje.org/index.html

Committee on Publication Ethics

COPE is a forum for editors of peer-reviewed journals to discuss issues related to the integrity of the scientific record; it supports and encourages editors to report, catalogue and instigate investigations into ethical problems in the publication process (from their mission statement)

http://www.publicationethics.org.uk/
Publication practices
Avoiding Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results or words without giving appropriate credit.

A finding of plagiarism is considered to be research misconduct.

Self-plagiarism, while not a great practice (unless you cite yourself), is NOT considered to be misconduct as defined U.S. federal regulation*... what does your policy allow?

A government-wide definition of Research Misconduct was proposed by the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP, 2000) and is now covered in the Code of Federal Regulations (42 CFR Part 93.103) for both the Public Health Service (PHS, 2006), the National Science Foundation (NSF, 2006), and other agencies as well.
Publication practices
More things to avoid

Dividing research findings into the smallest publishable units might increase the total number of publications, but works against the interests of science. This is an inefficient use of scarce resources, including space in journals and the time of authors, editors, and reviewers. It can give the false impression that a line of research has been more extensively pursued than is actually the case.

Publication of data in more than one location gives the findings more visibility, but can mislead readers into believing that the publications represent distinct data sets. Any data set, either in whole or in part, should not be published twice without making explicitly clear which of the data have been published previously and where and when the work was published. For the submission of papers, most journals require that the work not be submitted simultaneously elsewhere for consideration. Submission of a paper is tantamount to provisionally giving the selected journal copyright to the work, and it initiates considerable expense of time and effort in reviewing the manuscript. Only when an article has been rejected by or withdrawn from consideration in one journal may it be submitted elsewhere.
**Publication practices Prohibited?!**

**Ghostwriting**: is a practice whereby a commercial entity writes an article or manuscript and a researcher, clinician or otherwise recognized expert in a particular field of study is named as an author. This includes papers or presentations featuring data that were simply presented to the named author (without the opportunity for that person to analyze directly, perform calculations, review and/or question the data). Making minor revisions to an article, manuscript or presentation that is ghostwritten does not justify authorship.

**Honorary or courtesy authorships**: If the named author(s) did not make a contribution consistent with the established criteria for authorship or are contrary to the principles of the institutional guidance, then they are considered “honorary or courtesy” and as such, are prohibited.
The integrity of the work is best served by rapid correction of misleading or mistaken information. A decision to submit a correction or retraction should not be taken lightly and should involve all the authors of the paper. Despite any perceived risks, there are also advantages to an appropriate correction or retraction. Admitting error is typically perceived as a sign of integrity and concern for the highest standards. Failure to admit to an error can be devastating if the problem is first discovered by others. If errors are discovered after a manuscript has been published, then authors have several options, depending on the significance of the errors:

Errata: If minor errors are found, then a letter describing the error(s) should be submitted to the journal that published the article.

Correction: If unintentional errors are great enough to undermine part of a report, then the authors should submit a letter to the journal explaining the errors as a correction to the publication.

Retraction: If unintentional errors are of such a magnitude as to invalidate or seriously undermine the entire report or if misconduct affecting the work on the part of one or more authors is found to have occurred, then the authors should retract the paper by writing to the editor of the publication.
Citing for success

Acknowledge the funding!

No one would argue about the necessity to cite references when using other people’s (or your own prior) work. Equally important is to properly cite funding sources – with national Institutes of Health – this is a must... but all funding should be declared, in addition to any financial conflicts of interest that might appear to affect the results.
Acknowledgments
Funding and contributions of materials

Example:
A.J.M. was supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from the American Heart Association (12POST11890019). This study was supported by US National Institutes of Health grant HL107653 (A.R.T.). We thank A.L. DeFranco and C.A. Lowell of the University of California, San Francisco for providing Lyn−/− bone marrow cells and W. Tong of the University of Pennsylvania for providing the antibody to c-MPL for flow cytometry analysis.

Citing funding sources for a grant application or progress report for NIH is very specific...
Open Access Publishing

NIH Public Access Policy
PubMedCentral (PMC)
My NCBI – eRA Commons
NPPR

Overview
The NIH Public Access Policy ensures that the public has access to the published results of NIH funded research. It requires scientists to submit final peer-reviewed journal manuscripts that arise from NIH funds to the digital archive PubMed Central immediately upon acceptance for publication. To help advance science and improve human health, the Policy requires that these papers are accessible to the public on PubMed Central no later than 12 months after publication.

Preparation is Key to Avoiding Delays in Funding. Some suggestions:
• Use My NCBI’s My Bibliography feature to monitor Public Access compliance for all the applicable papers that you author or arise from your NIH award. Be sure to create an account using your eRA Commons ID, or link your current account with your eRA Commons account.
• As you plan a paper or support one with your NIH award, discuss with the authors how the paper and the NIH awards that support it will comply with the Public Access Policy.

How to Comply
All of your papers that fall under the NIH Public Access Policy, whether in press or in print, must include evidence of compliance in all of your NIH applications and reports.

1. **Determine Applicability**
   Does the NIH Public Access Policy apply to your paper?

2. **Address Copyright**
   Ensure your publishing agreement allows the paper to be posted to PubMed Central in accordance with the NIH Public Access Policy.
PubMedCentral
PMC ID - MyNCBI - RPPR

• Not the same as a PubMed number!

• Must be used and formatted in a very specific way.

• MyNCBI pulls information directly from Commons

• Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) [http://grants.nih.gov/grants/RPPR]
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