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Webinar overview

• Introduction: authorship issues & COPE resources

• Presentations by guest speakers

• Discussion (Q/A): please type your questions in the **Question Box** *(not the Chat Box)*

*Recording & summary report will be uploaded to COPE website*
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Importance of authorship

• Record of attribution
• Moral and legal rights
• Accountability in investigations
• Key in shaping research/academic careers
Authorship practices

- Larger groups (100s-1000s of authors); multiple institutions, countries, disciplines; new disciplines
- Depends on culture, research group, department, institution, discipline, journal, country…
COPE resources on authorship

publicationethics.org/resources

• 122 / 566 COPE Forum cases related to authorship, mostly author disputes

• *How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers*

• COPE flowcharts:
  o What to do if you suspect ghost/guest/gift authorship
  o How to spot authorship problems
  o Adding/removing authors before publication
  o Adding/removing authors after publication
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COPE resources on authorship
publicationethics.org/resources

• eLearning module on authorship
• Discussion document: *What constitutes authorship?*
  publicationethics.org/files/u7141/Authorship_DiscussionDocument_0_0.pdf
**COPE Webinar:** Standards in authorship

**ORCID**

Open Researcher and Contributor ID
- Persistent digital identifier for researchers

**CRediT**

Consortia Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information (CASRAI)
Contributor Roles Taxonomy (CRediT)
- Standardised contributorship roles

**ICMJE**

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors
- Declaration, 4 authorship criteria

[orcid.org](http://orcid.org)  [www.casrai.org/credit](http://www.casrai.org/credit)  [icmje.org](http://icmje.org)
Q

Can we or should we standardise authorship across disciplines?
Authorship Issues in the Humanities and Social Sciences

Deborah Poff, CM, PhD
The Problem of Talking about the Humanities and Social Sciences together
Humanities Distinction

Important point not said frequently enough
Authorship issues

• Most articles and monographs single authored.

• Thesis supervision often results in student publications but mostly with no expectation of authorship on the part of the supervisor or members of the supervisory committee.

• Frequently, ethical issues are not so much about authorship as they are about: excessive self-citation; plagiarism, redundant publications and the problem of citation in ‘received wisdom.’
Social Sciences

• More similarities with sciences generally.
• Considerable work done on research integrity, publication ethics and authorship, among professional organizations, such as, the APA, ASA, CSA, CPA, etc.
• There is some family resemblance within the Social Sciences in terms of authorship norms with exceptions (e.g., unless otherwise stated, authors are listed alphabetically and when that practice is not followed, the order indicates the level of authorial leadership and responsibility for the publication).
• Within some disciplines, for example, Psychology, the assumption is that with respect to journal articles based on a thesis or dissertation, the student is first author.
• Social Sciences generally have a smaller number of authors per research project although this can vary with large labs and multidisciplinary teams.

• With respect to the Social Sciences overall, from my experience as an EIC and from research in the field, most authorship disputes arise from not clearly stipulating authorship roles prior to engaging in the research or because of interpersonal conflict that arises between the co-investigators or members of the team.
• With respect to clarity and transparency about authorial roles, guidelines like the ICMJE or the American Psychological Association are helpful in identifying the substantive roles that must be present for ascribing authorship within the Social Sciences.

• Particularly with respect to students, but also for the sake of all researchers in a project, the best practice of identifying roles and responsibilities in writing (with agreement) is crucial to avoiding disputes later.
Some Unique Issues for Social Scientists

• Given the unique cultural factors in some Social Science research, unique common understanding among researchers and the participants of research needs to be identified upfront.

• E.g., many Aboriginal communities require that members of the community are authors in all research that takes place in those communities and also assert that they can veto publications if they believe the findings to be harmful to the communities.
Relationship between Journals and Institutions during Investigations

• Reasonably and for legal and labour relations factors, universities conduct investigations with respect to misconduct in publications.

• This can be an unusually long and protracted process which leaves the journal either making interim process announcements or making decisions independent of university investigations.
COPE’s Pilot Project with Universities

While COPE respects the autonomy of university governance, we are in a test pilot mode with respect to creating a category of university membership in COPE. We hope that among other things this will lead to:

1. Enhanced common educational practices on publication ethics issues, including appreciation of distinct issues for different disciplines, and

2. Common understanding of the role and importance of journals in knowledge dissemination and the protection of research integrity with the mutual understanding of how this matters to universities.
Thanks very much

Deborah Poff, CM, PhD
Vice-Chair and Chair-Elect, COPE
Email: poffd@brandonu.ca
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Lightning Poll 1
Engaging Research Institutions in Authorship Outreach
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Why do institutions care about authorship?

Authorship as a metric:
• Authorship confers credit (Rennie & Glanagin, 1994; JAMA)
• Research institutions use publications as a metric to highlight academic productivity and the achievement of impact
Why do institutions care about authorship?

Desire to avoid authorship conflict:
- Researchers
- Journals

**Solution:** Internal authorship policies
Need for training and support
- How to draft useful policies which are broadly applicable and in line with international best practice
- How to stay up to date with changes in authorship best practice
- When and how to incorporate novel tools/practices as policy
  - Risk averse: don’t want to ask more of busy researchers
- How to create and disseminate training to researchers
  - Potential for shared resources, policy templates
Research integrity officers (RIO)
• Often reactive rather than proactive due to resource constraints
• Could standard training be developed to support those acting in these roles?
• Are networks established within/between countries for RIO’s to get the support they need?

Publications Officers
• Dedicated staff who could be responsible for teaching what is and isn’t ethical in regards to authorship
Institutions need to take a seat at the table

• Typically only interact with journals when dealing with alleged misconduct
• There needs to be monitoring of changes to authorship policies and researcher needs assessments
• Contribute to implementation of new tools
  • CRediT
• Along with authorship comes important responsibilities; research institutions have an obligation to support their employees in publications best practice.
Engaging Research Institutions in Authorship Outreach

Thank You

Kelly Cobey
Senior Clinical Research Associate, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute

kcobey@ohri.ca
@kdcobey
http://www.ohri.ca/journalology/
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Lightning Poll 2
EXPLAINING THE CONTRIBUTOR ROLES TAXONOMY (CRediT)

Liz Allen
Director, Strategic Initiatives, F1000

29 June 2017
PROBLEMS WITH AUTHORSHIP WELL ESTABLISHED

When Authorship Fails
A Proposal to Make Contributors Accountable

Drummond Rennie, MD; Veronica Yank; Linda Emanuel, MD, PhD


Authorship: time for a paradigm shift?

BMJ 1997;314 doi: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.314.7086.992 (Published 05 April 1997)
Cite this as: BMJ 1997;314:992
CHANGING CURRENCY: AUTHORSHIP

**THE AUTHOR LIST:** GIVING CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

- **The first author**
  Senior grad student on the project. Made the figures.

- **The third author**
  First year student who actually did the experiments, performed the analysis and wrote the whole paper. Thinks being third author is “fair.”

- **The second-to-last author**
  Ambitious assistant professor or post-doc who instigated the paper.

- **The second author**
  Grad student in the lab that has nothing to do with this project, but was included because he/she hung around the group meetings (usually for the food).

- **The middle authors**
  Author names nobody really reads. Reserved for undergrads and technical staff.

- **The last author**
  The head honcho. Hasn’t even read the paper but, hey, he got the funding, and his famous name will get the paper accepted.

DEMISE OF THE LONE AUTHOR
RATIONALE FOR MORE ABOUT CONTRIBUTION ...

**Researchers**
- Credit for true contribution
- Credit for ‘new’/specific roles
  - Identify collaborators
  - Benefit junior reviewers
- Reduce authorship politics?
  - Accountability

**Research funders**
- Supporting grant applications
  - Understanding impact
    - Awarding credit
    - Identifying peer reviewers
- Identifying new funding opportunities

**Research institutions**
- Support tenure & appointment
- New esteem indicators for staff
  - Understanding impact

** Publishers**
- Increase transparency
- Reduce author disputes
  - Simplify process of chasing authors
  - Identifying peer reviewers
1. Wellcome-Harvard workshop 2011
2. Initial collaboration with medical editors (ICMJE)
3. Developed draft taxonomy (2012/13)
4. Pilot with corresponding authors (2013)
5. Refine taxonomy & consultation phase 2 (2014 - )
6. casrai ‘custodian’ of CRediT (2014 - )
   (http://casrai.org/CRediT)
7. Implementations 2015 onwards ....
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization</td>
<td>Ideas; formulation or evolution of overarching research goals and aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Development or design of methodology; creation of models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Programming, software development; designing computer programs; implementation of the computer code and supporting algorithms; testing of existing code components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>Verification, whether as a part of the activity or separate, of the overall replication/reproducibility of results/experiments and other research outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Analysis</td>
<td>Application of statistical, mathematical, computational, or other formal techniques to analyse or synthesize study data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Conducting a research and investigation process, specifically performing the experiments, or data/evidence collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Provision of study materials, reagents, materials, patients, laboratory samples, animals, instrumentation, computing resources, or other analysis tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Curation</td>
<td>Management activities to annotate (produce metadata), scrub data and maintain research data (including software code, where it is necessary for interpreting the data itself) for initial use and later re-use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing – Original Draft</td>
<td>Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically writing the initial draft (including substantive translation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing – Review &amp; Editing</td>
<td>Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work by those from the original research group, specifically critical review, commentary or revision – including pre- or post-publication stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically visualization/data presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Oversight and leadership responsibility for the research activity planning and execution, including mentorship external to the core team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>Management and coordination responsibility for the research activity planning and execution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Acquisition</td>
<td>Acquisition of the financial support for the project leading to this publication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vection is the main contributor to motion sickness induced by visual yaw rotation: Implications for conflict and eye movement theories

Suzanne A. E. Noojj, Paolo Pretto, Daniel Oberfeld, Heiko Hecht, Heinrich H. Bültzhofer

Published: April 5, 2017 • http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175305
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Contributorship badges: a new project

Posted on November 21, 2014 by Abigail Cabunoc Mayes

At the Science Lab, we’re always looking for opportunities to work with the community to build prototypes that help research thrive on the open web. We find that these prototypes are best approached by bringing together existing tools and the right groups rather than starting from scratch. This way, we can bridge gaps in workflow and communities while building on existing work done in this space.

http://credit.casrai.org/#
New Results

Transparency In Authors' Contributions And Responsibilities To Promote Integrity In Scientific Publication

Marcia McNutt, Monica Bradford, Jeffrey Drazen, R. Brooks Hanson, Bob Howard, Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Veronique Kiermer, Michael Magoulias, Emilie Marcus, Barbara Kline Pope, Randy Schekman, Sowmya Swaminathan, Peter Stang, Inder Verma

doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/140228
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Next steps

• Please comment on COPE Discussion Document: *What Constitutes Authorship?*
  publicationethics.org/files/u7141/Authorship_DiscussionDocument_0_0.pdf

• Please give us yourfeedback by responding to the email we will send you after this webinar
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Thank you!

Special thanks to:
Linda Gough, Sarah Gilmore, Elizabeth Moylan,
Natalie Ridgeway, Heather Tierney
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