

Authorship Procedure

Version 1 – Approved 12 July 2021

Contents

Purpose	1
Applicable governance instruments	1
Procedure.....	2
1. Scope.....	2
2. Authorship criteria	2
3. Attribution of authorship.....	3
4. Multiple authors.....	4
5. Authorship agreement	4
6. Order of authorship	5
7. Corresponding author	5
8. Acknowledgements.....	5
9. Accountability for research output.....	6
10. Subsequent publications.....	6
11. ORCID (Persistent Digital Identifier).....	7
12. Affiliation with the University	7
13. Resolving authorship disputes	7
14. Authorship and breaches of the Code	9
Related procedures.....	9
Versions.....	10

Purpose

This Procedure describes when and how to attribute authorship for research outputs, consistent with the principles and responsibilities of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (the Code) related to the authorship of research. It also explains the process for resolving disputes about authorship in a fair and timely manner if they arise.

Applicable governance instruments

Instrument	Section	Principles
<i>Research Policy</i>	2 Responsible conduct of research 4 Research data and output	2.1 - 2.2 4.3
<i>Intellectual Property Policy</i>	2 Ownership and assignment	2.1 - 2.2
<i>Behaviour Policy</i>	1 Behaviour	1.1

<i>Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018</i>		
<i>Authorship: A guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research</i>		

Procedure

1. Scope

- 1.1. This Procedure applies to the authorship of all research outputs (including non-traditional research outputs) and the attribution of authorship in other documents related to research, such as research proposals, projects and plans, grant applications, reports for funding agencies, tenders, patents and patent applications, and research theses.
- 1.2. This Procedure also applies to web-based publications and applications, including professional blogs and any form of authored research output that is made publicly available.

2. Authorship criteria

- 2.1. An author is an individual who:
 - a) has made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to research and its outputs, and
 - b) has agreed to be listed as an author.
- 2.2. While authorship conventions vary across disciplines, for a person to qualify as an author their significant intellectual or scholarly contribution must include one and should include a combination of two or more of the following:
 - a) conceiving and/or designing the project or output
 - b) acquiring research data where the acquisition has required significant intellectual judgement, planning, design, or input
 - c) contributing knowledge, where justified, including Indigenous knowledge
 - d) analysing and/or interpreting research data
 - e) drafting significant parts of research output/s or critically revising output/s to contribute to interpretation.
- 2.3. These are minimum thresholds for authorship, noting that some publications and disciplines may require a higher threshold.
- 2.4. Where a discipline, publisher, journal or other organisation involved in authorship requires a higher threshold for authorship, that threshold must be met.

3. Attribution of authorship

- 3.1. Authorship must be offered to all people who meet the criteria for authorship, including research trainees (which include early career researchers, Higher Degree by Research (HDR) candidates, and undergraduate students), research assistants, cultural advisors, and industry/community co-researchers.
- 3.2. Care should be taken to recognise Indigenous researchers and their inclusion as authors in accordance with section 2.
- 3.3. Authorship must not be attributed when an individual has not made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to a research output.
- 3.4. Authorship will not be attributed solely on the basis of:
 - a) the provision of funding, materials, infrastructure and/or access to equipment
 - b) providing materials or data from third parties or that have already been made publicly available
 - c) collecting data where the collection of the data has not required significant scholarly or intellectual contribution or expertise
 - d) the provision of routine technical support, technical advice or technical assistance
 - e) the position or profession of an individual, such as their role as the author's supervisor or head of department ('gift authorship')
 - f) whether the contribution was paid for or voluntary, and/or
 - g) the status of an individual who has not made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution being such that it would elevate the esteem of the research ('guest authorship').
- 3.5. Contributions or support as described in section 3.4a-d, which do not meet the criteria for authorship, may meet the criteria for Acknowledgements in accordance with section 8.
- 3.6. A supervisor of a research trainee is entitled to authorship if the supervisor has participated in the research in a way that meets the authorship criteria in section 2.
- 3.7. Research trainees who meet the authorship criteria in section 2 are entitled to authorship, notwithstanding that they may have been more closely supervised than other authors.
- 3.8. Sometimes the editor of a significant collective work or anthology of research papers has made contributions analogous to those of authors and, in such cases, similar criteria may apply to 'editor' as to 'author'. However, the term 'editor' should be applied only to a person who has played a significant role in the intellectual shaping of a publication.
- 3.9. 'Ghost authorship' - where an individual such as a research assistant or industry researcher meets the criteria for authorship but is not acknowledged as an author - is not an acceptable practice.
- 3.10. A person who qualifies as an author must not be included or excluded without their written agreement. This written agreement should be provided by each author in a timely fashion.

- 3.11. If an author is deceased, this should be noted in the publication.

4. Multiple authors

- 4.1. Collaborating researchers will discuss authorship at an early stage in the research.
- 4.2. As a project evolves, it is important to continue to discuss authorship, especially if new people become involved in the research and make a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution, or if a collaborating researcher leaves the project.
- 4.3. Where there is more than one author, it is good practice for an authorship agreement to be in place before the commencement of writing the content of a research project and updated as required.

5. Authorship agreement

- 5.1. An authorship agreement must:
- a) identify those who will be recognised as the authors of the research output
 - b) describe the contribution that each author has made (or will make) to the research output
 - c) list the order in which the authors appear
 - d) identify at least one corresponding author who is responsible for communication with the publisher and managing communication between the co-authors.
- 5.2. Prior to submitting the research output, the authorship agreement must also include evidence that all authors have approved the manuscript or research output that will be submitted for publication and agree to be accountable for it.
- 5.3. Prior to publication, the authorship agreement must also include evidence that all authors have approved the final version to be published.
- 5.4. An authorship agreement does not need to be a formal legal document. The authorship agreement may take various forms, including the UTAS Authorship Agreement Form, a journal's author agreement form, a transcript of an online discussion, or email correspondence between authors, providing that the authorship documentation meets the above criteria.
- 5.5. Publication can proceed, provided there are no grounds to believe that a person would have objected to being included as an author, where:
- a) an author is deceased, or
 - b) after all reasonable efforts, an author cannot be contacted, and those efforts have been documented.

In such instances, it may be appropriate for an author's institution to provide written agreement for the inclusion of an author.

6. Order of authorship

- 6.1. The agreed order of authors' names in the authorship list will be consistent with any applicable disciplinary norms and requirements of the publication.
- 6.2. Where no such conventions exist, the order of authorship should reflect the relative contribution of the collaborating researchers. The authorship criteria specified above can be used to assess the relative contribution of each author for a specific research output.

7. Corresponding author

- 7.1. The corresponding author has primary responsibility for ensuring that all contributors to the research output are properly recognised regardless of their position or any changes in their position or role.
- 7.2. The corresponding author will:
 - a) ensure that authorship has been offered to all individuals, including research trainees and students in accordance with section 2
 - b) maintain written records of the authorship agreement (refer to Section 5 of this Procedure)
 - c) manage and retain all correspondence between co-authors relating to authorship confirmation and the order of authorship, including any agreed changes
 - d) keep written records that confirm that all authors approve of the manuscript or other research output that will be submitted, and of the final version to be published
 - e) manage communication about the research output with the publisher/venue/facilitator.
- 7.3. If the corresponding author is based at another institution, co-authors affiliated with the University will designate one University co-author as a University responsible author. The University responsible author will ensure, to the best of their ability, that the corresponding author fulfils the above responsibilities.

8. Acknowledgements

- 8.1. All individuals who have contributed to the research, facilities or materials, but whose contribution does not meet the criteria for authorship attribution in accordance with section 2, must be properly acknowledged in the resulting research output/s.
- 8.2. The contribution of research infrastructure must be recognised.
- 8.3. Funding bodies must be acknowledged in a manner consistent with that described in the relevant funding agreement.
- 8.4. As a general rule, researchers should obtain permission from named contributors before acknowledging them in research outputs, since acknowledgement may imply a contributor's endorsement of the research output.

- 8.5. Express permission must be obtained to acknowledge Indigenous peoples, organisations, and communities.
- 8.6. Researchers intending to publish Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property (ICIP) must first seek approval in accordance with the Management of Intellectual Property Procedure. The individual and collective contributors of the knowledge must be offered authorship or acknowledged, as appropriate.
- 8.7. All data and information used as an input to a research project should be appropriately referenced and cited in the presentation, publication or sharing of research. In referencing and citing the work of others, researchers should follow accepted norms and standards for scholarly literature. Researchers who use a publicly distributed dataset must follow the citation or acknowledgement as required by the data provider.

9. Accountability for research output

- 9.1. All listed authors are collectively accountable for the whole research output.
- 9.2. An individual author is directly responsible for the accuracy and integrity of their contribution to the research output. Where an individual author does not accept this responsibility the research output should be amended to remove their contribution and co-author status.
- 9.3. Authors must take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the contributions of all other co-authors. They should, where feasible, be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific parts of the work and should raise any concerns about the accuracy and integrity of the research before submission or publication.
- 9.4. Following publication, all authors must ensure that any concerns about the accuracy or integrity of any part of the output are appropriately responded to. This process may mean providing all necessary evidence to demonstrate the accuracy and integrity of their contribution/s or seeking such evidence from other co-authors. The process may result in correcting the public record by way of erratum or retraction.
- 9.5. If an author is deceased (or cannot be contacted after reasonable attempts have been made), all the co-authors must still have confidence in the accuracy and integrity of that author's contribution. Establishing this confidence may require consideration of the underlying data and methodology.

10. Subsequent publications

- 10.1. Collaborating researchers should agree on the approach that will be taken for subsequent publications that arise from a research project. This should include a discussion of whether authors of the current output will be invited to collaborate on subsequent publications, and how the current output and authors will be acknowledged. This agreement will be made in accordance with Section 3.8.

- 10.2. Supervisors and HDR candidates will, at the time of thesis submission, indicate co-authorship for chapters (or part-thereof) of the thesis that may be published in the future. This agreement will be made in accordance with Section 3.8.

11. ORCID (Persistent Digital Identifier)

- 11.1. University researchers are expected to create and maintain an [ORCID](#) and add it to their profile.

12. Affiliation with the University

- 12.1. University researchers will explicitly acknowledge their University of Tasmania affiliation in any research outputs, grant applications, contracts and other scholarly work arising from their University role. The listing will include the University of Tasmania and the researcher's [organisational unit](#). Relevant external or multiple University of Tasmania affiliations may also be included and where possible as a separate by-line.

13. Resolving authorship disputes

- 13.1. Resolution of authorship disputes can be difficult. Researchers involved in an authorship dispute are encouraged to seek advice from a [Research Integrity Adviser](#) or their Head of Academic Unit (HoAU) in the first instance. Higher Degree by Research candidates are also encouraged to seek support in accordance with the HDR Supervision & Academic Support Procedure.
- 13.2. Parties to an authorship dispute must make all reasonable efforts to resolve the dispute in a fair, consistent, clearly communicated, and timely manner. Researchers will:
- a) comply with the University's [Behaviour Policy](#) and
 - b) treat fellow researchers and others involved in the research with respect and
 - c) not obstruct progress of a research project or output
 - d) cooperate in any process undertaken to resolve a dispute regarding authorship.
- 13.3. If an authorship dispute arises between co-authors, they will first attempt to resolve the dispute and reach an agreement in direct dialogue with each other. A record of authorship dispute discussions and any agreement reached should be made and kept by the researchers involved in the dispute.
- 13.4. This informal resolution process may not be possible in situations where:
- a) power imbalances exist between authors, notably relevant for early career researchers and students
 - b) there are breakdowns in communication, and/or
 - c) there is a failure to accept accountability for contribution/s.

- 13.5. Where the dispute cannot be resolved and involves co-authors from other institutions, the dispute should be managed by the institution of the corresponding author or as agreed by the co-authors. University co-authors are encouraged to seek support from their HoAU in the event the dispute resolution is being managed by another institution.
- 13.6. Where the dispute cannot be resolved and involves co-authors who are all affiliated with the University, the corresponding author will refer the dispute to their Associate Dean(s) Research Performance (ADRP). The ADRP will nominate a person with the relevant expertise and seniority to determine the matter.
- 13.7. If the dispute occurs outside of College/University Institute structures, or if the ADRP has a conflict of interest, the matter will be referred in writing to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) (DVCR) (research.integrity@utas.edu.au). The DVCR will nominate a person with the relevant expertise and seniority to determine the matter.
- 13.8. The nominee of the ADRP or DVCR will attempt to resolve the dispute by agreement. If the dispute cannot be resolved in this way, the dispute will be referred in writing to the DVCR (research.integrity@utas.edu.au).
- 13.9. The DVCR may request of the author/s provision of any or all the following information:
 - a) a copy of the documentation used for acknowledging authorship
 - b) copies of any key documentation to show how each of the authors have
 - i. met the criteria for authorship attribution as detailed in Section 2 Authorship criteria
 - ii. given final approval of the version to be published
 - c) a list of all authors believed to be valid authors, and why
 - d) a list of all individuals believed to have contributed to the paper and who should be fully acknowledged, and why.
- 13.10. The DVCR will review all relevant material, seek advice from an independent person with expertise in the area (as required), and make a final determination in writing and in accordance with sections 13.11 - 13.13 (inclusive).
- 13.11. Options for resolving disputes between authors include:
 - a) removing individuals who were deemed not to have met the authorship criteria as set out in Section 2 and acknowledging their contributions, if appropriate; however, data or work of individuals not listed as authors must not be published without their written permission
 - b) including all individuals who were deemed to have met the authorship criteria as articulated in Section 2
 - c) revising the order of authorship on the publication.
- 13.12. The research output may only be published when all valid authors agree on authorship of the publication.

- 13.13. If the valid authors cannot agree on authorship, then the paper cannot be published in its present form. In this circumstance it may be possible to break the paper down into sections where there is agreement, or where the contribution of individuals (or subgroups of the authors) might be published separately. However, no person who is a valid author can be excluded from the publication without their written permission.
- 13.14. During a dispute resolution process, if anyone has reasonable grounds to believe that a potential breach of the Code has occurred, they can and should make a complaint in accordance with Section 14.

14. Authorship and breaches of the Code

- 14.1. An authorship dispute does not necessarily constitute a breach of the Code.
- 14.2. Breaches of the Code that are related to authorship include, but are not limited to:
- a) crediting authorship to or accepting authorship from individuals who do not meet the criteria for authorship (for example, honorary, gift or guest authorship)
 - b) failing to ascribe authorship to individuals where those individuals meet the requirements of authorship (for example, ghost authorship)
 - c) attributing authorship to individuals without their consent
 - d) publishing research without the final approval of the attributed authors
 - e) failure to comply with an authorship agreement
 - f) making false claims about authorship in a grant application
 - g) demanding or accepting authorship of a research output where the individual does not also satisfy the authorship criteria in Section 2 (for example, on the basis of supervision).
- 14.3. Any person who wishes to make a complaint about a potential breach of the Code in relation to authorship will follow the University's *Managing Allegations of Research Misconduct Procedure*.

Related procedures

HDR Supervision & Academic Support Procedure

Management of Intellectual Property Procedure

Management of Research Data Procedure

Managing Allegations of Research Misconduct Procedure

Publication and Dissemination of Research Procedure

University Behaviour Procedure

Versions

Version	Action	Approval Authority	Responsible Officer/s	Approval Date
Version 1	Approved	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)	Executive Director Research	12 July 2021

REPLACED