AUTHORSHIP

Making or breaking careers
Objectives

At the end of this session, learners will be able to:

• Describe the guidelines for who should be listed as an author
• Define plagiarism
• Identify resources
Results from survey conducted Aug-Oct 2012 on AMC campus (362 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you been excluded... when made a significant contribution?</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been included as a middle author when you thought...first or senior author?</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your role in a publication been exaggerated?</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do you decide?

- Authors are usually listed in their order of importance.
- But
- Designation *first or last* author carries special weight.
- Corresponding or Primary Author assumes responsibility for all aspects of a publication.
- Senior authors “generally direct, oversee, and guarantee the authenticity of the work reported.”

What are the criteria for authorship?

1. Must have made a substantive contribution to:
   - Conception and design and/or
   - Acquisition of data, and/or
   - Analysis and interpretation
AND

2. • Drafted the article or • Revised it critically for important intellectual content

AND

3. • Have final approval of the version to be published
ICJME criteria requires all 3 conditions detailed above be met

- NATURE - does not impose an order on the list of authors but encourages a statement of actual contribution in the endnote
- Academic Medicine - requires all authors to be familiar enough with the entire manuscript to take public responsibility

*ICMJE – International Committee of Medical Journal Editors*
Why is it important?

Indicates:
• Who conducted the research
• Who should get the credit
• Who is responsible
• If there is fraud or misconduct then all authors impacted

Contributes to:
• Furthering the scientific field
• Prestige
• Future grant funding
• Promotion and tenure
What about these individuals?

- Person who provided the funding
- Provided the space
- Provided technical assistance
- Provided administrative assistance
- Provided the data
- Typed the manuscript
- Statistician
- Acclaimed in the field
Author or Acknowledged?

- Made substantial contribution but did not meet the criteria for authorship

- Implies endorsement of data and conclusions
An integrated encyclopedia of DNA elements in the human genome.


PMID: 22955616 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]
Bob Powell, a postdoctoral fellow in biochemistry, has just completed a manuscript detailing the results from the first project in which he has taken a leading role. The focus of his project has been to discern the ways in which humans metabolize sulfites, a class of chemicals commonly used to preserve wines and dried fruits. Although he had developed the rough outlines of the project on his own, he owes much to individuals both inside and outside his lab.
The assistance he received from others includes the following:

A colleague at another university, a toxicologist specializing in food additives, shared with Bob his previous work on the in vivo activity of sulfites, information that allowed Bob to choose the ideal animal model for the experiment--the Abyssinian field mouse.
A friend of his, who happened to be a wildlife specialist, provided Bob with much advice on rearing and maintaining a colony of Abyssinian field mice such that he would have a stable pool of animal subjects.
A highly experienced technician in the lab gave Bob advice on modifying an assay he had been using, which finally allowed him to measure successfully sulfite metabolites in mouse urine. This technician also assisted in writing up the methods section of the paper.
The number of assays that Bob had to conduct was quite sizable and more than he could manage on his own, given other demands of the project. Thus, an undergraduate college student collected most of the urine samples and conducted the assays yielding the data.
Finally, a senior researcher in a neighboring lab who took an interest in Bob’s career offered to review the initial drafts of Bob’s paper. By the end of the writing process, this researcher had helped Bob outline the paper, suggested a few additional experiments that strengthened the paper’s conclusions, and made a number of editing changes in the penultimate draft that enhanced the paper’s clarity.
Case 2

Dr. Jonathan Perry, a tenured professor, used his sabbatical to visit the laboratory of Dr. Brian Chandler, a widely published and respected senior scientist. During his stay in Dr. Chandler's lab, Dr. Perry hoped to learn certain techniques of molecular biology that he would employ in his own research.

To afford Dr. Perry this opportunity, Dr. Chandler assigned him a leading role in a new project that the lab was undertaking.
After seven months, laboratory work on the project was completed, and Dr. Perry returned to his own institution to begin work on a paper to report the final results. Ultimately, many drafts of the paper were faxed back and forth between laboratories until Dr. Perry received the penultimate version from Dr. Chandler’s lab.

On this version, a new name, J. B. Martin, Ph.D., appeared among the authors listed. Dr. Perry had never met Dr. Martin, never worked with him on any technical aspect of the project, and had never heard his name or ideas mentioned in the laboratory meetings in which the project was planned or the results discussed.
Dr. Perry called Dr. Chandler and questioned the addition of Dr. Martin as an author on the manuscript. Dr. Chandler stated that, due to prior collaborations, it was a longstanding policy to include Dr. Martin on all publications coming out of Dr. Chandler’s laboratory. Dr. Martin’s laboratory had a reciprocal agreement, he added.

Dr. Perry stated that he did not feel that Dr. Martin was a qualified author on this particular paper since he had not made a significant contribution to the work being published.
Dr. Chandler replied that Dr. Perry did not have the right to question the policy of a laboratory in which he had worked as an invited guest.

Dr. Perry maintained his position that Dr. Martin did not belong as an author on the paper and further stated that if Dr. Chandler insisted on including Dr. Martin’s name, then, as first author, Dr. Perry would not allow the paper to be submitted.

Dr. Chandler responded, "Well, you can withdraw your name, but the work was done here in my laboratory and we plan to submit the paper for publication."
What do you do if you disagree?

• Try to negotiate with PI and/or collaborators
• Write out contribution and have the PI affirm
• Discuss with faculty advisor / mentor
• Refer the issue to the authorship dispute committee at ResearchEthics@ucdenver.edu
• [More information at http://cctsi.ucdenver.edu/Research-Resources/Pages/Research-Ethics.aspx ]
• Raise allegation of plagiarism
How to avoid disputes

Vicens Q, Bourne PE. Ten simple rules for a successful collaboration.


1. Do not be lured into just any collaboration
2. Decide at the beginning who will work on what tasks
3. Stick to your tasks
4. Be open and honest
5. Feel respect, get respect
6. Communicate, communicate and communicate

7. Protect yourself from a collaboration that turns sour

8. Always acknowledge and cite your collaborators

9. Seek advice from experienced scientists

10. If your collaboration satisfies you, keep it going
Retraction rate


Figure 1. The course of retractions in biomedical literature for the 15-year period from 1996-2011. The annual number of retractions (as notices) has been adjusted by the total number of papers (as citations indexed in MEDLINE) appearing in the same year. The latest data (not shown) are that the 348 retraction notices for 2012 are equivalent to 0.0457%, or a 30.5% increase over 2011.
Plagiarism definitions

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

A full professor asked a colleague for a copy of a proposal that had received federal funds. The colleague, thinking the request was for informational purposes only, provided a copy. The borrower then lifted sections verbatim, put them in a new proposal, and gave it to the author of the borrowed proposal to review.

Is this a problem?
Self plagiarism

The researcher is obliged to cite his published work, whether paraphrased or taken whole. Self-plagiarism is defined as reusing one's own work that has been submitted previously as an assessed item for another publication. Self-plagiarism is more than recycling one's work. It can be perceived as an attempt to deceive editors, reviewers, and readers, "This happens when no indication is given that the work is being recycled or when an effort is made to disguise the original text." While some may argue that it is not possible to steal from one's own work, others feel that only original written material does not have to be cited.

Detection

• Plagiarism-detection software

• Googling on the web

• Keen memory of scientists
QUESTIONS?