

# Authorship Policy for Research Outputs from BODE<sup>3</sup>

Revised 3 April 2019.

This document is focused on principles – given the complex nature of the academic work environment and because there are potential future circumstances that are difficult to anticipate.

## Main principles

### 1. We will follow the ICMJE criteria

(<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html>)

ICMJE recommends that authorship be based on the following 4 criteria:

- Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

### 2. Wherever possible, we will explicitly state contributorship

Authorship serves a dual role. First, it is a means of obtaining **credit** in the academic world – promotion, invitations to conferences, and funding all to some extent are measured by a person’s publications. Second, it is a means of assigning **responsibility** – the authors must be answerable and responsible for the results.

To assign both credit and responsibility, many journals now require or encourage explicit statements of contributorship. We follow this system wherever possible.

One author, usually the first or last author, will take the overall responsibility of ‘guarantor’ of the written output. However, specific individual roles and responsibilities remain identifiable under contributorship. Occasionally, it may be appropriate for two authors to be co-guarantors (eg, supervisor and student).

There may be occasions where group authorship is simplest and appropriate. For example, “BODE<sup>3</sup> team” denoted as sole or co-author. (However, this option should only be used where it is difficult to clearly identify named authors to appear in the by-line, and when all member of the group agree to this option.) Should this group authorship approach be used, then the contributor statements take on greater importance.

### 3. Authorship order will usually be on the basis of importance of contribution

We will attempt to follow the recommendation of Rennie et al (1997): “*The colleagues .... having agreed on their respective contributions, should list their names systematically - in the [author] byline and in the contributorship list - according to the*

*relative importance of their duties: in descending order, starting with the collaborator who made the most substantial contributions."*

Within BODE<sup>3</sup> we will generally favour the amount of total work time being the determinant of the **lead author status**. But in some cases it may be appropriate for the lead author to instead be the person who came up with a notably good and original idea or innovative methods for which it is appropriate that they get substantial recognition for. However, this needs to be discussed with the team of co-authors before the bulk of the study is conducted.

We also follow the increasingly common practice of the **last author role** being typically assigned to a senior researcher who was instrumental to the conception of the study and provided intellectual contributions and oversight of the study.

Should the **number of authors be very large**, it may only be practical to order the first two or three authors by importance of contribution, and order remaining authors, say, alphabetically. If this were done, the contributorship section would be amended to state this. In some circumstances a footnote can state "Both these authors contributed equally to this work".

A special consideration around the type of work BODE<sup>3</sup> does is recognition of model development work and the potential for co-authorship of related research outputs. For these people we will ensure appropriate opportunities for co-authorship via: (i) attentiveness of the Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) of the relevant model/model versions to previous contributions by various people; (ii) through the regular 2-3 monthly publication meetings that BODE<sup>3</sup> runs; and (iii) encouraging individuals to discuss such issues with their line managers and/or the SRO.

## **Resources**

1. Rennie D, Yank V, Emanuel L. When authorship fails. JAMA 1997;278:579-585.
2. Smith R. Authorship is dying: long live contributorship. BMJ 1997;315:696.