

# The Ethics of Authorship.....

*it's more delicate than it looks.*

---

<http://www.icmje.org/#author>

[www.harvard.edu/integrity](http://www.harvard.edu/integrity)

The COPE Report 2003

[http://www2.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/quiz/quiz.cgi?quiz\\_id=MqvgAzd3vo](http://www2.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/quiz/quiz.cgi?quiz_id=MqvgAzd3vo)

[http://ccnmtl.columbia.edu/projects/rcr/rcr\\_authorship/case/index.html](http://ccnmtl.columbia.edu/projects/rcr/rcr_authorship/case/index.html)

# Objectives

---

- Recognize the importance of the responsible authorship.
- Identify criteria for authorship (Make a K-PACT):
  - who should be
  - who shouldn't be
  - “the gray areas”
- Gain familiarity with resources about publication
- Identify strategies to deal with controversies or conflicts that might arise in authorship.
- Identify steps in resolving authorship controversies.
- Talk about “who’s on first”

# Authorship....

*...It is more delicate than it looks.*

---

1. One of the leading causes of academic disputes.
2. Stalls careers
3. Can cause a future academic scientist to leave

***and...all the above is 100% preventable***

4. Ends fruitful collaborations – which could have made major contributions to the field
5. Mental and emotional stress
6. Triggers the “unthinkable in academics”

# Criteria for Authorship

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors 2006

Who should be	Gray area	Who shouldn't be
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <i>Substantial, direct contribution to:</i><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• conception and design or</li><li>• acquisition of data or</li><li>• data analysis, interpretation</li></ul></li><li>2. Drafting or critically revising article for <i>important intellectual comment</i></li><li>3. Final approval of version to be published</li><li>4. All 3 conditions must be met</li></ol>	<p><b>Technical contribution</b></p> <p>What if they developed the model?</p> <p>What if they developed an index or biomarker for cancer, and you want to use it for Type II diabetes?</p> <p>1st paper? 2nd paper? 1000th paper?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>“Gift authors..”</b> reciprocity</li><li>• <b>“Honorary authors..”</b> out of historic respect or <b>“fear”</b></li><li>• <b>\$\$\$ or lab space</b> with no input</li><li>• Data collector (with no input)</li><li>• General supervisor</li></ul>



# CASE

---

- ◆ [http://www2.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/quiz/quiz.cgi?quiz\\_id=MqvgAzd3vo](http://www2.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/quiz/quiz.cgi?quiz_id=MqvgAzd3vo)
- ◆ [http://ccnmtl.columbia.edu/projects/rcr/rcr\\_authorship/case/index.html](http://ccnmtl.columbia.edu/projects/rcr/rcr_authorship/case/index.html)
- ◆ This case is adapted, with permission, from:  
"When in Rome: Conventions in Assignment of Authorship"  
Research Ethics: Cases and Commentaries  
Volume 2, Section 1, Authorship.  
Brian Schrag, ed. Association for Practical and Professional Ethics  
Bloomington, Indiana, February, 1998

# How to Prevent Authorship Problems

## It's a "K-PACT"

---

- ✓ **Keep** written record. **Preplan**.... before you start.  
Bring the criteria ahead of time for authorship.  
Decide who will be on it.  
Decide author order.
- ✓ **Accountability**: For what is each author accountable for in the paper? Who has overall accountability? Did she/he do his part – did you do yours? Would an objective outside person agree?
- ✓ **Credit**: Is the credit proportional to the contribution.  
Can you do it without your colleague?  
Authorship vs Acknowledgement
- ✓ **Trust**: Don't collaborate without it.

# We have an authorship controversy.....NOW WHAT?

---

Pull out the original  
“document of understanding.”

You don't have one?  
Hmmm.....

*Right now Write down... your contributions.  
Your colleague writes down her/his  
contributions.*

Do they pass the criteria?  
for authorship?  
Hmmm.....

*State in the **draft** of the manuscript the precise contributions  
of each author....**and** be willing to send the statement with the  
manuscript **and** sign on the line that it is accurate.*

*Ask your Chair/ Director or other mediator  
to ....well... “mediate.”*

*Abide by the decision and move on.*

# Who's on First?

# Who's last?

## Rule of Thumb

---

### First: JUNIOR

You do the work, make it happen, write the paper  
(see criteria)

Early in your career – you should STRIVE to be first

Putting yourself as SENIOR author too soon  
makes you look not so credible

**What did the criteria say?**

### LAST (SENIOR):

Established the line of inquiry in the collaboration or lab **and** mentors the first author **and** meets the criteria

**The senior faculty insists on being first author-PLUS he has power. Now what?**

**Senior authors have to be mentored to “give it up.”**



---

Authorship..... It's more delicate  
than it looks...

# Objectives

---

- Recognize the importance of the responsible authorship
- Identify criteria for authorship (Make a PACT):
  - who should be
  - who shouldn't be
  - “the gray areas”
- Identify strategies to deal with controversies or conflicts that might arise in authorship
- Identify steps in resolving authorship controversies
- Talk about “who's on first”

THANK YOU

---