

Research Authorship

1.0 Purpose

2.0 Scope

3.0 Procedure

3.1 Authorship principles and responsibilities | 3.2 Criteria for authorship | 3.3 Acknowledgement of contributions other than authorship | 3.4 Authorship agreements | 3.5 Griffith affiliation | 3.6 Authorship disputes | 3.7 Potential breaches of the Australia Code for the Responsible Condition of Research

4.0 Definitions

5.0 Information

6.0 Related policy documents and supporting documents

1.0 Purpose

This Procedure describes the processes for:

- Determining eligibility for authorship;
- The appropriate acknowledgement of other contributions;
- Authorship agreements;
- Attribution of the research publication to Griffith University and appropriate affiliation; and
- The resolution of authorship disputes.

This Procedure supports the principles articulated in the Authorship guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (NHMRC/ARC/Universities 2019) and follows Griffith's *Research Quality Framework*.

2.0 Scope

This Procedure applies to all Researchers generating research outputs under the auspices of Griffith University.

This Procedure applies to all types of research outputs including non-traditional research outputs such as creative works and reports. This Procedure may also apply to research proposals, funding applications and web-based publications.

3.0 Procedure

3.1 Authorship principles and responsibilities

Consistent with Griffith's *Responsible Conduct of Research Policy* and the **Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct (2018) (the Code)** researchers must:

- Be accountable for the research output. An author is accountable for the accuracy and integrity of their direct contribution and should take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the research as a whole;
- Disclose any conflict of interest (irrespective of whether it is perceived, potential or actual) in the research output;
- Disseminate overall research findings and conclusions responsibly, honestly and with integrity, transparency, and make findings openly accessible where possible. The Library offers **resources**

including publisher agreements to advise and guide researchers to support Griffith's commitment to Open Research;

- Promptly and diligently act to correct the record to amend any errors made in any section of published material;
- Ensure appropriate and fair attribution of authorship, avoiding ghost authorship, gift or honorary authorships. Ensure that all listed authors of research outputs are those, and only those, who have made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to the research and the output (see section 3.6), and that they have agreed to be listed as an author;
- Approve a research output prior to its publication. Approval should be confirmed in writing and confirms accountability for the research output. In rare circumstances where all reasonable efforts have been made to contact an author and these are documented, or where a person is deceased, and approval cannot be obtained, publication can proceed provided their contribution warranting authorship is recorded in writing and there are no known reasons why the person would object to being included as an author;
- Fairly and fully acknowledge those who have contributed to the research and output, including sources of funding or any financial or in-kind support relevant to the output;
- Cite and acknowledge other relevant work appropriately following corresponding guidelines and formatting accurately; and
- Follow publisher guidelines in regard to the use of artificial intelligence, and/or disclose whether an artificial intelligence system was used and clearly acknowledge and explain how the tool was used.

3.2 Criteria for authorship

Consistent with the Guide, authorship must be based on a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution that must include one and should include a combination of two or more of the following:

- Conception and design of the project or output;
- Acquisition of research data where the acquisition has required significant intellectual judgement, planning, design, or input;
- Contribution of knowledge, where justified, including Indigenous knowledge;
- Analysis or interpretation of research data;
- Drafting significant parts of the research output or critically revising it so as to contribute to its interpretation.

It is a breach of the Code to fail to acknowledge individuals who meet any of the above criteria. It is also a breach of the Code to include authors who do not meet at least one of the above criteria.

Also, as it is **current best practice** (e.g. ICMJE - International Committee of Medical Journal Editor - recommendations), all authors must:

- Agree to be personally accountable for the author's own contributions;
- Ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work even those in which the author was not involved, are appropriately investigated, resolved, and resolutions documented in the literature;
- Approve the submitted version of the output.

Contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship or are unable to approve the submission or be accountable for its content should be listed in the Acknowledgements section. In extreme circumstances where approval is not possible due to death or long term loss of contact, a person's role

as author and their position might need to be discussed based on their contribution and recorded as agreed by all authors in the [Research Authorship Agreement Form \(Appendix 1\)](#).

Researchers are strongly encouraged to familiarise themselves with the Contributor Role Taxonomy (CRediT), an approved NSI/NISO standard used by academic journals. CRediT helps contributors of a research output have clarity of roles minimising authorship disputes (see Supporting Documents in section 6.0).

3.3 Acknowledgement of contributions other than authorship

- Griffith researchers need to ensure that appropriate acknowledgement is given for any support provided in undertaking their research. Research outputs can include significant contributions by persons such as research assistants, statisticians, software/code developers, cultural/community advisors, librarians, and technical writers among others. In certain circumstances, these contributions may meet the criteria for authorship (section 3.2). If the criteria for authorship are not met, the contribution should be documented by an acknowledgement.
- Contributions in the form of samples, materials, data, equipment, technical assistance or writing, or routine data acquisition may also require acknowledgement.
- All those who are not co-authors, but who have significantly contributed to the research output must be offered an acknowledgement. Written consent must be obtained from those to be acknowledged, where practicable.
- An acknowledgement could also appear if one of the major contributors passes away before an output is finalised (in case it is not clear they meet the criteria for authorship). The terms of acknowledgement should be discussed with the next of kin and their views sought prior to publication.
- A research output must include information on all sources of financial and in-kind support for the research; where applicable, the acknowledgement must be in accordance with the relevant funding agreement.
- Acknowledgement for the provision of goods or services by a third party, such as materials, data or infrastructure, must be made in accordance with any relevant research or user agreements.

3.4 Authorship Agreements

Researchers should discuss and agree on the authorship of each research output at an early stage as well as throughout the life of the research project. An authorship agreement is needed for each research output and should be regularly reviewed, particularly when there is a change in circumstances in the project or in the collaboration.

Written authorship agreements do not have to be formal documents, a [Research Authorship Agreement Form \(Appendix 1\)](#) is available to facilitate discussion and as suitable record of agreed authorship and contributions during the life of the project. Alternatively, an agreement may be in the form of emails, or transcripts of conversations acknowledged by all collaborators. Regular review of the Research Authorship Agreement Form or authorship documentation may help prevent authorship disputes.

An authorship agreement should include:

- **A list of authors** as per section 3.2 Criteria for authorship.

- The **order of the authors** (the ordering of authors may vary depending on discipline, and/or determined by outlet/publisher guidelines) should be agreed by all authors and reviewed as needed. In most disciplines, the order of authors reflects the extent of each author's contribution to the output.
- The **first author** is normally the person who contributes the most, intellectually and or practically (e.g. participating in the conception and design, collecting and analysing the data, drafting the manuscript, also equivalent activities depending on the output type). Often this is a HDR candidate, or a research fellow. On occasions author 1 and author 2 share the first authorship stating they made equal contribution and are presented alphabetically in the byline.
- The **senior author**, in many disciplines the senior author(s) appears in the last position and generally acts as the corresponding author. Often this is the primary HDR supervisor, or the senior academic project manager. The combination of intellectual contribution in the conception and design of the research, the responsibility of leading and supervising the research, the broader experience in their field, and often their financial contribution defines the role of senior author(s).
- The senior author is responsible for managing an authorship agreement and all authors are encouraged to keep their own records and invite discussion and agreement as required.
- The **corresponding author(s)**, there is great responsibility attached to the corresponding author role usually assigned to the first and/or senior author. During the pre-publication stages this role is responsible for communication with the journal, publisher or equivalent. The corresponding author must ensure that the submission is compliant and the research presented satisfies all requirements by the outlet as well as institutional, national and international, and must ensure that all authors have approved the submission, including the order of authors and contributions. Once the output is accepted for publication the corresponding author is responsible for the proofreading and verification of the final version and approval of submission by authors of the output before its publication. Once the output is published, the corresponding author is the point of contact for queries about the published work and must inform all co-authors of any matters arising in relation to the published paper and ensure matters are dealt with promptly.

Given the importance and need for permanence of the corresponding author role after publication it is strongly encouraged that when assigned to student researchers or HDR candidates, the role is shared with their supervisor or senior author when applicable. Alternatively, the corresponding author role could switch from the student researcher or HDR candidate (or other) responsible for pre-publication stages, to the senior author as future contact for continuity of the work and collaborations once the output is published. For further guidance see responsibilities of the Corresponding Author in section 3.6. Authorship Disputes.

- The **expected contribution from each of the authors** as per section 3.2 Criteria for authorship.
- A **list of individuals or organisations to be acknowledged** as per section 3.3 Acknowledgement of contributions other than Authorship.

3.5 Griffith Affiliation

The name 'Griffith University' must:

- Appear in all outputs produced by Griffith researchers (definition in section 4.0) and only in research outputs generated under the auspices of Griffith, even if published after the researcher(s)

leave Griffith; if the researcher moves to another institution Griffith University should appear as secondary affiliation. Incomplete or incorrect profiles or research output records are minimised when all authors include their unique identifier (ORCID, see section 4.0 Definitions) in every output authored.

- Be used in full, acronyms or abbreviations should not be used in research outputs.
- Appear as the primary affiliation of researchers employed with a research function at the University. A School, Research Institute, Research Centre, or Research Group may be listed as part of the 'Griffith University' byline, also in full, and if that Element has contributed to the research. Examples of a Griffith byline are below. Slight variations can be applied as required by the outlet guidelines.

"<Researcher's Name>, Griffith Criminology Institute, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia".

"<Researcher's Name>, School of Engineering and Built Environment, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia".

"<Researcher's Name>, Centre for Mental Health, School of Applied Psychology, Griffith University and Gold Coast University Hospital, Queensland, Australia".

- Be accompanied by other non-Griffith affiliations relevant to the author's research and academic practice (e.g. company, business, organisation). Citing non-Griffith affiliations related to the output is important for identifying industry collaboration, research translation as well as necessary for declaring a potential, perceived or actual conflict of interest.

3.6 Authorship Disputes

It is expected that all those involved in authoring a research output will make every reasonable and good faith effort to resolve a dispute in accordance with the Griffith University Code, the Australian Code and this Procedure.

The following steps will be followed when attempting to resolve an authorship dispute involving **an unpublished research output** [for authorship dispute involving a published research output, refer to section 3.7]:

1. Individuals involved in the authorship dispute should first seek resolution through good faith discussion and ideally using an existing authorship agreement for the output under dispute. Advice on the principles of author eligibility or order of authors etc may be sought from a Research Integrity Advisor (RIA). The RIAs for each Academic Group are found in Griffith's Research Integrity webpage.
2. Disputes that cannot be resolved will be referred to the Head of the Element of the corresponding author who will attempt resolution through mediation.
3. Where mediation is unsuccessful, the matter will be referred to the relevant Group Dean Research who will provide a recommendation for consideration of the individuals involved in the dispute. Recommendations will be based on evidence of contribution to the research output and the eligibility criteria in section 3.2.
4. The matter may be referred to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), or nominee, only if there is a concern about the process undertaken in step 3.

If an agreement cannot be reached among all eligible authors, the research output should not be published in its current form in accordance with section 3.4 of this Procedure.

Disputes involving authors from other institutions are to be handled by the institution of the corresponding author.

3.7 Potential Breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research

Any concerns or complaints about potential breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (the Code), including any allegation regarding authorship of a published research output, must be managed in accordance with the *Research Integrity Breach Investigation Procedure*. Examples of breaches of the Code that are related to authorship include, but are not limited to:

- Accepting credit or authorship on a research output where the researcher does not meet the criteria for authorship.
- Failing to attribute authorship where a researcher meets the criteria for authorship.
- Attributing authorship to a researcher without their consent.
- Publishing a research output without the final approval of all attributed authors.
- Failing to comply with an agreed authorship agreement.
- Making a false claim about authorship in a grant application or funding proposal.

4.0 Definitions

Ghost authorship refers to the unethical practice of not crediting the contribution of an individual who meets the authorship criteria but is not acknowledged as an author.

Gift or honorary authorship refers to the unethical practice of assigning authorship to an individual or group of individuals who have not contributed to the research output.

ORCID stands for Open Researcher and Contributor ID and is a global initiative aimed at all persons who participate in research, scholarship, and innovation so they can be uniquely identified and connected to their contributions across disciplines, borders, and time.

Researcher: Any University Staff member, Student, Higher Degree by Research candidate or Affiliate including adjunct appointments, academic title holders, visiting appointments and contractors, whether funded or unfunded, who conducts, or assists with the conduct of research at, or on behalf of, the University.

Research output: A research output communicates or makes available the findings of research that may be in hardcopy, electronic or other form. Examples of research outputs include journal articles, book chapters, books, conference papers, reports, datasets, patents and patent applications, performances, videos and exhibitions.

5.0 Information

Title

Research Authorship Procedure

Document number 2024/0000077

Purpose This Procedure describes the processes for:

- Determining eligibility for authorship;
- The appropriate acknowledgement of other contributions;
- Authorship agreements;
- Attribution of the research publication to Griffith University and appropriate affiliation; and
- The resolution of authorship disputes.

This Procedure supports the principles articulated in the Authorship guide supporting the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* (NHMRC/ARC/Universities 2019) and follows Griffith’s Research Quality Framework.

Audience Staff
Students

Category Academic

Subcategory Research

Approval date 18 October 2024

Effective date 18 October 2024

Review date 2029

Policy advisor Deputy Director, Strategy Performance and Systems

Approving authority Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research)

6.0 Related Policy Documents and Supporting Documents

Legislation [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct 2018](#)
[Authorship: A guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2019](#)

Guide to Managing and Investigating Potential Breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018

Policy	Code of Conduct Student Complaints Policy Responsible Conduct of Research Student Academic Integrity Policy Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech Policy
Procedure	Research Integrity Breach Investigation Procedure Student Charter Framework Research Quality Framework
Local Protocol	Griffith University Research Integrity Resource Sheet #11 - Disputes between researchers Research Integrity webpage Research Integrity Advisors webpage
Supporting documents	CReDIT Author Statement in Elsevier based on Allen, L., O'Connell, A. and Kiermer, V. (2019), How can we ensure visibility and diversity in research contributions? How the Contributor Role Taxonomy (CRediT) is helping the shift from authorship to contributorship. Learned Publishing, 32: 71-74. (https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1210) Nature portfolio editorial policies: Authorship International Committee of Medical Journal Editors McKnutt, MK. (2018), Transparency in authors' contributions and responsibilities to promote integrity in scientific publication. PNAS 115(11):2557-2560. (www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1715374115) COPE Discussion Document: Authorship. 2019 The Turing Way handbook to reproducible, ethical and collaborative data science.

Appendix 1 RESEARCH AUTHORSHIP AGREEMENT FORM

This form is used to record discussions and agreement of authorship on research outputs. As contributions and collaborations change over time it is recommended to update regularly, share with all authors and save as confirmation of final agreement of authorship on a research output. The use of this form minimises the risk of authorship disputes.

Date							
Research Output Type (e.g. journal article, book, other published material)							
Title (e.g. the proposed title/s of the research output/s)							
<p>List all authors in the order that they will appear on the publication. Label the senior or leading author(s) and the corresponding author(s).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. <p>Contributors to be acknowledged in the research output</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. <p><i><u>Guidance for HDR authorship:</u> Under most circumstances a HDR candidate should be considered first author when the output is direct product of their candidature. When HDR candidates are assigned as corresponding author it is desirable to share this role with the supervisor.</i></p>							
<p>Contributions each author will make (record each author and their contribution in relation to following authorship criteria (<i>Research Authorship Procedure</i> section 3.2 Criteria for Authorship and the Australian Code for Responsible Conduct, section 3.7):</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%; text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Authorship Criteria</th> <th style="width: 50%; text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Author(s)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><i>Conception and design of the project (IP)</i></td> <td style="height: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><i>Data collection where collection or acquisition require significant intellectual judgement, planning, input</i></td> <td style="height: 40px;"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Authorship Criteria	Author(s)	<i>Conception and design of the project (IP)</i>		<i>Data collection where collection or acquisition require significant intellectual judgement, planning, input</i>	
Authorship Criteria	Author(s)						
<i>Conception and design of the project (IP)</i>							
<i>Data collection where collection or acquisition require significant intellectual judgement, planning, input</i>							

<p><i>Justified knowledge contribution, including Indigenous knowledge</i></p> <p><i>Analysis and interpretation of data</i></p> <p><i>Drafting, writing and critically revising the work to actively contribute to the interpretation of results</i></p> <p><i>Stewardship and support such as supervision, ensuring integrity, strategic collaboration, other (but see Authorship Principles and Responsibilities careful consideration of section 3.7).</i></p>	<div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div>
<p>Expected Dates of Submission and/or Publication/Communication (expected dates or timelines)</p> <div></div>	
<p>Expected Place/s of Publication/Communication (list expected journal, publisher, release)</p> <div></div>	
<p>Other expectations and/or arrangements regarding publication (e.g. publication costs, accountabilities, acknowledgements)</p> <div></div>	

Record of Agreement of Authorship (Each author name and sign off required below)

I agree to be included in the research output titled above and understand my accountabilities under Griffith's *Responsible Conduct of Research Policy*, and the *Research Authorship Procedure*.

Date	Name	Signature
	<i>Add rows as needed</i>	