



OVERVIEW

SCOPE AND APPLICATION

POLICY PRINCIPLES

PROCEDURES

1. Authorship Protocols
2. Dispute Resolution

DEFINITIONS

OVERVIEW

The University of Adelaide has adopted the principles embodied in the [2018 Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#) [the Code] via its [Responsible Conduct of Research Policy](#). This includes the responsibilities of all researchers for the fair, honest and transparent attribution of authorship in [research outputs](#). This Policy is designed to promote good practice, ensure University compliance with the Code, and is informed by the Code [Authorship Guide 2019](#) (the Guide). It is also consistent with the authorship criteria of the internationally recognised [International Committee of Medical Journal Editors](#).

To be an author, it is essential to have made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to the published work. While specific practices may differ from discipline to discipline, there are a number of overarching ethical principles and procedures to which all researchers are expected to adhere.

These formal procedures are also intended to minimise potential disputes over authorship issues.

SCOPE AND APPLICATION

This Policy applies to all staff, students and titleholders of the University of Adelaide who are or have been involved in the conduct of [research](#) associated with the University.

Attempts to resolve disagreements and disputes should initially be undertaken at the local level (school and faculty). The processes detailed in this Policy precede any escalation to those in the [Research Misconduct Procedure](#).

Implementation of this Policy will be carried out in accordance with the University's Code of Conduct and the Academic Board Statement on Undue Influence. Any attempts to improperly exert pressure or influence actions or decisions made pursuant to this Policy must be reported in accordance with the Fraud and Corruption Control Policy.

POLICY PRINCIPLES

1. Researchers have a responsibility to disseminate research findings responsibly, accurately and broadly and, where necessary, take action to correct the record in a timely manner. This includes accurate reflection of contributions in authorship, acknowledgements and citations.
2. Although attribution of authorship depends to some extent on the discipline involved, in line with the [Code](#), authorship must be based on a significant scholarly or intellectual contribution involving at least two of the following five activities:
 - conception and design of the project;
 - acquiring research data where that acquisition requires significant intellectual judgement or input;

-
- contribution of knowledge, where justified, including Indigenous knowledge;
 - analysis and interpretation of research data; and
 - drafting significant parts of the article or critically revising it so as to contribute to the interpretation.
3. Any person who qualifies as an author must be included or excluded only with their [Written Consent](#).
 4. Authorship must not be offered purely on the following grounds:
 - holding a position of authority, e.g. head of a research group or a supervisory role ('gift' or 'honorary' authorship);
 - facilitating the acquisition of funding, materials, infrastructure or access to equipment;
 - providing routine assistance in some aspects of the project; and/or
 - providing routine technical support, advice or assistance, data that has already been published, or materials obtained from third parties, but having no substantial input to the research output.
 5. All listed authors are collectively accountable for the whole research output. An individual author is directly responsible for the accuracy and integrity of their contribution to the output. Authors should take steps to ensure that they have confidence in the accuracy and integrity of the contributions of their co-authors.
 6. Publication may not proceed if any of the authors have valid reservations concerning the theory, data or its interpretation underpinning critical parts of the work, or citations or lack thereof.
 7. All individuals and organisations that contributed to the research outcome (e.g. research assistants, technical writers, funding bodies, research students, the University), must be properly acknowledged or disclosed, if relevant, within the research output.
 8. The University encourages all authors to publish in the most appropriate outlets relevant to the discipline, and to avoid ['predatory publishers'](#) who engage in unprofessional or unethical practices.
 9. The University recommends that authors use the [Open Researcher and Contributor ID \(ORCID\)](#) as it assists in making an author's body of work more accessible by others, and provides a seamless updating of information to University of Adelaide and some external publication and funding systems.

PROCEDURES

1. Authorship Protocols

- 1.1 In circumstances where there is more than one author, a [corresponding author](#) must be appointed to record authorship and manage communication about the work with the publisher.
- 1.2 As the accepted practice for the order of author names on a research output varies between disciplines, that order should be determined, recorded and reviewed in tandem with any other decisions about authorship. Authors should be prepared to explain the listing order, if required. While acknowledging that it is neither possible nor desirable to prescribe in a university-wide policy the detailed authorship requirements for application to every discipline, the University encourages local areas to promote discipline-specific guidelines as part of best practice.
- 1.3 Where individuals who contributed to the research outcome are to be acknowledged within the publication (e.g. research assistants, technical writers, community representatives), their [Written Consent](#) should be obtained, where practicable.
- 1.4 Under some circumstances it may be permissible to re-publish research findings, but researchers must take all reasonable steps to obtain permission from the copyright owner, if relevant, before republishing research findings in any format.
- 1.5 As an acknowledgement of the institutional contribution to the delivery of research outcomes, authors must cite their institutional affiliation or affiliations in any research output. All University staff and student authors are required to cite/by-line the University of Adelaide as their primary affiliation for work conducted as part of their association with the University. (Refer to Appendix 1).

-
- 1.6 In accordance with the requirement to formalise authorship arrangements, and where there are multiple authors, an online '[Authorship Declaration](#)' must be completed by the corresponding author of a research output. This must be done before the research output is presented in a public forum. In addition, for specific matters relating to higher degree by research student theses, refer to the [Research Student Handbook](#).
 - 1.7 Following publication, all authors must ensure there is an appropriate response to any concerns about the accuracy or integrity of part of the Research Output. This may include seeking or providing necessary evidence, and may result in correction of the public record.
 - 1.8 Where required by a funding organisation (e.g. the NHMRC, the ARC, etc.) as a condition of providing support for a research project, or as required by the University [Open Access Policy](#), any peer reviewed journal publication arising from that support must be deposited into an [open access institutional repository](#). Any requests for an exemption must be made to the funding organisation.
 - 1.9 All authors must declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to their research project if and when they become apparent. For staff, this will be in line with the University's Conflict of Interest Procedure in the [Behaviour and Conduct Policy](#); and for Higher Degree by Research students, this can be done as part of milestone review processes or when submitting work to a publisher.

Responsibility: Researchers

- a) At an early stage of the research project, discuss authorship of a research output with all other researchers involved, and review whenever there are changes in participation.
- b) Where there are joint authors, appoint a corresponding author.
- c) Collectively determine the order of authorship.

Responsibility: Corresponding Author

- a) Offer authorship to all people, including research trainees, who meet the criteria for authorship listed in this Policy. Those offered authorship must accept or decline in [writing](#) within 30 days.
- b) If a potential author fails to respond in 30 days, the corresponding author must keep a record of decisions made on behalf of the authors.
- c) Acknowledge all individuals and organisations that contributed to the research output, (e.g. research assistants, the University, etc.). Where individuals are to be named, obtain their [Written Consent](#), where practicable.
- d) Complete an '[Authorship Declaration](#)'. Ensure that all authors have approved the version to be published, unless circumstances are such that this is not possible. If an author is deceased or cannot be contacted following reasonable efforts, publication may proceed provided that there are no grounds to believe that this person would have objected to being included as an author. The Declaration will need to be updated if a research output is re-submitted. Approval or non-approval should not be unreasonably withheld and should not be withheld for non-research or non-scholarly reasons.
- e) Subject to any copyright restrictions, lodge a copy of the accepted publication with the University of Adelaide's [institutional repository](#), via [Aurora](#).

2. Dispute Resolution

It is acknowledged that, on occasions, disputes over authorship may arise. Where researchers are unable to reach mutual agreement on an issue of authorship, the following procedures apply:

- 2.1 Attempts to resolve disagreements and disputes should initially be undertaken at the local level (school and faculty). Any person involved in the dispute may seek advice from their supervisor, a [Research Integrity Advisor](#), a Head of School, or a [Postgraduate Coordinator](#) (if involving HDR students).
- 2.2 Continuing disputes over authorship are to be referred for attempted resolution to the Executive Dean of the corresponding author's Faculty. Disputes involving co-authors from other institutions are to be handled by the institution of the corresponding author.
- 2.3 If the dispute remains unresolved within 30 days of referral under clause 2.2, it will be referred to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Research) for determination. The DVC&VP(R) may engage an external arbitrator or mediator to assist in this process, although the final decision remains with the DVC&VP(R).

-
- 2.4 Outcomes at any stage during the dispute process may include the following options:
- agreement is reached by all valid authors (as defined in Principle 2);
 - individuals who do not meet the authorship criteria will not be included as authors of the research output, but may have their contributions acknowledged;
 - where valid authors cannot agree on content, the research output might be divided in such a way that some sections can be published separately, or not published at all; or
 - where disputes concerning research outputs arise over matters not directly related to the inclusion or exclusion of an author, content or interpretation of data, a reasonable decision may be made that permits the research output to be published and the dispute to be suitably acknowledged.
- 2.5 Any determination made as part of a dispute resolution will not be considered grounds for findings of research misconduct, as detailed in the University's [Research Misconduct Procedure](#). However, proceeding to publication without written agreement or formal determination of authorship may be considered a [Breach](#) of the Code. Dispute resolution agreements should include a statement that precludes future research misconduct complaints being lodged by any of the parties on the related matter, unless the agreement is not honoured.

Responsibility: Executive Deans

- a) Attempt resolution of authorship disputes.

Responsibility: Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Research)

- b) Where it has not been possible to resolve authorship disputes at the faculty level, make a determination on what action will be taken.

DEFINITIONS

[Aurora](#) (University of Adelaide Researcher Outputs, Reporting and Analytics) is the University's web-based system for capturing and reporting research publications, outputs, professional activities and profile information.

A **Breach of the Code** is a failure to meet the principles and responsibilities of the Code. This may refer to a single or multiple breaches. Examples of Breaches include fabrication, falsification or misrepresentation of research data; plagiarism; inappropriate maintenance of research records, inadequate supervision or mentoring; conducting research without necessary ethical approvals; and misleading ascription of authorship.

The **Code** refers to the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018, developed jointly by the National Health and Medical Research Council, the Australian Research Council and Universities Australia](#).

A **Conflict of Interest** arises when an individual's personal, external or financial interests, or those of a person with whom they have a close personal relationship, come into conflict with the performance of their duties to the University. A conflict of interest may be actual, perceived or potential. Refer to the [Conflict of Interest Procedure](#).

The **Corresponding Author** is defined as a specified co-author of a research output who takes formal responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, acts as point of contact for all correspondence regarding the research output, and maintains related records. The position is determined by agreement amongst the authors. The corresponding author is sometimes referred to elsewhere as the 'executive author'.

Predatory Publishers are publishers that engage in unprofessional or unethical practices by taking advantage of the open access model to charge authors an article processing fee without providing (quality) peer review or editorial services. It is important to note that unethical and low quality publishers are not confined to open access, but also exist in traditional publishing models. A [list of indicators and additional information is provided by the University Library](#).

The concept of **Research** 'includes the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way so as to generate new concepts, methodologies, inventions and understandings. This could include synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative'.¹

A **Research Output** is defined as the dissemination by the author(s) of research findings or outputs in a public forum whether in hardcopy, electronic, web-based or other tangible forms. It includes refereed and non-refereed books and journals, web-pages, conference presentations, abstracts, proceedings, creative works, technical papers, research proposals, performances, professional blogs, social media posts, etc. Research grant applications are not considered to be Research Outputs for the purpose of this Policy, but Principle 7 and Procedure 1.3 relating to acknowledgement do apply. Student theses are not subject to the joint authorship provisions of this Policy, but Principle 7 and Procedure 1.3 relating to acknowledgement do apply.

Written Consent includes original hand-written signatures, emails, scanned documents or electronic identification as appropriate.

RMO File No.	2019/4693
Policy custodian	Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Research)
Responsible Policy officer	Executive Director, Research Services
Endorsed by	Academic Board on 6 November 2019
Approved by	Vice-Chancellor and President on 6 November 2019
Related Policies	<p><u>Internal</u></p> <p>Responsible Conduct of Research Policy Research Misconduct Procedure Intellectual Property Policy Conflict of Interest Procedure Open Access Policy</p> <p>Higher Degree by Research Academic Program Rules HDR Student Handbook</p> <p><u>External</u></p> <p>Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018 Code Authorship Guide 2019 NHMRC Open Access Policy ARC Open Access Policy</p>
Effective from	7 November 2019
Review Date	7 November 2022
Contact for queries about the Policy	Executive Director, Research Services ext: 35137

¹ The Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, 2018, p.5

Appendix 1: Author Publication Affiliation and Acknowledgement Guidelines

PREAMBLE

University of Adelaide researchers are expected to disseminate their research and publish in the best possible outlets. In doing so, they need to ensure their affiliation is correctly listed and that appropriate acknowledgement is given for any support provided in undertaking that research. The appropriate organisational affiliation will relate to the institution at which the researcher is employed or enrolled, and also at which the bulk of the research was conducted, if different.

WHY THIS IS IMPORTANT?

- It supports research impact in terms of quality and/or translation of the research into beneficial outcomes.
- It is both good research practice and a requirement of the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#).
- It encourages continuing research funding by relevant bodies and is often required by them.
- It ensures the University of Adelaide is recognised in external bibliometric analysis.
- It makes a positive impact on the University's rankings and the perceived quality of the research environment provided to the researcher.
- It allows more efficient harvesting of relevant research publications into University systems, and facilitates better capture and re-use of research data for multiple purposes. This includes lodgement in the University's Open Access repository - an external requirement for Australian Research Council and the National Health and Medical Research Council grant and fellowship recipients.

SCOPE AND APPLICATION

These Guidelines² apply to all academic staff, titleholders and students whose research outputs result from their employment, affiliation or enrolment with the University. They apply to all University authors, not simply the first-named or corresponding author.

A Research Output is defined as the dissemination by the author(s) of research findings or outputs in a public forum whether in hardcopy, electronic, web-based or other tangible forms. It includes refereed and non-refereed books and journals, web-pages, conference presentations, abstracts, proceedings, creative works, technical papers, research proposals, tenders, patents, performances, professional blogs, social media posts, etc. The principles of acknowledgement apply to all forms of research outputs.

Care should always be exercised in identifying the most appropriate publication outlets relevant to the discipline³, and in ensuring any potentially valuable intellectual property is protected prior to public release⁴.

AUTHOR AFFILIATION

University staff and students:

- All University staff and student authors are required to cite/by-line the University of Adelaide as their primary affiliation for work conducted as part of their association with the University.
- Other relevant organisations should also be cited, including other research institutions, industry associations, businesses or companies, not-for-profits, and those relevant to their research and its translation, e.g. end-users.

Clinical and Affiliate Titleholders:

- If the research output would be reasonably viewed as related to their University appointment⁵, then it would be expected that the University of Adelaide is by-lined.

² This document is based around the University of Leicester "Policy on institutional affiliation in research publications" <http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/researchsupport/integrity/code-of-conduct/5-after-research/5-1-publishing-outputs>

³ If you are unsure what these outlets may be, please consult with either your supervisor, Head of Discipline/Department/School or Faculty Deputy Dean Research.

⁴ If in doubt, please contact Adelaide Enterprise for advice - <http://www.adelaide.edu.au/enterprise/>

⁵ For instance, where the research is conducted on a University administered grant, the output results from supervising a University research student, or is supported by University infrastructure accessed as a result of their University appointment.

-
- If the research is also part of their role at their employing institution, it would be expected that, where possible, the article would be jointly by-lined with their employing institution and the University of Adelaide.

AUTHOR BY-LINING AND CITATION

By-lining and citations must take into account the following:

- The name 'The University of Adelaide':
 - must appear prominently and be cited as the first organisation in a publication by-line for the relevant University staff and students for work conducted as part of their association with the University;
 - must be used in full - acronyms or abbreviations should not be used in formal publications; and
 - must appear as the first element in recording the affiliation, unless specific publication guidelines mandate otherwise. A University School, Department, Research Institute, Research Centre or Research Group may be listed as subsequent elements of the affiliation, if it has materially contributed to the research that led to the research output.
- Clinical or affiliate titleholders will by-line their employing institution.
- Relevant external affiliations, such as a company, business or other organisations pertinent to the author's research and translation, including professional practice, should be cited. (This is now used as an important metric of external engagement with industry and end-users, and may be relevant to any conflict of interest declaration.)
- Appropriate citation of patents and related datasets is also important to demonstrate connectivity between original research and impact.

Examples of publication affiliations are attached as Attachment 1.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In line with good research practice and the requirements of the [Australian Code for Responsible Conduct of Research](#), authors are required to acknowledge:

- The sources of any research support funding (financial and in-kind) related to the research output, noting that this is a formal requirement of many research sponsors for receipt of funding. This should include support by internal University funding schemes.
- Any conflicts of interest.

If in doubt about how or whether to acknowledge funding supporting their research, authors are encouraged to consult relevant funding agreements and/or to seek advice from the appropriate central area responsible for administration of the funding.

Examples of acknowledgements of funding sponsors are provided in Attachment 2.

RESOURCES

Authors should always check their work for consistency with:

- [The Australian Code for Responsible Conduct of Research](#)
- The University of Adelaide Authorship Policy
- Publisher Guidelines
- Research Sponsor Guidelines

Attachment 1: By-line examples

1. <Researcher's Name>, The University of Adelaide, School of Computer Science, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.
2. <Researcher's Name>, The University of Adelaide, Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, Research Centre for Infectious Diseases, Adelaide, Australia.
3. <Researcher's Name>, The University of Adelaide, Robinson Research Institute, Adelaide Medical School, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA 5005, Australia.
4. <Researcher's Name>, The University of Adelaide, Discipline of Medicine, and Royal Adelaide Hospital, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia
5. <Researcher's Name> is a Research Fellow at The University of Adelaide in the School of Social Sciences, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.
6. <Researcher's Name>, Women's and Children's Hospital, Adelaide, South Australia, and an affiliate of The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.

Attachment 2: Examples of appropriately acknowledging research sponsors

1. This work was supported by funding from the former Australian Commonwealth Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources National Enabling Technologies Strategy's Public Awareness and Community Engagement Program, administered by the Government of South Australia, Science and Information Economy, Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology.
2. <Name> was supported by a fellowship from the Fay Gale Centre for Research on Gender at the University of Adelaide.
3. <Name> is the recipient of an Australian Research Council Future Fellowship (FT11xxxxxx) and funded by the Australian Government.
4. This research was funded (partially or fully) by the Australian Government through the Australian Research Council.⁶
5. The authors are grateful for feedback received on an early version of this paper at the <Conference> in <year> in <place>.
6. Thanks to <name>, <name> and <name> for useful discussions.
7. We thank <name> (Centre of Research Excellence in x, The University of Adelaide) for her expert statistical advice. <Equipment or other material> were provided by <company name>.
8. Author contributions: T.W. was involved in conception, design, and coordination of the study, subject recruitment, data collection and interpretation, statistical analysis, and writing of the manuscript; X.Z., L.G.T., and M.J.B. assisted with data collection; T.J.L., C.F.D., M.H., and K.L.J. were involved in conception of the study and data interpretation; C.K.R. was involved in conception and design of the study, data analysis, and interpretation. All authors critically reviewed the manuscript and have approved the publication of this final version of the manuscript.
9. This report was produced with financial support from the Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation's (RIRDC) Organic Produce Program.

⁶ For further information on acknowledgement of ARC funding refer to: <http://www.arc.gov.au/acknowledging-arc>