

COPE's Core Practice on Authorship and Contributorship states: "Clear policies (that allow for transparency around who contributed to the work and in what capacity) should be in place for requirements for authorship and contributorship as well as processes for managing potential disputes" (see https://cope.onl/authorship-2).

Although editors may not always be able to individually monitor author or contributor listings for every submission, they may sometimes have suspicions that an author list is incomplete (eg, involves ghost authorship) or that undeserving authors have been added (eg, includes guest or gift authorship). This guidance document is designed to alert editors to potential warning signs of inappropriate authorship and prevent future authorship problems at the manuscript submission stage.

SIGNS THAT MIGHT INDICATE AUTHORSHIP PROBLEMS

Industry funded study with no authors from sponsor company

This may be legitimate, but may also mean deserving authors have been omitted; reviewing the original protocol may help determine the role of employees

Name on author list known to be <u>from u</u>nrelated research area

This may indicate guest authorship

Unspecified role in

acknowledgements

Individual thanked without a specific contribution

Unfeasibly long or short author list

For example, a simple case report with a dozen authors or a randomised trial with a single author

Questionable roles of contributors

For example, it appears that no one drafted the paper or analysed the data

A similarity check shows work derived from a thesis where the original author is not on the author list or acknowledged

ALCOGNISE P

Language quality in the manuscript does not match that of the cover letter Consider that this may be legitimate if author has used language editing services

ANTIAL SIGNS OF AUTHORS

PROBL

SWA

Corresponding author seems unable to respond to reviewers' comments

> Manuscript was drafted or revised by someone not on the author list or acknowledged

Check Word document properties or tracking or comment functions, but consider that there may be an innocent explanation for this

Tracking in manuscript shows that authors have been added or removed

Consider that there may be legitimate reasons for this

Impossibly prolific author

For example, a department head is listed as last author in many research papers: consider if this is legitimate

Authorship changes without notification during revision stages

Several similar articles have been published under different author names or aliases

This may be detected by an online search or plagiarism check

BEST PRACTICE TO PREVENT AUTHORSHIP PROBLEMS



for transparency around who contributed to the submitted work and in what capacity

POLICIES





Check for and follow up unusual patterns of behaviour that may suggest authorship problems

PROCESSES

and infographics – How to recognise potential authorship problems – English. https://doi.org/ 10.24318/cope. 2019.2.22 ©2023 Committee on Publication Ethics (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) [Z* Publicationethics.org] Version 2: April 2023.

Cite this as:

COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts



TYPES OF AUTHORSHIP PROBLEMS

The presence of one or more of the above warning signs may indicate authorship problems or misconduct.

A **ghost author** is someone who is omitted or deleted from an author list despite qualifying for authorship. A ghost author is not necessarily the same as a ghost (unacknowledged) writer, because omitted authors may have performed other roles, in particular data analysis, and might have been named in an acknowledgement instead of the author list. Gøtzsche *et al*¹ have shown that statisticians involved with study design are frequently omitted as authors from papers reporting industry funded trials. If a professional writer has been involved with a publication, the authorship criteria being used will determine whether they qualify as an author. According to the authorship criteria of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors,² medical writers would not usually qualify as authors in primary research papers, but their involvement and funding source should be acknowledged.

A guest or gift author is someone who is listed as an author despite not fulfilling the authorship criteria being used. A **guest author** is a person who is added, with or without their knowledge, to make the author list look more impressive despite having no involvement with the research. A **gift author** is a person who did not make a significant contribution to the research or publication (and could have instead been acknowledged for their role) or someone not involved with the research who is added as a favour or out of appreciation or perceived courtesy. Gift authorship is often transactional and bestowed for the purpose of mutual professional enhancement (eg, including colleagues on papers in return for being listed on theirs or for other career benefits). Guest and gift authorship may overlap, such as when adding the name of a well known department head or supervisor unconnected with the research, in an attempt to take advantage of their status while gaining their favour.



Cite this as: COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts and infographics – How to recognise potential authorship problems – English. https://doi.org/ 10.24318/cope. 2019.2.22 ©2023 Committee on Publication Ethics (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) [27 Publicationethics.org] Version 2: April 2023.



References

- Gøtzsche PC, Hróbjartsson A, Johansen HK, et al. Ghost authorship in industry-initiated randomised trials. PLoS Med 2007;4:e19. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0040019</u> [2]
- 2. ICMJE. Recommendations for the conduct, reporting, editing, and publication of scholarly work in medical journals. May 2022. https://b.link/icmje-7 🖓

The COPE Flowchart 'Ghost, guest, or gift authorship in a submitted manuscript',

(https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.18) suggests actions for these situations. However, other types of authorship misconduct include naming fictitious characters or non-humans (eg, software) as authors; publishing coauthors' work with or without their names but without their knowledge, permission, or agreement; and not disclosing authorship to conceal major conflicts of interest. Possible associated issues are forged authorship forms, plagiarism, systematic manipulation of the publishing process, and use of paper mills. The following are some preventive measures that can be taken.

- Develop and publicise clear policies on: authorship eligibility criteria and (if applicable) author order, joint authorship positions; any limits on author number (eg, by article type); acknowledging non-author contributors (with their consent); and managing author disputes
- 2. Require routine authorship declarations from all authors and require the corresponding author to declare that all authors qualify for authorship and no authors have been omitted; encourage use of emerging standards for attribution, such as ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID) identifiers; and obtain itemised author contributions (eg, using the CRediT or Contributor Roles Taxonomy system)
- 3. Adopt suitable document screening or checking processes to detect possible authorship problems at submission, copy email correspondence to all authors, follow relevant COPE flowcharts, and inform institutions when cases require investigation or involve possible misconduct

Relevant COPE Flowcharts:

Suspected ghost, guest, or gift authorship. https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.18

Request for addition of extra author before publication. https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.8

Request for removal of author before publication. https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.9 Plagiarism in a submitted manuscript.

https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.1 Systematic manipulation of the publication process. https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.23

Further reading

COPE Discussion document on authorship. https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.3.3

COPE Discussion document on best practice in theses publishing. https://doi.org/10.24318/LQU1h9US

eLearning module on authorship (members only). https://cope.onl/elearn-authorship

Siu-wai Leung. Promoting awareness of good authorship practice. https://cope.onl/authorship-awareness

Seminar 2021: Ethical authorship versus fraudulent authorship. https://cope.onl/ethical-fraudulent

COPE position statement on authorship and AI tools https://cope.onl/ai-authorship

DeTora LM et al. Good Publication Practice (GPP) Guidelines for Company-Sponsored Biomedical Research: 2022 Update. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2022;175(9):1298-1304. https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M22-1460 C ORCID https://b.link/orcid-1 C CBediT

https://b.link/CRediT-2



Cite this as:

Version 2: April 2023.

