

NITCAR AUTHORSHIP POLICY

Policy on authorship of projects supported by NITCAR Version 2.0

1. The goal of NITCAR is to support trainee involvement in multi-centre collaborative projects, and appropriate recognition of trainee involvement through authorship of resultant publications is a key aspect of our work.
2. The overall aim of this policy is to set out how to support those involved in a project to reach the criteria for authorship set out by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). Nothing in this policy is intended to contradict the ICMJE recommendations (<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html>).
3. The view of the management committee is that anybody who meets the first of the ICMJE authorship criteria (“substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work”) should be given a reasonable opportunity to meet the remaining three criteria. Project leads should maintain a log, to be provided to NITCAR management committee, and those involved in projects, annually, those people who have contributed to the relevant ICJME author components.
4. NITCAR supports quality research, audit and service evaluation projects. A major part of the value of such projects is their communication to others. The size and scope of large collaborative projects necessarily limits the extent to which any individual can reasonably influence a decision to submit for publication, and in particular with an inclusive authorship policy it would be inappropriate for individual authors to exe

NITCAR AUTHORSHIP POLICY

Policy on authorship of projects supported by NITCAR Version 2.0

1. The goal of NITCAR is to support trainee involvement in multi-centre collaborative projects, and appropriate recognition of trainee involvement through authorship of resultant publications is a key aspect of our work.
2. The overall aim of this policy is to set out how to support those involved in a project to reach the criteria for authorship set out by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). Nothing in this policy is intended to contradict the ICMJE recommendations (<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html>).
3. The view of the management committee is that anybody who meets the first of the ICMJE authorship criteria (“substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work”) should be given a reasonable opportunity to meet the remaining three criteria. Project leads should maintain a log, to be provided to NITCAR management committee, and those involved in projects, annually, those people who have contributed to the relevant ICMJE author components.
4. NITCAR supports quality research, audit and service evaluation projects. A major part of the value of such projects is their communication to others. The size and scope of large collaborative projects necessarily limits the extent to which any individual can reasonably influence a decision to submit for publication, and in particular with an inclusive authorship policy it would be inappropriate for individual authors to exercise (de jure or de facto) right of veto over submission for publication, as might be the case in smaller projects.
5. Projects supported by NITCAR vary widely in scope, and whilst this policy represents a general position, the management committee may notwithstanding this agree that a particular project is exceptional and agree to the substitution of a different policy on authorship for an individual project, as long as that policy is made clear prior to recruitment of contributors.

Study protocols: eligibility for authorship and ordering of authors

6. All projects supported by NITCAR must, as part of their study protocol, have a section defining the minimum criteria that a regular contributor must reach to be considered to be listed as an author of a paper.

rcise (de jure or de facto) right of veto over submission for publication, as might be the case in smaller projects.

5. Projects supported by NITCAR vary widely in scope, and whilst this policy represents a general position, the management committee may notwithstanding this agree that a particular project is exceptional and agree to the substitution of a different policy on authorship for an individual project, as long as that policy is made clear prior to recruitment of contributors.

Study protocols: eligibility for authorship and ordering of authors

6. All projects supported by NITCAR must, as part of their study protocol, have a section defining the minimum criteria that a regular contributor must reach to be considered to be listed as an author of a paper.
7. Most contributors to a study should be able to meet the minimum criteria for authorship. Such criteria do not have to be excessively onerous: an individual contribution to a many- author paper is likely to be less than an individual contribution to a few-author paper.
8. Authorship criteria must not be constructed in a way likely to lead to guest or ghost authorship. In particular, the management committee anticipates that the contribution of those with senior supervisory roles at individual centres is unlikely to match the contribution of a minimum regular contributor. By the same token, if a project is constructed in a way such that trainees are supervising more junior trainees or students in contributing to the project, then such supervisees should not routinely be excluded from being able to meet authorship criteria. It must not be an explicit condition of eligibility for authorship that the contributor be an infection trainee.
9. Study protocols should specify how those contributing other than by a regular contribution may meet authorship criteria. It is sufficient for a protocol to state that this will be left to the discretion of the project lead.
10. Study protocols should specify how the ordering of those meeting authorship criteria will be determined. It is sufficient for a protocol to state that this will be left to the discretion of the project lead. The management committee expects that the ordering of authors will reflect contributions to the project; in some cases this will correlate with authors' institutions, but care should be taken to ensure that ordering of authors does not result solely from their institution.
11. The management committee anticipates that the project lead(s) will be the first named author(s) on a manuscript submitted for publication, except in exceptional circumstances. In the event a project lead becomes uncontactable or appears to have abandoned the project, the management committee reserves the right to recognise a replacement project lead, who will be regarded as the sole project lead, with the authorship status and position of the previous project lead subject to the remainder of this policy.

Communication

12. Responsibility for keeping contact details up to date lies with individual project contributors, who should communicate changes of contact details to project leads or, if the leads themselves were to become uncontactable, to the NITCAR management committee. The management committee will support any project lead who is unable to include a contributor as an author because lack of contact within a reasonable period means the contributor cannot meet all of the ICMJE authorship criteria, regardless of the extent of contribution to date.
13. The project lead is responsible for making reasonable efforts to contact contributors to solicit contributions to a project that would allow them to meet ICMJE authorship criteria.

Involvement of NITCAR management committee members in projects

14. The support of NITCAR as a whole should be acknowledged on any paper arising from a project it has supported. Corresponding authors may presume that if they have supplied a copy of a manuscript to be submitted to both the consultant chair and the trainee chair of the steering committee and no objection to acknowledgement has been received within a week, then this policy serves as written permission to be acknowledged. NITCAR does not have a right to stop publication of a project, and, just as with authors and their names, its ultimate recourse is to ask for references to NITCAR to be removed from a manuscript. Where projects fail to appropriately acknowledge contributors the NITCAR committee reserves the right to communicate this with relevant professional and academic bodies.
15. Individual management committee members may serve as regular contributors to projects, and may meet authorship criteria in this way.
16. The role of the management committee is to support projects. Simply serving on the management committee would not in general be regarded as sufficient to meet the criteria for authorship on a project, and the acknowledgement of the overall support of NITCAR suffices in this situation.
17. Where individual management committee members provide substantial contributions to a project (at any stage of the project), project leads may elect to offer the opportunity to meet the criteria for inclusion as authors on a resultant paper, or may elect to offer to acknowledge their contributions individually, as appropriate. However, the NITCAR management committee does not require this offer, and to avoid any conflict of interests will not stipulate that a management committee member who is not a project lead or a regular contributor should be offered the opportunity to meet authorship criteria.

18. Criteria for authorship ordering (including the discretion of project leads as a possible criterion) may take into account authors' additional contributions to a project in their roles on the NITCAR management committee, but again to avoid any conflict of interests the NITCAR management committee does not require this.

Journals and limits on numbers of authors

19. In general, the NITCAR management committee is of the view that the decision as to where to submit any project write-up for publication should lie with the project lead, who would be expected to seek advice from other parties involved with the project. The management committee does not stipulate any particular journal. NITCAR is supported by the British Infection Association, which operates a number of journals, and project leads may wish to consider whether one of those journals would represent an appropriate forum for dissemination of the findings of a project.
20. The management committee believes that those who meet ICMJE authorship criteria should be citable authors. Collaborators names may be listed under a single 'Collaborative name.' Or there may be a writing committee with a separate list of citeable authors. Wherever possible, the lead author should seek to submit to journals where such authors remain citeable on Pubmed. The assistance of the management committee should be sought before submission of a publication to a journal where citable authorship is not guaranteed for all contributors.
21. It is possible that the funding bodies of some authors will impose restrictions on where works to which they have contributed can be submitted for publication. In general, the management committee considers this a matter between those authors and their funding bodies. The management committee is unlikely to become involved in such matters, and in particular will not support a funding body that requires open access publication unless the funding body is willing to assume the full cost of open access publication without restricting the project lead's decision as to the journal for submission.
22. It is recognised that projects may or may not be published, and so no guarantees of publication are required. It is recognised that publication can be a challenging and so in situations where reasonable efforts to comply with the policy have been attempted, permission from the NITCAR committee can be sought to deviate from the policy.

Disputes as to authorship

23. NITCAR supports, but does not formally sponsor, collaborative projects. In line with the practice of the Committee on Publication Ethics' (COPE) practice in this area, generally disputes regarding authorship will therefore be considered a matter for individual institutions, and certainly in cases where there is a dispute within an institution as to the contribution of an individual. However, in line with the principle of promoting dissemination of project findings, the management

committee feels it would be inappropriate for an individual institution's action or inaction to render it impossible to publish a project write-up. It is therefore a condition of support of a project by NITCAR, and of individual participation in a project by NITCAR, that if the management committee decides it needs to take a decision on authorship in order to allow dissemination of a project's findings, those involved in the project agree to be bound by the management committee's decision.

24. Individual institutions adjudicating authorship disputes are expected to follow the guidance of COPE. Where the NITCAR management committee involves itself in a dispute as to authorship, it should aim to follow the guidance of COPE, save that it may choose to take a position where COPE guidance would avoid doing so if taking a position would be likely to lead to greater dissemination of project findings.

Presentation of work prior to and after publication

24. Nothing in this policy should be taken to impede the customary practice of presenting one's own ongoing and completed work within one's own institution, subject to maintaining requested confidences over ongoing work.
25. It is anticipated that work in progress and completed work will be presented, and NITCAR encourages this as part of the dissemination of that work.
26. The customary practice that presentations (and submission of abstracts for presentations) outside one's own institution should be made by or with the approval of the project lead should be followed.
27. The requirement that a full authorship list be given for a presentation as for a submitted manuscript does not have to be followed where pragmatic requirements dictate otherwise. NITCAR recognises that final authorship eligibility and orderings may not be fully determined at the time presentations are given, but excessive permutation of authorship lists between presentations, which can mislead as to individual contributions, is discouraged.

Updates to this policy

28. This policy may be updated by the NITCAR management committee, and the existence of an update circulated by project leads to contributors. Contributors will be deemed to have accepted an updated policy by continuing to contribute to a project.
29. If a project contributor is disadvantaged as to authorship eligibility by an update to this policy during contribution to a project, then the earlier policy should be applied with scope solely surrounding that contributor's eligibility for authorship.

Exceptions to this policy

30. Notwithstanding the remainder of this policy, exceptions to this policy may be agreed between the NITCAR management committee and a project lead/project lead(s), as long as the presence of an exception to this policy is made clear to project contributors.

Name of Project:

Name and Signature of Trainee Lead:

Date: