

## GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORSHIP AGREEMENT BETWEEN SUPERVISORS AND STUDENTS

---

### 1. Introduction:

Research and other academic outcomes are often distributed via publications, such as journal articles, books, chapters and reports. To be an author of such material is an indicator of a researcher's productivity. Therefore, it is vital that only those who have contributed towards the research and production of the manuscript are equitably acknowledged.

### Aim of Authorship Guidelines:

The Guidelines on Authorship Agreement is for determining authorship of publications emerging from student research at The University of the South Pacific.

“Supervisor” here also refers to “co-supervisor”

### Authorship Guidelines:

In most cases, Masters and PhD research culminate in publication. The issue of authorship may become contentious where there are two or more individuals working together on a research project. The authorship guidelines should assist to avoid disputes between student researchers and their supervisors.

1. A student will be an author of a publication resulting from his/her research project when the student has made a significant intellectual contribution, including data collection and analysis.
2. The supervisor is not *automatically* entitled to authorship of a publication resulting from a student's work, but in most cases is likely to be because of their contribution in areas such as the research ideas, mentorship and guidance of the student in data collection and analyses and in the preparation of the manuscript for publication.
3. Issues concerning expectations for authorship should be discussed at the beginning of the research project. If considered beneficial the understanding reached may be recorded in the form of a Statement of Authorship Agreement<sup>1</sup>
4. Prior to the submission of any manuscript to a publisher a Statement of Authorship<sup>1</sup> must be lodged with the Faculty Associate Dean Research Office.

---

<sup>1</sup> Annex 1

5. The order of the authors' name should follow established convention for the discipline field or for the journal in which the work is to be published. In some discipline fields the principal supervisor is the first author, while in others the main supervisor is normally the last author. In some cases the Authorship Scoring System<sup>2</sup> provided may serve as a guide for determining authorship and the order of authors on publications.
6. In cases where the postgraduate student fails to submit the work for publication within 12 months of completion of the thesis/project then the supervisor may prepare a manuscript for publication, and be entitled to authorship – the student and the supervisor to be authors. As much as possible the student should be notified in writing on the 9th month.
7. In cases where a supervisor fails to provide feedbacks and comments within one month of receiving a draft of a paper in which he/she and the student are co-authors then the student may refer the case to the Faculty Associate Dean Research who can authorize the student to submit the paper without the supervisor's name. This is important to encourage timely publications by students.
8. Any disputes that cannot be resolved should be referred to the Faculty Associate Dean Research. In cases where the Faculty Associate Dean Research or the Faculty Research Committee is unable to resolve the dispute, the parties involved should be referred to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor [Research, Innovation, and International] for resolution.

### **Acknowledgement:**

These guidelines were developed by the University Research Office. They draw heavily on the guidelines developed by the Department of Environmental Science at Rhodes University, South Africa, from which the Research Office has obtained the right to use any part of the their document titled "GUIDELINES ON AUTHORSHIP AGREEMENTS BETWEEN SUPERVISORS AND STUDENTS."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Annex 2

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.ru.ac.za/static/departments/environsci/documents/Coauthorship%20guidelines%20Sept09.pdf>

Annex 1:

**STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP**

On each occasion that research results are prepared for publication, a Statement of Authorship Form must be completed, signed and submitted to the Faculty Associate Dean Research Office. This document must be lodged with the Office *prior to* submitting the manuscript to the publisher.

Where it is not practical to obtain an original signature, faxed or emailed consent is acceptable.

\_\_\_\_\_

Title of Research Project: \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Publication: \_\_\_\_\_

Submitted to (Publisher Name): \_\_\_\_\_

Order of proposed authorship for the publication .....

Principal Author: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

Co-author(s): \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

Annex 2: *We acknowledge the co-authorship scoring system used by the Department of Environmental Science, Rhodes University, South Africa, which has given us the right to reproduce any part of their document.* <sup>4</sup>

## **AUTHORSHIP SCORING SYSTEM**

**It is not mandatory to use these guidelines, but they may assist in determining eligible authors and where appropriate their order of presentation on the manuscript.**

### **Criteria:**

1. **Conceptualisation:** Whose idea was the project? Who contributed most to the conceptual design?
2. **Research design:** Who developed the methodology? Who designed the experiment?
3. **Data collection:** Who collected the data? Who evaluated it as the research progressed?
4. **Data analysis:** Who made conceptual inputs? Who analysed the data? Who interpreted it?
5. **Write-up:** Who made the greatest inputs during the draft write-up stage?
6. **Submission:** Who edited and submitted the final publication from the write up?

### **Decision framework - allocation of authorship:**

1. The student and supervisor do the scoring independently of one another
2. Allocate a score for each criterion.
3. Score as follows: 0 = no contribution; 1 = minimal contribution; 2= some contribution; 3 = major contribution.

### **Proposed actions, based on the scores:**

- If the supervisor receives mostly 0s and 1's, then the student probably has a case to be the sole author as it is clear the supervisor played a relatively minor role. The student should prepare the manuscript.
- If both the student and the supervisor receive approximately equal inputs, then the supervisor deserves second authorship. Responsibility for preparation of the manuscript for publication will be a joint responsibility, or a split of tasks and timetable negotiated between the student and supervisor.
- If the student receives mostly 0's and 1's, and the supervisor mostly 2's and 3's, then the supervisor may write up the work after 12 months and the student might receive co-authorship. This would be an unusual scenario, and reflects the situation where a student may have indeed failed their project, but that some aspects of the data may be publishable if re-analysed or supplemented with additional data from other work.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.ru.ac.za/static/departments/environsci/documents/Coauthorship%20guidelines%20Sept09.pdf>

**AUTHORSHIP SCORING SHEET:**

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Lead Author Score</b>	<b>Co-Author Score</b>
Conceptualisation	Origin		
	Conceptual Design		
Research design	Development of Methodology		
	Experimental lay-out and design		
Data collection	Data collection		
	Evaluation of data		
Data analysis	Methods and tests		
	Analysis		
	Interpretation		
Write-up	Initial write-up		
	Getting manuscript ready for publication		
<b>Total</b>			

(Score as follows: 0 = no contribution; 1 = minimal contribution; 2= some contribution; 3 = major contribution)