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1 PURPOSE

1.1 This Guideline sets out the criteria for authorship, peer review and dissemination of research, and processes to be followed in:
   1.1.1 appointing and reporting authors of all Research Outputs;
   1.1.2 attributing authorship in other documents related to Research, including (but not limited to) grant applications, contracts, and tenders;
   1.1.3 ensuring appropriate peer review of Research Outputs;
   1.1.4 publishing and promoting Research Outputs.

1.2 The Guideline applies where Research Outputs or other documents related to Research are communicated or made publicly available, including (but are not limited to) journal articles, book chapters, books, conference papers, reports, performances or exhibitions. These may be in hardcopy, electronic or other form.

2 RELATED DOCUMENTS

2.1 Australian Code of Conduct for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018
2.2 Authorship – A guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018
2.3 Peer Review – A guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018
2.4 Vancouver Protocol
2.5 Code of Conduct: Research
2.6 Procedure: Managing Potential Breaches of the Code of Conduct: Research
2.7 Policy: Intellectual Property
2.8 Policy: Privacy
2.9 Policy: Research Data Management
2.10 Procedure: Research Data Management
2.11 Policy: Supervision of HDR Students
2.12 Policy: Award of Emeritus Title
2.13 Procedure: Supervision and Candidacy Processes for HDR Students

3 SCOPE

3.1 This Guideline applies to any form of Research Output that is made publicly available.

3.2 Where a non-traditional Research Output is published in written form or otherwise presented as a creative work, authorship should apply in a manner appropriate to the format of the Research Output.

4 AUTHORSHIP CRITERIA

4.1 In order to qualify for authorship, a person must make a substantial scholarly contribution to the intellectual shaping of a Research Output, and be accountable for the Output. At least one, and normally a combination of the following criteria must be satisfied:
4.1.1 Participation in the conception and design of the research project;
4.1.2 Acquisition of research data where the acquisition has required significant intellectual judgment or input;
4.1.3 Analysis or interpretation of research data;
4.1.4 Drafting significant parts of the work or critically revising it so as to contribute to its interpretation and intellectual content;
4.1.5 Giving final approval of the version to be published.

4.2 A person not qualified to be named as an author should not be offered authorship.

4.3 The following contributions on their own do not justify authorship:
4.3.1 Provision of funding, materials, infrastructure or access to equipment; or
4.3.2 Collection of data where the collection has not required significant scholarly or intellectual contribution or expertise; or
4.3.3 General supervision of the research team conducting the research; or
4.3.4 Membership of the research group; or
4.3.5 Holding a position of authority, status or seniority; or
4.3.6 Status of an individual being such that it would elevate the esteem of the research; or
4.3.7 Providing routine technical support, technical advice or technical assistance.

4.4 If a person has contributed to the creation of the research in ways other than through a substantial scholarly input, their contribution should be appropriately acknowledged, however this does not qualify the person for authorship.

4.5 Any part of an article critical to its main conclusion must be the responsibility of at least one author.

4.6 A person qualifying as an author in accordance with clause 4.1 must not be included or excluded as an author without their written agreement.

5 AGREETING TO AUTHORSHIP

5.1 Authorship of a Research Output should be discussed between researchers, including research students, where relevant. Discussion should take place at an early stage in a project, and reviewed whenever there are changes in participation.

5.2 In accepting authorship, the author is responsible for the integrity and accuracy of at least that element of the research they conducted.

5.3 Where there is more than one author, the order of authorship should be a joint decision of the co-authors based on an objective and fair assessment of the proportional contributions of each individual.

5.4 Where there is more than one author, an authorship agreement should be in place that includes the following information:
5.4.1 Who will be recognised as the authors of the Research Output;
5.4.2 Who will be considered the ‘senior author’ (that is, the person who has made the primary intellectual contribution to the Research Output), and a description of the contribution that each author has made (or will make) to the Research Output;
5.4.3 The order in which the authors appear, consistent with any applicable disciplinary norms and publication requirements;
5.4.4 At least one corresponding author who is responsible for communication with the publisher and managing communication between the authors. This can be, but does not have to be, the senior author.

5.5 An authorship agreement may be in the form of emails, a transcript of an online discussion
5.6 All listed authors are accountable for the whole Research Output, although responsibilities associated with this accountability are dependent on the extent and type of contribution made.

5.7 When agreeing to authorship, each author will declare any potential or actual conflicts of interest, in accordance with the Code of Conduct: Research.

5.8 If a conflict of interest arises following the agreement of authorship, the author should declare their conflict to the other authors and any other relevant parties, such as funding bodies and publishers.

5.9 Dissemination of research may not proceed until all valid authors agree on authorship.

6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS

6.1 A publication must contain appropriate acknowledgement of the contributions made by all participants in the relevant research, including the work of research students and research assistants, laboratory assistants, supervisors, participants, funders, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledge holders, external collaborators, and any other persons providing technical writing, technical support, editing, translation and transcription services.

6.2 Research Outputs should appropriately acknowledge:

   6.2.1 all sources of financial and in-kind support for the research;
   6.2.2 people and/or organisations who have contributed facilities, data or materials to the research.

6.3 As appropriate, permission should be obtained from named contributors before acknowledging them in a Research Output, as acknowledgement may imply a contributor’s endorsement of the Research Output.

6.4 As per the University’s Policy: Award of Emeritus Title, Emeritus title holders must provide appropriate acknowledgement in publications and grant applications arising from research involving the University.

7 AUTHORSHIP DISPUTES

7.1 Every attempt should be made to reach agreement on the authorship of a publication and the order in which authors are listed.

7.2 Any disputes about authorship should be referred to a Research Integrity Advisor, for resolution at the local level where possible.

7.3 If a dispute cannot be resolved, then it will be referred to the Dean, who will decide on an appropriate course of action.

7.4 Work that is the subject of an authorship dispute will not be disseminated until the dispute is resolved.

8 PEER REVIEW

8.1 Peer Review processes should be conducted responsibly and in accordance with Peer Review: A Guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (the Guide).
8.2 In accordance with the Guide and the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* 2018, Peer Review is “the impartial and independent assessment of research by others working in the same or a related field”.

8.3 Researchers with the appropriate expertise should recognise the importance of participating in Peer Review processes, and embrace the opportunity to support activities such as, but not limited to, the formal or informal assessment of research proposals, grant applications and Research Outputs.

8.4 Peer reviewers should be fair, rigorous and timely. They should maintain the confidentiality of the content under review and also:

8.4.1 Ensure that they are informed about, and comply with, the criteria to be applied in the Peer Review process;

8.4.2 Review research objectively and respectfully with respect to review criteria;

8.4.3 Declare any potential conflicts of interest prior to the review in accordance with the *Code of Conduct: Research*;

8.4.4 Apply standards equally to all research under review;

8.4.5 Maintain professionalism in the tone of their comments, ensuring that reviews are as constructive as possible;

8.4.6 Act in accordance with the rights associated with the Statement: Academic Freedom, by giving proper consideration to research that challenges or changes accepted ways of thinking, which may include innovative, interdisciplinary or collaborative research.

8.5 Researchers whose work is undergoing Peer Review must not seek to influence the process or outcomes.

9 PUBLICATION AND DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH

9.1 Publication and dissemination of Research Outputs should be complete, accurate and unambiguous.

9.2 Deliberate inclusion of inaccurate or misleading information in any dissemination of Research Outputs (including in curriculum vitae, grant or job applications or other public statements) is a form of Research Misconduct and will be addressed as per the University’s Procedure: *Managing and Investigating Breaches of the Code of Conduct: Research*.

9.3 A researcher should not submit the same or very similar Research Outputs/manuscripts for simultaneous peer review by multiple publishers. If a manuscript is turned down by one publisher, and is submitted to another publisher in the same or similar form, this should be disclosed to the publisher at the time of submission.

9.4 Research Outputs should not be disseminated to the public before undergoing Peer Review. The only exception to this is where the dissemination of Outputs is demonstrably and clearly in the public interest; in this case, dissemination may be justified but the unreviewed status of the Outputs must be disclosed at the time.

9.5 Where there is private reporting of Research Outputs that have not yet undergone peer review (for example, to prospective or current financial supporters), researchers should explain fully the status of the work and the Peer Review that will be undertaken.

9.6 Publications must detail all sources of financial support for the research. Financial support that carries an embargo on such detail should be avoided.

10 DEFINITIONS
10.1 For the purpose of this Guideline, the definitions outlined in the *Code of Conduct: Research* apply.

10.2 In addition, the following definitions apply to this Guideline:

10.2.1 *Author* means an individual who has made a substantial intellectual contribution to a Research Output and who has agreed to take responsibility for the Research Output.

10.2.2 *Research Output* or *Output* communicates or makes available the products of research and include (but are not limited to) journal articles, book chapters, books, conference papers, reports, performances or exhibitions and may be in hardcopy, electronic or other form.

10.2.3 *Senior Author* means the person who has made the primary intellectual contribution to the research output.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date of approval</th>
<th>Approved by</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25 March 2021</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor (following endorsement by Provost and Academic Council on 2 March 2021)</td>
<td>Effective date - new Guideline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11  APPENDIX A: EXAMPLE OF AN AUTHORSHIP AGREEMENT

This example is suggested by Elsevier (https://www.elsevier.com/__data/promis_misc/Author
contributions.docx), and is recommended as a guide.

Author Contributions Agreement

This agreement specifies the contribution of each author of your manuscript. Five types of contributions are listed: Conceived and designed the analysis; collected the data; contributed data or analysis tools; performed the analysis; wrote the paper.

For each author of your manuscript, please indicate the types of contributions the author has made. An author may have made more than one type of contribution. Optionally, for each contribution type, you may specify the contribution of an author in more detail by providing a one-sentence statement in which the contribution is summarised. In the case of an author who contributed to performing the analysis, the author’s contribution for instance could be specified in more detail as ‘Performed the computer simulations’, ‘Performed the statistical analysis’, or ‘Performed the text mining analysis’.

If an author has made a contribution that is not covered by the five pre-defined contribution types, then please choose ‘Other contribution’ and provide a one-sentence statement summarising the author’s contribution.

Manuscript title: Enter manuscript title

Author 1: Enter author name
☐ Conceived and designed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Collected the data: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Contributed data or analysis tools: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Performed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Wrote the paper: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Other contribution: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)

Author 2: Enter author name
☐ Conceived and designed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Collected the data: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Contributed data or analysis tools: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Performed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Wrote the paper: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Other contribution: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)

Author 3: Enter author name
☐ Conceived and designed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Collected the data: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Contributed data or analysis tools: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Performed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Wrote the paper: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Other contribution: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)

Author 4: Enter author name
☐ Conceived and designed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Collected the data: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Contributed data or analysis tools: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Performed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Wrote the paper: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Other contribution: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)

Author 5: Enter author name
☐ Conceived and designed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Collected the data: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Contributed data or analysis tools: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Performed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Wrote the paper: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Other contribution: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)

Author 6: Enter author name
☐ Conceived and designed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Collected the data: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Contributed data or analysis tools: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Performed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Wrote the paper: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Other contribution: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)

Author 7: Enter author name
☐ Conceived and designed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Collected the data: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Contributed data or analysis tools: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Performed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Wrote the paper: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Other contribution: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)

Author 8: Enter author name
☐ Conceived and designed the analysis: Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
☐ Collected the data: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Contributed data or analysis tools: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Performed the analysis: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Wrote the paper: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Other contribution: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*

**Author 9: Enter author name**
☐ Conceived and designed the analysis: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Collected the data: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Contributed data or analysis tools: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Performed the analysis: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Wrote the paper: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Other contribution: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*

**Author 10: Enter author name**
☐ Conceived and designed the analysis: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Collected the data: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Contributed data or analysis tools: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Performed the analysis: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Wrote the paper: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*
☐ Other contribution: *Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)*