#

**Publication and Authorship Policy**

# SECTION I: AUTHORSHIP POLICY

1. **PRINCIPLES OF AUTHORSHIP**

 The following principles of authorship have been derived from editorial publications from leading journals1,2 and are in accordance with the rules of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (<http://www.icmje.org/ethical_1author.html>). These principles apply to all NELA outputs including reports, scientific papers and presentations.

1. **Individual Authorship**

In order to qualify for authorship an individual must fulfil the following criteria1:

1. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work represented by the article to take public responsibility for the content.
2. Participation must include three steps:
* conception or design of the work represented by the article, and/or acquisition of data, and/or analysis and interpretation of the data; AND
* drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
* final approval of the version to be published.

Participation solely in the collection of data is insufficient by itself. Persons who have contributed intellectually to the article, but whose contributions do not justify authorship, will be acknowledged and their contribution described.1

1. **Group Authorship (five options)**

Group authorship may be appropriate for some publications, such as scientific manuscripts summarising NELA reports. This will apply when the intellectual work underpinning a publication 'has been carried out by a group, and no one person can be identified as having substantially greater responsibility for its contents than others'.1 In such cases the authorship will be presented by the collective title – “The NELA Project Team” - and the article should carry a footnote of the names of the people (and their institutions) represented by the corporate title.

One or more authors may take responsibility for drafting the paper but all group members qualify as authors; in this case, this should be recognised using the byline 'Jane Doe ***and***The NELA Project Team'.2

Group authorship may also be appropriate for publications where one or more authors take responsibility for a group, in which case the other group members are not authors but may be listed in the acknowledgement (the byline would read 'Jane Doe ***for***the NELA Project Team'). 2

Group authorship may incorporate a combination of these approaches. For example ‘Jane Doe ***and*** the NELA Project Team ***for*** the NELA Collaborators.

Particular papers, such as describing methodological developments, may have individual authorship only.

1. **Definition of Group Membership**

NELA Project Team: all members of the NELA Project Team who contributed to analysis and/or interpretation of data used in the relevant manuscript. At the time of manuscript submission, these individuals may be current or past members of the NELA Project Team.

NELA Collaborators: all registered data contributors during the timeframe relevant to the manuscript.

1. **Determining Authorship**

Tentative decisions on authorship should be made as soon as possible.1 These should be justified to, and agreed by, the chair of the NELA Project Team following discussion by the Project Team through the process outlined in Section II. Any difficulties or disagreements will be resolved by the NELA Project Team. Any conflicts may be referred to NELA Project Team, with appeal to HSRC (non-conflicted chair/deputy).

1. **AUTHORSHIP FOR PUBLICATIONS ARISING FROM NELA**
2. **Operationalising Authorship Rules**

We envisage two types of report (including conference presentations) arising from NELA and its associated projects:

1. *Reports of work arising from the main NELA Dataset -* If all NELA Project Team fulfil authorship rules, group authorship may be used under the collective title of “The NELA Project Team”; if one or more individuals have made a significant contribution above and beyond other group members but where all group members fulfil authorship rules, authorship will be attributed to 'Jane Doe and “The NELA Project Team”.

Reports that contractually required to deliver will as a rule be by NELA PT. publication vs reports

1. *Reports of individual sub-studies and subsidiary projects -* Authorship should be guided by the authorship rules outlined in Section 1 above. NELA Project Team members not directly associated with the specific project should only be included as authors if they fulfil the authorship criteria. NELA Project Team members who have made a contribution to the project but do not fulfil authorship criteria should be recognised in the Acknowledgement section. The role of “The NELA Project Team” in the development and support of the project should be recognised in the Acknowledgement section. The lead author should be responsible for ratifying authorship with the NELA Project Team.

For reports which specifically arise from NELA but where all Project Team members do not fulfil authorship rules (for example, specialist sub-study publications), authorship should be attributed to “Jane Doe *for* ‘The NELA Project Team”. If individual members of the group are dissatisfied by a decision, they can appeal to the NELA Project Team for reconciliation. If this cannot be achieved, the matter should be referred to the HSRC (non-conflicted chair/deputy).

**b. Quality Assurance**

Ensuring quality assurance is essential to the good name of NELA. All reports of work arising from NELA including conference abstracts should be peer reviewed by the NELA Project Team.

The NELA Project Team undertakes to respond to submission of articles for peer review following submission within three weeks of manuscript circulation.

The internal peer review for reports of work arising from NELA is mandatory and submission may be delayed or vetoed if there are serious concerns about the scientific quality of the report. The NELA Project Team will be responsible for decisions about submission following internal peer review. If individual members of the group are dissatisfied by decisions, the matter may be referred to the HSRC (non-conflicted chair/deputy).
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**SECTION II:** **PUBLICATION PROCEDURES**

NELA has explicit procedures for undertaking individual authorship publications. All relevant steps that should be undertaken in order to author a paper stemming from data collected as part of NELA are outlined below:

* Every author who is planning to write a paper for publication in a peer-reviewed journal or in a peer reviewed presentation should complete a “paper/presentation proposal form” (Appendix) providing all the necessary detail.
* The proposal form should be circulated to all the potentially relevant co-authors (see Section 1.1.a for details on how to qualify for authorship).
* Electronic copies of completed forms should be sent to the NELA
* All publications need to conform to HQIP rules and SOPs on publication of HQIP data.
* Given a positive decision in favour of writing a paper the lead author is responsible for co-ordinating (a) the writing of the paper (b) circulating drafts for comment allowing co-authors reasonable time to respond (c) ensuring quality assurance (see Section I, 2.b) and for informing the NELA Project Team when (d) the paper has been submitted and (e) when the paper has been accepted.
* Resubmission of the same paper to a different journal following rejection should be checked with the group of authors as well as the NELA Project Team

**SUB-STUDY / SUB-PAPER PROPOSAL**

#  Date: ................

# LEAD AUTHOR: ...............................................................

## Working title of paper

...........................................................................................................................

**Target journal**

[With key author guidance such as word limit]

## Named co-authors, contributions to date and expected contributions

## Timeline for drafts and author comments

[including target date for submission]

## Background

[Include aims and research questions]

## Data, Analysis, Discussion

[Include i. Data management plan (separate database, linkage to METS main database); ii. Whether statistical resources and skills are in place to undertake the analysis]

## Hypotheses

## Likely resource requirements

## Likely key messages

## Dissemination Plan

## Key references