Authorship and its abuse in a scientific publication.
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INTRODUCTION
Authorship of a research in scholarly publishing is asserted by those who contributed intellectually to the completion of the research described in the work. Even writing the whole paper, according to other criteria, would not constitute authorship unless the writer was already engaged in at least one other stage of the research. There are many forms of authorship, and there is exploitation authorship in the scientific community. Concern with these terms and the use of standard publishing principles ethically honors one’s research work.

THE ICMJE RECOMMENDS THAT AUTHORSHIP BE BASED ON THE FOLLOWING 4 CRITERIAS: (1)

- Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

DIFFERENT TYPES OF AUTHORSHIP:
There are commonly three types of author like: First Author Co-author and Corresponding author.

First author:
First author is the one who carries out the bulk of the experiments.
(2) , First author has an important contribution to :
- Experimental design,
- Data analysis,
- Data interpretation and
- Writing of the manuscript.

The corresponding author conventionally, also called ‘last author’.is in most cases the supervisor or the principal investigator.
He has major contribution in –
- The design of the work,
- He will supervise experiments,
- He will verify or even contribute to data analysis, data interpretation and writing of the manuscript.
- Primary responsibility for communication with the journal during the manuscript submission, peer review, and publication process
- Ensures that all the journal’s administrative requirements, such as providing details of authorship, ethics committee approval, clinical trial registration documentation, and gathering conflict of interest forms and statements, are properly completed
- Should be available throughout the submission and peer review process to respond to editorial queries in a timely way.

If you are a named co-author, this means that you: (3)
- Made a significant contribution to the work reported, whether that’s in the conception, study design, execution, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation, or in all these areas.
- Have drafted or written, or substantially revised or critically reviewed the article.
- Have agreed on the journal to which the article will be submitted.
Reviewed and agreed on all versions of the article before submission, during revision, the final version accepted for publication, and any significant changes introduced at the proofing stage.

Agree to take responsibility and be accountable for the contents of the article and to share responsibility to resolve any questions raised about the accuracy or integrity of the published work.

ORDER AUTHOR NAMES:
Based on relative contribution:
1. First author first
2. Co-authors according to contribution
3. Traditionally, corresponding author at last.

There could be multiple first authors, or corresponding authors, these additional first authors equally contributed can be noted by an asterisk other symbol accompanied by an explanatory note.

This practice arose as some journals wanted to increase accountability by requiring senior lab members to review all data and interpretations produced in their labs. Here is an example of multiple first authorship contribution. (https://doi.org/10.3329/updcj.v11i1.53005)
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AUTHORSHIP ABUSE:
When a person is listed as an author, who has not provided any significant assistance to the study is definitely an authorship abuse. Different types of abuse are happening with or without concentration in scientific publication.

Kevin strage from Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee, has been describe in details different types of authorship abuse and recommendation to minimize these abuse has been mention here: (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Authorship Abuse</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercion authorship</td>
<td>Use of intimidation tactics to gain authorship. Arguably a serious form of scientific misconduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary, guest, or gift authorship</td>
<td>Authorship awarded out of respect or friendship, in an attempt to curry favor and/or to give a paper a greater sense of legitimacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual support authorship</td>
<td>Agreement by two or more investigators to place their names on each other’s papers to give the appearance of higher productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication authorship</td>
<td>Publication of the same work in multiple journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghost authorship</td>
<td>Papers written by individuals who are not included as authors or acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of authorship</td>
<td>Publication of work carried out by others without providing them credit for their work with authorship or formal acknowledgment. A form of plagiarism and therefore scientific misconduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MINIMIZING AND RESOLVING AUTHORSHIP DISPUTES (5)

1. All research institutions, journals, and scientific societies should have in place formal authorship policies. The threshold for authorship on a scientific paper should be a direct and significant intellectual contribution to the study. All authors should have contributed to the writing of the manuscript. At a minimum, each author should have written at least the portion of the manuscript in which his/her contribution is discussed and should be able to take public responsibility for that contribution.

2. All research institutions should have in place a well-recognized mechanism for addressing authorship disputes that cannot be resolved by the authors themselves. Authorship dispute resolution committees should comprise both senior and junior investigators and should be free from all real and perceived conflicts of interest.

3. Research institutions should never be allowed to be decision-making bodies in authorship disputes. The role of the institution is to provide a fresh set of eyes on the problem and to assist the individuals involved in the dispute to arrive at an ethical and professional solution.

4. Authorship dispute resolution committees should have the authority to recommend that disciplinary action be pursued if clear evidence of abusive authorship practices is uncovered. At a minimum, individuals who abuse authorship should be required to satisfactorily complete a bioethics course. “Coercion authorship” and “denial of authorship” (see Table 1) should be treated as scientific misconduct and be referred to appropriate institutional bodies for further investigation and disciplinary action.

5. All letters of submission accompanying manuscripts should include an authorship verification statement that is signed by each coauthor and that describes his/her specific contributions.

6. The specific roles of all coauthors should be included in the published article. Deliberate falsification of the description of coauthor contributions should be viewed as scientific misconduct.

7. Every effort should be made to avoid authorship problems from the outset. Authorships should be negotiated and defined in writing at the beginning of an investigation. Frequent communication between all coauthors should occur while investigations are ongoing. Authorship should be discussed regularly and redefined in writing if necessary.

CONCLUSION

Setting authorship criteria, as the ICMJE has done, is evidently inadequate for journal editors. Ignoring the misuse of authorship tarnishes the whole procedure. Simply asking both parties to sign a written declaration of authorship engagement to formally back up a related statement of commitment that is contained in the report as a footnote could go a long way toward curbing this practice and maintaining the jurisdiction over scientific authorship.

However, there is no guarantee that signing the form and making the statement won’t simply become part of the bargaining process, allowing the abuse to continue. Social awareness development within researcher community in a broader way could mimic the condition.
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