



Authorship Policy

The structural and organisational impacts of perioperative enhanced care services in the UK:
A Retrospective Evaluation of Post-operative Alternatives to Critical Care (REPACC)

Pan-London Perioperative Audit & Research Network

IRAS Project ID: 338772

Correspondence

Chief Investigator (CI):

Dr Christopher Oddy

Department of Anaesthesia

Kingston Hospital

Galsworthy Rd

Kingston upon Thames

KT2 7QB

Email: repacc.plan@gmail.com

Section I: Authorship Policy

Principles of authorship

The following principles of authorship have been derived from editorial publications from leading journals^{1,2} 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 REPACC outputs including reports, scientific papers and presentations.

Individual authorship

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

- i. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work represented by the article to take public responsibility for the content.
- ii. 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

Group authorship (five options)

1. Group authorship may be appropriate for some publications, such as scientific manuscripts summarising REPACC 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 REPACC Study Investigators' - and the article should be published alongside an authorship document with the names of collaborators and their affiliated organisations. Regional and local leads will be recognised as such. This document should be ordered as follows:
 - a. Members of the REPACC Core Committee.
 - b. Regional leads and leads for trainee research networks (TRNs).
 - c. Collaborators for each site, ordered by:
 - i. Trainee lead (or co-leads up to a maximum of 2).
 - ii. Trainee investigators.
 - iii. Consultant supervisor.

2. 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 REPACC Study Investigators'.²
3. 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 REPACC Study Investigators').²
4. Group authorship may incorporate a combination of these approaches. For example 'Jane Doe **and** The REPACC Study Investigators **for** The REPACC Study Investigators'.
5. Particular papers, such as describing methodological developments, may have individual authorship only.

Definition of Group Membership

REPACC Core Committee: all members of the REPACC Committee 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 REPACC Core Committee.

The REPACC Study Investigators: all registered data contributors during the timeframe relevant to the manuscript.

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 REPACC Core Committee following discussion by the core committee through the process outlined in Section II. Any difficulties or disagreements will be resolved by the REPACC Core Committee. Any conflicts may be referred to REPACC Core Committee, with appeal to HSRC (non-conflicted chair/deputy).

Authorship for publications arising from REPACC

Operationalising authorship rules

We envisage two types of report, including conference presentations, arising from REPACC and its associated projects:

- i. **Reports of work arising from the main REPACC Dataset** - Provided all of the REPACC Core Committee fulfil authorship rules, following individual authorship, group authorship will be recognised under the collective title of 'The REPACC Study Investigators'. 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 REPACC Study Investigators'.
- ii. **Reports of individual sub-studies and subsidiary projects** - Authorship should be guided by the authorship rules outlined in Section 1 above. REPACC Core Committee members not directly associated with the specific project should only be included as authors if they fulfil the authorship criteria. REPACC Core Committee 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 REPACC Study Investigators' 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 REPACC Core Committee.

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

References

1. Huth EJ (1986). Guidelines on authorship of medical papers. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, **104**, 269-274.
2. Glass RM (1992). New information for authors and readers. Group authorship, acknowledgements and rejected manuscripts. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, **268**, 99.

Quality assurance

Ensuring quality assurance is essential to REPACC and the HSRC. All reports of work arising from REPACC including conference abstracts should be peer reviewed by the REPACC Core Committee.

The REPACC Core Committee undertake 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 REPACC is mandatory and submission may be delayed or vetoed if there are serious concerns about the scientific quality of the report. The REPACC Core Committee 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).

Section II: Publication Procedures

REPACC 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 REPACC 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 write a short proposal providing all the necessary detail.
- The proposal should also 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 proposal should be sent to the REPACC Core Committee for review (via the CI Dr Chris Oddy).
- 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 REPACC Core Committee 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 REPACC Core Committee.