**Guidelines for co-authoring publications between research supervisor and supervisee**

**Prepared by Dr Kaushalya Perera and Mr Kanishka Werawella for the Research Ethics Committee for Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts, University of Colombo**

With the steep rise in research journals and journal publications there have been growing concerns about unethical practices related to publishing. As a higher educational institution interested in research, the University of Colombo encourages the dissemination of research by its academics and graduate and undergraduate students, which can take the form of publications, conference papers, and abstracts among other forms. The Research Ethics Committee for Social Sciences and Humanities (RECSSH) presents these guidelines on co-authoring and co-publishing between supervisors and their supervisees in order to contribute to awareness and further discussions on this issue amongst the academic community. The RECSSH understands that disciplinary norms and guidelines may differ, e.g., publishing between supervisors and supervisees in STEM subjects may differ from humanities and social sciences where supervisees typically work on a study considered their own and publish independently. As such, our guidelines are specifically aimed at supervisors publishing with supervisees in the social sciences and humanities and should be understood as such.  It is also assumed that the research that gives rise to publications has been conducted ethically, and has obtained necessary approvals.

**Collaboration**

It is recommended that the supervisor(s) and supervisee(s) discuss roles and responsibilities related to co-authoring and co-publishing from early in the supervision process.

A log of responsibilities and contributions by each author should be maintained jointly (see Annex 1) which can result in clarity and ensure transparency of the process and may be useful for all parties if required at a future date.  This will also be useful for any eventuality where supervisors change.

**Authorship**

There is no one simple definition of authorship versus lesser contribution to a scholarly text and some grey areas exist. The criteria we present for deciding authorship are gleaned from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

*Who is an author?*

COPE guidelines (Cope Council, 2019, p.4) require that authors fulfill the following two criteria at the very least:

1.  substantial contribution to the work

2.  accountable for the work that was done and its presentation in a publication

In the social sciences and humanities, many journals also consider 'substantial contribution' to mean not merely supervision of the research that contributed to the publication, but substantial input towards the writing of the text.

*Order of authorship*

In a research publication with more than one author, it is recommended that the supervisee is the first author of a publication stemming from their research.

**Acknowledgements**

Limited contributions to the publication are credited with an acknowledgement rather than authorship. Where relevant and appropriate, individuals, institutions and organizations who have contributed to the publication, including in terms of providing funds and access to material,

should be acknowledged. In addition to being an acknowledgement of services, this also provides clarity on the individual's contributions.

Acknowledgements typically include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Supervisors who have not taken part in authoring the text to be published

- Research support personnel (e.g., translators, interpreters, coders, statisticians, etc)

- Other scholars who have provided feedback on the publication in draft form

**Data Ownership**

In deciding authorship, a discussion on the ownership of data is pertinent. We propose the following considerations:

- Establishing clear agreements about data ownership and intellectual property rights at the beginning of the supervisory relationship is essential. This discussion should include answers to questions such as 'Who owns the data collected? Who has the right to publish findings? What are expectations regarding co-authorship?'

- Supervisors should ensure that the supervisee's contributions to the research design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation are fairly recognized, especially in publications and presentations. This includes appropriate authorship and acknowledgement.

- Supervisors should never coerce supervisees into collecting or analyzing data in a way that compromises ethical principles or the supervisee's well-being. This includes pressuring them to fabricate data, manipulate results, presenting biased accounts or working under unreasonable conditions.

- Supervisors have a responsibility to guide supervisees in understanding and adhering to ethical best practices in quantitative and qualitative data collection and management, including data security, privacy, documentation, and dissemination.

- In instances, where research is conducted with secondary data or databases (e.g., corpora, databases, census data), which are either freely accessible or paid for by the institution where the supervisee is registered or by the supervisor, the supervisor may use that data to publish on other issues separately.

- In supervision scenarios where outputs other dissertations are involved (e.g., apps, curricula, creative work) it is recommended that in relation to ownership and intellectual property rights international guidelines over such outputs be followed.

- In instances where other entities are involved (e.g., institutions other than where the supervisee is registered as a student, commercial entities, organizations, groups of people) the supervisor, supervisee and the third parties should discuss ownership of data and any other output, and agreements must be made where use and ownership of of data, dissemination rights and other outputs are fair and just with regard to all parties.

- In instances where Artificial Intelligence tools have been used by the supervisor or supervisee, these must be acknowledged (see Annex II).

For ease of reference, these guidelines are brief. Supervisors and supervisees should make all possible efforts to educate themselves on publishing ethics and norms, since this is a changing landscape.

Reference

COPE Council. (September 2019). "COPE Discussion Document: Authorship." Available at

file:///Users/air/Downloads/cope_dd_a4_authorship_sept19_screen_aw.pdf

Annex 1

**Example of a description of roles and responsibilities:**

Conceptualization of study: AA1 (Supervisee)

Ethical approval by institution: first draft by AA1 and revisions by AA2 (supervisor)

Primary data Collection/data identification [e.g., in corpora, database]: AA1

Secondary data collection: AA1

Formal analysis: AA1

Supervision: AA2

Funding acquisition: AA2

Methodology: AA1 (conceptualization), AA2 (supervision)

Project administration: NA

Writing – original draft of journal article: AA1

Revisions of first draft: AA2

Revisions after round 1 of review - AA2, AA1

Revisions after round 2 of review - AA2

Proofs – AA2

This is a sample of the AI declaration in *World Development* [journal published by Elsevier].

# Declaration of generative AI in scientific writing

Authors must declare the use of generative AI in scientific writing upon submission of the paper. The following guidance refers only to the writing process, and not to the use of AI tools to analyse and draw insights from data as part of the research process:

- Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies should only be used in the writing process to improve the readability and language of the manuscript.

- The technology must be applied with human oversight and control and authors should carefully review and edit the result, as AI can generate authoritative-sounding output that can be incorrect, incomplete or biased. Authors are ultimately responsible and accountable for the contents of the work.

- Authors must not list or cite AI and AI-assisted technologies as an author or co-author on the manuscript since authorship implies responsibilities and tasks that can only be attributed to and performed by humans.

The use of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in scientific writing must be declared by adding a statement at the end of the manuscript when the paper is first submitted. The statement will appear in the published work and should be placed in a new section before the references list. An example:

- Title of new section: Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process.

- Statement: During the preparation of this work the author(s) used [NAME TOOL / SERVICE] in order to [REASON]. After using this tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take(s) full responsibility for the content of the published article.

The declaration does not apply to the use of basic tools, such as tools used to check grammar, spelling and references. If you have nothing to disclose, you do not need to add a statement.

Please read Elsevier's author policy on the use of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies, which can be found in our GenAI Policies for journals.

Please note: to protect authors' rights and the confidentiality of their research, this journal does not currently allow the use of generative AI or AI-assisted technologies such as ChatGPT or similar services by reviewers or editors in the peer review and manuscript evaluation process, as is stated in our GenAI Policies for journals. We are actively evaluating compliant AI tools and may revise this policy in the future.