



Case Study: Authorship

University of Granada team

UZDOC 2.0 meetings

Tashkent Chemical-Technological Institute, 09/02/2018

Case Study: Authorship

This case discusses issues of assignment of authorship, mentor-student relationships, intellectual property and intellectual contribution, and the role of technicians vs. the role of graduate students.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

People

- Dr. Messelman Killinger head of the lab.
- David Tonkyn is a post-doc in Killenger's lab.
- Haruko Tomonaga, a technician in Killinger's lab.
- Benson Zophar is a first year graduate student who is currently doing a six-week rotation through Killenger's lab.

Policy about authorship

- The policy is discussed with each new member who joins his lab.
- It states that only those who have made a significant intellectual contribution to an experiment will be included on any paper.
- It states that the head of the lab is the final authority about what is defined as a significant intellectual contribution, should a disagreement arise.
- It states that the head of the lab will be included as last author on any paper that is the result of research done in his lab.



UZDOC 2.0.
FURTHERING THE QUALITY OF DOCTORAL
EDUCATION IN UZBEKISTAN



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

A particular application of the policy

David write a paper, gives the paper to Haruko for review, and then presents the data at the lab meeting the following week.

Following the meeting, Killinger, David, Haruko and Benson discuss authorship assignments for the paper.

David makes the point that since Haruko offered novel ideas to the project and helped in trouble-shooting and in the review of the paper, she should be included as second author.

He further argues that although Benson assisted on the last experiment of the project, he did not contribute intellectually and therefore should not be listed as an author. David states that Benson should be included in the acknowledgements for his contributions to the project.

Finally, David states that Killinger should be included as last author on the paper since the work was done in his lab and supported by funds from his grant.

All present are in agreement with David's decision, and the paper is submitted.

Discussion Questions

- Do you agree with the order of authorship that David proposed? Why or why not?
- Is it ethical to include Haruko (the technician), but not to include Benson (the graduate student) on the list of authors for this paper?
- Does it matter that Benson was just rotating through the lab and not (as yet) a regular member?
- What constitutes a significant intellectual contribution? Who should decide?