



## How to spot authorship problems

Editors cannot police author or contributor listing for every submission but may sometimes have suspicions that an author list is incomplete or includes undeserving (guest or gift) authors. The COPE flowchart on 'What to do if you suspect ghost, guest or gift authorship' suggests actions for these situations. The following points are designed to help editors be alert for inappropriate authorship and spot warning signs which may indicate problems.

### Type of authorship problems

A ghost author is someone who is omitted from an authorship list despite qualifying for authorship. This is not necessarily the same as a ghost writer, since omitted authors often perform other roles, in particular data analysis. (Gotzsche et al. have shown that statisticians involved with study design are frequently omitted from papers reporting industry-funded trials.) If a professional writer has been involved with a publication it will depend on the authorship criteria being used whether s/he fulfils the criteria to be listed as an author. Using the ICMJE criteria for research papers, medical writers usually do not qualify as authors, but their involvement and funding source should be acknowledged.

A guest or gift author is someone who is listed as an author despite not qualifying for authorship. Guests are generally people brought in to make the list look more impressive (despite having little or no involvement with the research or publication). Gift authorship often involves mutual CV enhancement (i.e. including colleagues on papers in return for being listed on theirs).

### Signs that might indicate authorship problems

- Corresponding author seems unable to respond to reviewers' comments
- Changes are made by somebody not on the author list (check Word document properties to see who made the changes but bear in mind there may be an innocent explanation for this, e.g. using a shared computer, or a secretary making changes)
- Document properties show the manuscript was drafted by someone not on the author list or properly acknowledged (but see above)
- Impossibly prolific author e.g. of review articles/opinion pieces (check also for redundant/overlapping publication) (this may be detected by a Medline or Google search using the author's name)
- Several similar review articles/editorials/opinion pieces have been published under different author names (this may be detected by a Medline or Google search using the article title or key words)
- Role missing from list of contributors (e.g. it appears that none of the named authors were responsible for analysing the data or drafting the paper)
- Unfeasibly long or short author list (e.g. a simple case report with a dozen authors or a randomised trial with a single author)
- Industry-funded study with no authors from sponsor company (this may be legitimate, but may also mean deserving authors have been omitted; reviewing the protocol may help determine the role of employees – see *Gotzsche et al.* and commentary by Wager)

#### References

Gotzsche PC, Hrobjartsson A, Johansen HK, Haar MT, Altman DG et al. *Ghost authorship in industry-initiated randomised trials*. PLoS Med 2007; 4(1):e19, doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.00440019

Wager E (2007) *Authors, Ghosts, Damned Lies, and Statisticians*. PLoS Med 2007;4(1):e34, doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0040034

Developed for COPE by Liz Wager of Sideview ([www.lizwager.com](http://www.lizwager.com)) © 2013 Committee on Publication Ethics First published 2006

A non-exclusive licence to reproduce these flowcharts may be applied for by writing to: [cope\\_administrator@publicationethics.org](mailto:cope_administrator@publicationethics.org)