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well i introduce you are we okay with starting i'll go ahead and start uh hi i'm Peter Schwartz i'm

the director of the iu center for bioethics and for this talk i'm most importantly the director of the

bioethics and subject advocacy program of the indiana ctsi and this is our next version of our

treats talks translational research ethics and applied topics we present these

roughly monthly and often taught by one of our faculty members in the bsap program and jane is

absolutely one of those she's been a long-standing bsap faculty member as well as a faculty investigator

at the iu center for bioethics we are lucky and proud to have jane to count her among our crew

her day job though is to be the director of clinical and organizational ethics

for the academic health center at the fairbanks center for medical ethics at iu health and i learn from jane all

the time not just when she's teaching my classes if she's a guest lecturer but also whenever i talk to her

and so i'm sure we all will learn from her today um the treats talks are all archived on our website somebody maybe

talk and put that into the chat if you want to go see while not you won't be i mean you'll be paying full attention

to jane i know professor i should say professor hartsock uh and so you'll be favored but you

might want to see our treats page which now has all the previous treats talks so this is once

the last few years with resources attached and a description uh and so you can see where the resources

are you can direct other people to them if you'd like we're very proud of that i've worked hard to improve that maybe we'll put

that like i can put that in the chat or talk and um okay and so with no further ado i am

thrilled to have uh professor hartsock talk to us about authorship she's spoken to us about that before

she's going to give us an update and perhaps some additional um pointers so thanks uh professor

Hartsock all right i'm going to share my screen which is always the most

stressful part of any presentation these days but hopefully that will work uh well

enough but i'm going to be the bad guy here and say people who can turn on their camera feel free to you don't have to

it's always more fun to have cameras on we were talking about teaching in person versus over zoom if you're eating lunch or doing

something you don't want to have a have guests with you that's fine but we do appreciate when cameras are on

hi jeff thanks all right so i should be sharing only one slide and so if i'm not

somebody can text me furiously let me know okay so uh as um Dr. Schwartz said i am Jane

Hartsock i'm a faculty investigator with iu center for bioethics and have some other fun roles that i

play here on campus um this will be our uh treats talk on authorship i have tried to center my

talk around some of the publishing issues that have come up in the context of the covid publishing frenzy of the past

year and a half or so um and i've done that just to make it sort of relevant to um

to people um or particularly interesting maybe hopefully to people

but really much of what we talk about today applies to just authorship in any time it's just that covid seems to be good at

revealing existing issues and inequities in medicine and it does that in authorship

as well so it serves as kind of a nice example of much of what we will discuss so i have two primary objectives for our

conversation today the first is to go over the general guidelines for calling oneself and author this is

in keeping with the treats talk mission of providing easily accessible straightforward answers for our

researchers and the second sub-topic we'll dive a little bit more into some of the ethical obligations for authors

and we'll spend a bit of time discussing how covet has changed publication norms whether that's good bad

or not anything at all um i'll also say in the spirit of our

treats talks that the two uh papers or resources that would probably be the most helpful to our

researchers if they want to follow up and read more or just have quick access to this

include the ICMJE guidelines on defining the roles of

authors and contributors which you can access online and the authorship and scientific and

academic research paper written by Kenneth Pimple in 2012 which is almost 10 years ago now but

it's still a really comprehensive detailed discussion of what we will discuss today and issues

beyond that so um when i teach authorship

to some of our grad students as part of the iucb graduate courses i also focus on the

whole process of generating a scholarly manuscript um including an overview of the peer

review process and i provide a really comprehensive discussion on plagiarism since there are so many

learners who are participating in that course and I'm not necessarily going to do that in as much detail as i usually do

um and just sort of anecdotally i think people like to focus on these

really big ticket authorship problems like falsification of data or what um can pimple terms culpable

as opposed to technical plagiarism but i think the problems you're much more likely to encounter

are probably going to be simple academic pettiness the failure to list an appropriate

author the failure to include or the insisting on including inappropriate authors

in manuscripts games with authorship order those kinds of things and so we'll talk

a little bit about that as an ethics issue so just really briefly i will say

a few words at the front end about research misconduct there are three primary categories of

research misconduct that are important to authorship they are fabrication of data falsification of data and plagiarism

i don't know that i need to go into these in really extensive detail but fabrication of data is

obviously creating studies that you didn't actually do when publishing them falsification of data would be a good

example of that as the Wakefield Andrew Wakefield studies on the connection between autism

And MMR vaccine and then plagiarism is copying um and not just copying but

uh not just your sort of cut and paste copying but stealing ideas synthesis um uh concepts

uh those kinds of things that are not of your invention and so just uh as a sort of general rule

the reason these things are bad is because they are essentially you know matters of dishonesty

presenting work that you didn't do or work that is not yours and so we should not do that just as a

general rule so i want to go over the um the sort of

criteria for uh authorship what does one have to do to consider themselves an author as i said

at the beginning these criteria are set out by the international committee of medical journal editors which is a committee

that has standardized ethical criteria for submission and publication of scholarly manuscripts

this is not the only authority on criteria for manuscript submission but it is the dominant one

in science and medical journals so satisfaction of ICMJE criteria is required

for submission to the New England journal of medicine the lancet JAMA um and so if you're if we've got

those big players uh um embracing these criteria that you know we can consider them kind

of important criteria so so the four criteria are substantial contribution to the conception or design

of the work um drafting of the actual manuscript

um reviewing it for critical or important intellectual content and then approval of the final version

to be published with an agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work

um i think that it is worth discussing maybe we can do that kind of at the end

of our conversation today but i think it's worth discussing whether this is an appropriate standard in today's research

world um to require that every single person on a research team have done all of these

things in order to consider themselves an author i do think this kind of ignores the

modern um uh team-based approach multi-disciplinary team-based approach

to research that tends to rely on the individual strengths or weaknesses of individual members of

the team and it also doesn't acknowledge different cultures of publishing that are sort of discipline specific where it

might be a norm to have um you know somebody included as an author who

you know for example did not contribute to the conception of the manuscript but came in you know after as

a sort of you know i don't know uh strong writer or interpreter or researcher you know that kind of thing

so um in any case um and for the time being

these are the guidelines and adherence to them is likely to be required by you at some point

in time if you are involved in scholarly publication and biomedical sciences it's also important to remember that the

second clause here is that all who meet the four criteria should be identified

as authors um i think we tend to be concerned in the ethics of

authorship about people being included as authors who shouldn't be

and maybe need to give a little bit of attention at least to people who should be included as authors and are sometimes

frozen out that's actually something that the ICMJE has caution specifically against

freezing people out for purposes of making it impossible for them to satisfy all four criteria of course if somebody

does not satisfy all four criteria of authorship they may satisfy criteria for an

acknowledgement so here are some examples of the kinds of participation that may merit an

acknowledgement general supervision of the research writing assistance technical editing

language editing proofreading i think it's kind of funny that a lot of this has to do with people who compensate for maybe weak writers on

the team um but they deserve an acknowledgement and much like authorship it's also

important here that if somebody satisfies this criteria they

they should be placed in the acknowledgement section um ken pimple again kind of downplays

the significance of this i think he says something like only your mom cares if you're included in an acknowledgement

i'm not sure that's true if someone has given a substantial amount of time to help you get your article published you

should say thank you and in academics this is where you do that

so the as i mentioned at the beginning increasingly publishing is taking place

by multi-disciplinary large teams large research teams and so there

are problems related to multiple authors um and those things require sort of more and more attention

i think these days it's um important to note that the ICMJE does not grant an

exception to uh their sort of like all four criteria standard even in cases of very large

research groups or multi-institution projects so the table here

is actually from several years ago noting the overall trend towards an increasing number of authors

on journal articles some of these are kind of funny the idea of there being 3179

authors on a single publication i will note that most of these are physics publications though which i understand

is a discipline with its own set of cultural norms with respect to authorship

but genomic medicine is um becoming somewhat analogous in terms of the number of individuals who may have meaningfully

participated in the generation of a manuscript so um there's a pretty good paper in

short two by uh Hammer and Mayaskowski that comment specifically on this within

the genomic medicine the precision medicine context and note that there is a sort of team-based approach to that

research that can sometimes include tens or even hundreds of individuals

so while the previous table was sort of unique to um physics

increasingly we're starting to see that same issue developed within medicine um and so the question becomes if you

have an article with 112 people on it have they really satisfied all four of those criteria and if they

haven't um i mean should they necessarily have or is that becoming a kind of antiquated

over restrictive hurdle so i do want to take some time to

talk about some of the challenges that arise in publication of manuscripts

these are these are sort of particular ethical pitfalls we might think of them i already discussed research misconduct but um

three issues that probably require specific um discussion include what we call

gift authorship a ghost authorship and then specifically faculty

student collaborations so gift authorship is the granting of authorship

to somebody who was not really instrumental to the um production of the manuscript

they might not even be somebody who necessarily satisfies the criteria of even an acknowledgement sometimes this

is like um a department head or the owner of the lab that kind of

thing or the person who runs the lab is included as an author when they are not really necessarily

um they don't fit the criteria for that sometimes you can also see gift

authorship as an attempt to increase the chances of publication so um if you have two junior authors

writing and they think their chances of publication might increase by including on that manuscript

the you know person in their department who is nationally recognized etc. and that person didn't really have

anything to do with the manuscript um those are examples of gift authorship and they are ethically impermissible you

are not supposed to do that um ghost authorship is the sort of flip side of that

where um i guess the best example of this would be for example a pharmaceutical company

that wants to have an article published that shows you know wonderful benefits of its

newest statin or something like that and so they write the article and then have it published under the

name of somebody else so that it appears to be um neutral uh and sort of

academically generated when in fact it was written and generated by um

uh pharmaceutical companies so that's also ethically impermissible so i always i always feel a need to

give us a special sort of supportive conversation about our faculty student collaborations because

it's i do think and i hear quite a bit um from students and former students and colleagues about

the sort of exploitation and misunderstandings that can occur within this area um and i and ken pimple does a nice

job talking about faculty student collaborations as a particular risk too so um some of the biggest problems in that

area include that students really don't know what to expect from publication particularly if it's their first rodeo

and they rely on us as mentors to kind of protect their interests and guide them

and some of the you know little horror stories that i've heard from students over the year include

everything from a student who substantively participated

in drafting various chapters in a in a book that was written and was then relegated to an

acknowledgement section all the way to students who are eliminated from papers altogether

um that they've that they've written um there are also obviously problems with

students who are placed in middle author position or um students who are caught in the

middle of faculty you know fighting about authorship position

and um and all of that is just very much inappropriate i try to think of um working on a

manuscript with a student you know as having sort of two objectives the first is the production

of the manuscript and the second is the learning by the student so

um while the work is likely to be much more involved when you're publishing

with a student um you know although not always um that work is is sort of your

scholarship overhead right that that uh the labor of working with a student so you should factor that

into the collaboration on the front end so um i want to focus a little bit on

some of the authorship issues that that come up a lot but have come up a lot in covid publishing so um

a lot of this has to do with the sort of speed to publishing and the volume of publishing related to

covid during this time so just for context just so that you know i'm being kind of

balanced here i think it's important to acknowledge that the need for shared information

is real during this pandemic and the ability to quickly share that information globally has undoubtedly led to

improved outcomes for patients the development of better treatment

mitigation and vaccination strategies and the quickness with which we've been able to accomplish those things

so there's a real value there um so i think the um early i mean by

you know we're like a year a year into all this now but um the early understanding that

ventilators were not as effective as like BPAP and CPAP um that was something that was shared

very early on and led to better patient outcomes the advantage of proning was something

that was shared by Italy really early on in the pandemic um and um and then all of the conversation

around masks and our increasing consensus and understanding of what about the fact that masks work

and how um in mitigating transmission so the peer review process has sped up um

during this time and probably necessarily so but i really like this quote from London um

in a recent science article in science about you know the old model for like six

months to publication it's just not going to work during a pandemic and it certainly hasn't been the norm here

so some of this is good right because it helps us share information quickly um but some of it is bad um

and so there are some examples of real problems from aggressive over publishing and um

i'm going to do my Kai Risdall impression here and go by the numbers um that um we've seen a

massive increase in submissions to journals um 270 000 more articles

just to one publisher um submissions to health and medicine journals increased by 92 percent there

were more than a hundred thousand articles about covid published in 2020 alone

um and 10 of those were um 10 of pre-prints in 2020 were on cover

19. so um huge increase um and i like to think because i'm gen x i

like to think of this somewhat like the early days of Napster right when it was really cool that you

could get a paper or get a song easy and early and whatnot but sometimes you didn't

know what you were downloading and the file that you got when you downloaded was not the song you wanted

or was just a really bad song that you thought you might like and you did not and so that's kind of what's going on now with

the covid publishing that um that it's great that we have access to it but sometimes what you're

getting is not very good so some of the examples of this are funny and entertaining

right so commercial disinfectants should not be administered orally or

subdurally um you know that was kind of an early joke about

misunderstanding some of the research on fomite transmission but but some of it's very real and has

had really negative impacts on um patients so i think of the

controversy over hydroxychloroquine is a really good example of sloppy publishing fast publishing

um during the pandemic and i think it's easy for us to think of

this as just you know a sort of a publishing um

area problem but this whole mess had a really negative impact on particularly on

patients with autoimmune disorders like lupus because the demand then for hydroxychloroquine by

patients who believed it would help covid reduced its supply for patients who actually can benefit from

hydroxychloroquine like patients with lupus and so um so these are not sort of abstractions in terms of the effect of

publishing on overall patient health um there is a website where you can

actually follow the number of retractions that have been um made as uh during the coveted publishing

frenzy and um to date they are at 104 um full retractions they have other

categories of you know um articles that have been sort of um criticized or whatnot

um it would probably help this is a total aside but my background is in law and i would love it if PubMed would

develop a shepardizing function the way Westlaw has where an article has a green a yellow

or a red next to it and you can see all of the articles that have published it or that have cited to it i think that

would be great pipe dream um so anyway lots of retraction some of these are really silly

retractions there's an article out there about whether a cat is better at recognizing covid than AI

and that article was formally retracted i don't know that i care but some of the retractions have been

obviously much more consequential so another issue that i wanted to make

sure to discuss in covid publishing has been the way it has exposed gender inequity

in in publications so um so the gender representation of authors

during covert publishing this graph on the left-hand side of the screen is what employment numbers looked

like for women and men during the summer during this past summer and this is the percent of adults

of childbearing age who are not working due to covid related

child care issues so we see a sizable number of people there who are not

working um and this is consistent you know with a pattern that has persisted

through covid um there is an article i think i think CVS

online published an article about the fact that 275 000 women left the

workforce just in January of 2021 that's compared to 71 000 men

so it's a huge number and that has played out in academia as well so

um just again some of the numbers publications for both men and women are

up consistent with the covid frenzy that we have seen with publications but publications that include women are

lagging behind those where there are men only teams and publications that are so low

authored by women are actually down relative to 2019 so while the pandemic

has benefited men's publishing overall publications by women have been negatively affected

and they've been particularly negatively affected in health and medicine physical sciences and engineering and

social sciences and economics there's also an interesting irony in here

um that women with more seniority have been more strongly affected negatively by the

publication sort of gap which probably has to do with who's having babies and when

um and the inability to publish when you've got small children at home um doing remote learning and zooming and

all of that so um a positive at least is that the rate of acceptance once an

article is submitted is the same as it has been it's still at baseline so the issue really is a generation of

the work itself so i want to say just a little bit on this because i think there's a tendency to understand this

issue as one of just simple fairness like it's not fair that that women are disproportionately

picking up the load at home and therefore unable to advance their careers with publishing

and certainly that's true um because publications factor into promotion in 10-year

so to the extent that women are hampered and publishing because of a pandemic there's going to be a shadow effect

where women are also less represented in positions of leadership in academic and scientific institutions

but there's an actual um sort of like a kind of patient or or epistemological effect here which is

that um in so far as the conversations about science and medicine and covid

are being largely shaped by the male perspective they are necessarily lacking in

the kinds of things that women generally think about or in the life experiences that women bring to

that conversation so here's just a small anecdotal example um

so i think back to the very early days of the pandemic when a lot of authors were postulating

that children couldn't get or transmit covid you kind of all remember that from like March and April

and um and so as a mom my first thought when reading that was

well they're just all at home that's why i mean like that's why that's why it looks like that

that's why they're not in the hospital they're all my children are in my family room while i'm trying to teach that's

why they're not giving anybody coven and so uh you know it's not so much that

they're not biologically capable of being vectors and as they've returned to school we've seen that that's true that they

you know clearly are capable of being vectors so i think also secondarily about the conversation around the Johnson Johnson

vaccine which obviously is very um front and center right now

and that this too raises issues of gender equity and publishing so all six of the people who have

experienced um blood clots from the Johnson and Johnson vaccine were women of childbearing age and as a woman of

child-bearing age i would really like a woman to be part of the conversation not only as to what might be the

underlying cause of those thoughts but also as to what is ethical and appropriate in terms

of mitigating the risk so um with all of that in mind

um i think i bring you sort of my broad conclusions which is that certainly all the time but

definitely during covet we've seen a need to balance the publication speed with the ethical obligations of authorship

and this is an interesting thing to consider when we also back up into the pre-covet times and think about how the

slow process of publication has actually been kind of a problem for some researchers

and then we need to engage in early conversations regarding authorship order responsibilities expectations for members

of your research team including your students and employ a model of inclusion in

collaboration and publication that rewards and encourages participation rather than engaging in sort of

gamesmanship and sort of petty academic concerns so i think with that i have met

my treats obligation of short and sweet and i will turn it over

to questions if people have them

oh Colin has one hi thank you for that lovely talk

um i have two questions one of them is more i'm hoping you can say a little bit more

in detail about and that is the shepherding function i'm not familiar with that that sounds very

interesting to me uh but i'm wondering what the nitty-gritty is like what does

green yellow red actually tell us oh um yeah so shepardizing in law um

as um people with a law background know when you when

you cite a case in your brief or in your law review article you want to make sure that you're citing something that's still

good law right so you're not citing a case that's been overruled or overturned or a case that has an appellate history

that is really significant so your case isn't good anymore um and so that the green

means that the case has been positively cited by subsequent cases so it's a really good indication

that the case that you're citing is okay to cite the yellow means usually that it has

negative treatment some negative treatments so then you can go through the cases that have cited that case and see

what part of the case is being treated negatively because a case might not be overruled

in whole right it might have three holdings and one holding is overruled and then the red means wait a minute

you're about to cite something that was has been completely disregarded right you're about to

go with you know Plessy v. Ferguson and you might need to update your knowledge there

so um so i love that function in Westlaw and it's not a it's there's a version of

it a little bit of a version of it on google scholar which is that you can at least see who cited that article but it would be great if

you could see much more history than that and it should be possible i mean anyway

we're off topic i well so just a little bit off topic maybe but i do really like that idea i

think especially very jokingly in my uh writing group the other day one of my friends is like

had submitted something that was kind of uh not her best work and it was a

little provocative more than maybe like well thought yeah like well i'll just save it until i

get tenure and then i'll publish it and he'll get a million citations because everybody's going to hate it you know and it does

seem like citations that is the only thing that google scholar really tracks as far as i know

and a lot of those it's like with twitter you know you get ratio it's not a good you know it's not a good

index of whether this is useful information or not or like like worth

uh worth citing if you're just kind of like reading the abstract

yeah i agree with that and i also think that um one of the advantages of something like of shepardizing in law

is that you can find the original source really easily so one of the problems i i have found in

academic publishing as as a somewhat newbie i guess to this um relative to my practice in law anyway

is that um what ends up getting cited is the thing that cited something else and

so you have to engage in this like back to find out well who's the who's the person who

developed this paradigm um and unless it unless the paradigm is named after them

you know you might never find it yeah i think that's another really interesting aspect of

the citation question too because a lot of things on you know on the med side of the world

there's a lot of reliance on lit reviews which as far as i know also

don't give like citation points to like each time a lit review is

cited yeah um anyway i do appreciate that that's a little bit off topic but i thought that

was great and i wanted to hear more uh the one that's more on topic of my questions is i'm wondering uh

when you're talking about the changing norms of authorship and who counts as an author uh it made

me think like what do we what are we thinking is the point of getting your name as an author uh what's that supposed to

represent um you know because they're really practical issues that you brought up at the very end in terms of like tenure

case etc. and i'm wondering if the norms of authorship are changing do you have a

sense of whether the interpretation of what it means to be an author is also changing

i i do think the norms are changing um and i i don't know at what point the ICMJE

will sort of fully embrace the fact that there's a shift

um but i mean i i just noticed in the i guess sort of i mean

i've worked in several sort of large collaborative teams i mean large for me so like you know six

authors or so right not on a physics project where there are three thousand but um but there's a real sense of like

what we each bring and it's not all four things right like there's the power

writer there's the idea person there i can't do statistics i'm an english major there's somebody on the team who's

really good at numbers um and not only good at numbers but good in like they can look at it and things

just pop out to her of like oh this we got to talk about this this is really cool so

so she's indispensable right even if she's not the strongest writer on the team

um and i do think that there's um i think that's important and i'm not

trying to you know be too sort of like participation trophies for everyone i think that's a millennial problem less a

gen x problem just kidding um but i think that um teams are built around a collective

group of talents and not everybody having the same strengths

so um i do hope that i mean i just hope they kind of you know think about that

there's a i when i teach as you know i always have the APA um model of authorship which assigns a

certain number of points for your tasks on a project and when you get up over a certain number of points

then you can call yourself an author and i think that's a much more equitable and way to do it and fits

better with the way research teams actually function these days

Peter liked that answer

so Jane i'm driving but that was a great talk so uh thank you so uh so

jane for promotion they usually count first and the last of authors as

as valuable so can you talk uh on that a little bit as well sure

sure um uh so one of the nice things for me is that i

like to write and my bosses let me write but my publications don't factor in heavily to

my there is no tenure you know in this position necessarily so

um so i'm in a position where i get to observe a lot of that tension without any you

know real risk um to me with it but um i've seen it play out with um

real i mean real sorts of um the only word that can come to mind is

pettiness i mean i was um i i was involved in a research project in which

one of the um people on the team just sort of announced that they would be the mentor author

and um and that seemed not um not accurate to me in terms of the

amount of work that had been put in and the only thing that i could really say to myself was that i didn't follow

my own rule of having the conversation at the front end about the order of the order of authorship and you know if i'm telling people to do

that i should probably do it myself and so it's kind of did i want to really have the fight about it or did i want to just sort of

learn and move on um but i think this is something i actually remember peter saying a few

years ago that that there also probably needs to be

not just a penalty for under publishing but a sort of heightened scrutiny of

clear over publishing so if you've got somebody whose name is on like

32 manuscripts in a year like that's probably a red flag that

like is that really what's going on and what like what is that person doing that that they have you know 32

publications and just as an aside too even though it wasn't this wasn't necessarily

asked of me i do think that the overemphasis on publication and i'll call it an overemphasis on publication

in academia results in um not always enough attention on quality

of teaching which is the first and fundamental purpose of a university

um like that's its thousand-year-old mission um so i i wish that there

um i guess i wish that there were a little bit less of that but have the conversation up front

because it matters there's no question it matters these days

does that answer your question saying it

yes it does so i have another question i'm sorry for the sound i'm driving so Jane what is the

uh so i have two questions one is what if person um actually she was uh my

my one of my mentees so she did a study she had uh the idea she worked for it

uh she collected the data but then she did not write it up

i mean we uh we contacted her several times she said she was going to do it

but she never did it uh so what to do with that so can we

just write it up and tell her that she could um she could um contribute as she wants to

but she has the idea she got the data so yeah so contains on that

she's your mentee right so you're the mentor author on that so i think you send her an email and you say hey if i don't hear back from you in

a week or two weeks or whatever we're going to move on with this project without you and then if she doesn't want to write it

up or indicate a response then either you or a new mentee can write it up and you put her in an acknowledgement

section um and so she generated the data and she generated the design but she didn't do

the write-up and she didn't she doesn't apparently want to be accountable for the final project i'd be careful with that um

particular project because one of the things i'd be nervous about was somebody who has sort of ghosted you on

a data driven project are they nervous about their data like what makes them drop a project like this

i mean maybe they dropped the project because they got really busy and life is really busy right now but um

you know i guess you're welcome thank you but i there are probably some other reasons there too but no i think you give the project

to somebody else and they write it up and they're an author and she's not okay okay jane that's great and one last

question well what if you let's say three four uh or two authors cannot

um agree on who's going to be the first second or third whatever is there a certain place that they can

uh go for consultation yeah so one well there's not a place they can go for consultation

but one way to get around that is to name your research group and so um you can be the whatever

team you know the tigers or something like that i don't know um give yourself a nice acronym and then

you publish as a group and the members of the group are listed alphabetically rather than in order of seniority so that's kind of

a way to skirt the issue um the other the other thing to do that i found is that if it's a team that's

going to produce multiple manuscripts you can rotate authorship i've done that before i have a colleague

that we sort of switch back and forth you know and that works well for us um

but um yeah so i think those would be my two solutions and i noticed that peter unmuted himself and so i think he has

either something to add or to debate in terms of some of the suggestions i've offered

you know i love you all the questions dana and i and i love the answers jane that's not a debate issue but

for each other maybe the second one first that's first in my mind and i would say about that it's part of

the lesson of this talk and what i was taught early on by Kim Quaid who gave a previous version of a talk on authorship

um who said basically there are two types of people in academia those who have had an authorship dispute and those who will have one so like with

all relationships there are fights and so what you're describing is nf is a case where

you have to have it out you have to have a discussion always sooner rather than later like jane said her one of our primary rules to discuss

authorship and authorship order at the very beginning and when you can do that that is essential and if need be you have to be

able to return to it and to have do the hard work of a relationship um and so i like i like what she said i

like the uh also idea there are certain ways out if you are at an empath so she's a good lawyer and a good negotiator she says

here's a good compromise you can come up with inclusive rotating authorship and or naming your writing group and avoiding

having a first author some journals actually let you define the corresponding author as more than

one person i recently found out very late in the process of the journal we were submitting to would not let us have more

than one corresponding author so that did not solve our problem um but again it's a relationship issue right

and i've learned that and i see jane actually looks like she wants to say something else about that case before i do the student who disappeared

case are you are you good Jane no i'm fine yeah

yeah no i was going to say also um about the fights over authorship and i've lost it now i i will say that

yeah exactly the patient disappeared okay the students disappeared case stand up again i'm vanishing that case because

as you said you sort of you're waiting for her right she's here he they are not um doing the writing time

is passing maybe they've moved on it sounds like they're not available to you anymore and i agree with jane's suggestion to reach out and say look

this is the situation we want to get these things into print and um somebody else can write this the

question i have for jane is i would guess and you can tell me if i'm wrong about this but the ethics is this

this individual by not writing has not forfeited her ability to be an author but it's still on the table for

her to be an author she generated the idea she um you know collected the data she's got a lot of effect and so

it seems almost an ethical obligation to say look if you're willing to engage in the writing

as you know providing critical input and taking responsibility the other the other steps

then you can still be an author we can talk about all order and if you don't write it you probably will be the first author

you're still invited to be an author i don't like the it almost sounds like freezing out to say you failed to write it so now it's not even on the table i won't offer you the

opportunity to fulfill the other criteria i completely agree with you peter no i absolutely agree i'm thinking

more in terms of the student who just doesn't respond to the email like you send it out and then it goes to you right and so they're not

responding they're not interested they're not you know whatever but i like what makes

me really nervous i like what you said too about the nervousness to actually again make it clear

in a non-judgmental way to say you know we're going to publish this i need to know now any concerns you have about

this data because i i feel very uncomfortable going forward if you had any concerns please let me know you know try to make it a safe sort of

conversation obviously if there's been um misconduct some kind of you know

faking of data that's not sure if she's going to share he's going to open up to you about that and there are

dangers there i guess so as always what's up colin

yeah so i love that case too i think that's such an interesting question um in part because i think there's two

different uh dimensions to why it's troublesome one is a question of data

ownership which i do think is very different from authorship but is related

yeah and then the other part is the question uh going along with what peter was saying um of analysis and contribution which i

do think is like these things are different but it's very different uh like i for me like personally it

seems inappropriate to think that just because a specific researcher collected the data

that they have um that they have a say in the public or how that data

are used by other members of the team especially disappeared but i would be interested to hear what you think about that i think ownership

issues are super interesting in in authorship

and i mean this is something i talk more about when we teach this in class but um yeah so like who

owns the data um i think is a is it absolutely an interesting question and i i think if the data i mean

one way to make i think if the data is um produced as

the result of a group idea right the group owns the data regardless of like who did the

interviews or who you know whatever sat in the lab and

watched the values whatever it is that is happening the group conceived of the idea um

then the group owns the data but there are a lot of um and i i don't know if there's i haven't

looked up into whether or not um there's a sort of consensus about how that ownership issue goes

and actually now i'm thinking of my own paper because i bet there's a i bet there are lawsuits about it um so

there's probably a legal answer somewhere shepardized on Westlaw um

but the other thing that's really interesting about ownership that i've run into is as a as a clinical ethicist is

when i create products for clinics to use in order to sort of obviate uh an

ethical problem so hey we're going to use this particular consent form or you're going to start sending out this

letter or here's an infographic i've developed for you whatever and then iu health owns that graphic or

that letter and i want to use it to publish right because like i came up with the idea

and i think you know fortunately i work for a friendly enough institution that they're not going to you

know complain too much about that but you can imagine something like that if you know

um if you work for the clinic or something and then suddenly the director of the clinic wants to say

they own it or they want to publish about it and it's you know that sort of thing so the way um Ken Pimple talks about

um ownership he live he equates it very closely to plagiarism and i actually think the issue is much

bigger than that i mean the analogy between

authorship and ownership are really analogical as well as direct and material as you're describing and

the whole idea of an author of course is a bit outdated now that we do this work with teams maybe it was never inundated um

that you know the idea that somebody or some group people are responsible for the work is kind of the core notion i think of

authorship maybe that's simplistic but now you know the work is so diffused and our

understanding of who creates work is more diffused but the idea of the again i think it's gendered right the great man you know the great genius or

great woman who's come up with the idea i think with the um better understanding of how

knowledge is produced ideal author has exactly changed the way he said jane i loved your question or maybe it was a question after you spoke

about when has the cut when has the uh the custom change so now we're recognizing a change in

what should be counted as an author in a field and what is just being misused right is it is it

it's sort of like grammar right when grammars people speak in a new way it's just ungrammatical but once

everybody's speaking that way it's just a new way of speaking and it becomes the accepted grammar Colin don't listen

to any of that it's not it's not informed by any true knowledge of linguistics but that's my understanding from uh from a layman

perspective and what Jane was saying about authorship it seems to me like are they misusing the notion of authorship in

physics or have they changed the notion what some point they changed it are we misusing it in precision health i think

so still or have we changed it of course the issue there is what are you um what are you indicating

when you call somebody an author i'll say this last thing before i let you jump back in because now the chat is exploding which as you know i cannot

handle because i'm just not a i'm not gen x or gen z um i think i'm gen x actually i'm not a

bloomer i'm just after boomers anyway so what i was going to say was um now i've lost it

oh i was going to say this annals of internal medicine have you had you list for each author

what exactly they did yeah so the idea is it's just a group if you really want to know what the person

did and how much they own the idea and the product then you should look at that end of the paper

where it says exactly what they did our journals are doing that too saying just just tell us what you did

just tell you know list your contribution um and i think that's actually a pretty decent way to do things it also creates

accountability within the group um it's sort of like when i have to draft my end of the month reports on

what i did you know i'm like oh boy not enough that's what i did was not enough this

month so um but i think to your other point um peter about the sort of old school

model of authorship i read one article like um in anticipation of just of today's talk

and now i can't remember which one it was that that walked through that really like

old-school sense of authorship of like before computers you know when you're

writing it on a legal pad and passing it around and then somebody types it up

and just sort of as a practical matter you didn't have what you have now of like a google doc that people are

jumping in and jumping out of and making comments on the side and you know that just was obviously not the

way people worked so there was a sort of like you know the sense of the author as the person

who literally put pen to paper and wrote the thing um so yeah

colin has a question here um IP analysis ownership as a literal

form of ownership is difficult um i think it's very difficult which is

why i'm not an IP lawyer so there was a great talk i recommend

years ago actually i had to uh come to uh Kimberly Kuwait to to uh construct her

own so it's difficult when you are working with a totally different department like

school that i was working with a medical sociology group and they

said at the time they could only publish with one author not more than that and i said

you know i'm the PI on this project and i can make some meaningful

contribution and plus i really need the publication too but they said for our world it's we can only have one

on certain papers we can have only one author so that was tough and actually

unfortunately it wasn't helpful to me in the end in the i wish i just kept my silence

uh i really wish i did i totally regret that not now um yeah so

um my lesson is that maybe as you said it's better to set

the rules at the beginning at least get getting the rules of each department

yeah uh you can back off or maybe just say all right fine whatever you want to do but

um do you want to comment on that or have you ever seen anything like that yeah oh definitely so the so here's the

way i see it as somebody who works both with

doctors and scientists and my academic home is in the school of liberal arts and so one of the things that has come

up um for me and for some of my colleagues who also sort of bridge that

that gap is really requesting from our school our home that they be flexible in their

evaluation of the way they accord priority in authorship so

so what i mean by that is that if the school of liberal arts um at when they're looking at promotion

in 10-year has a sort of hard and fast rule that only the first two authors on

a paper matter they need to understand that for example their comm studies department

is using first and last author as the as the privileged author spots and so

they're actually not capturing what they want to capture and so are they really trying to enforce

some draconian rule about first and second author or are they trying to evaluate who are their heavy

hitters of publication and if they're trying to do that then they're actually going to need to use one more than one methodology for that

evaluation and i think as we get more into um sort of interdisciplinary

collaborative work which i have never worked anywhere other than iu academically but iu seems to do

a lot of um schools are going to have to be flexible on that or they're actually not going to be correctly

evaluating their own people so um so that's kind of how i've seen it

yeah great thank you jane thank you Zainab it's good to see you

again the field of philosophy had a lot of problems with this too Jane that uh

they hated multiple authors of work they felt that he didn't know who had done it you know they wanted the ownership thing

they want to know i get to peg this to this person however the great one of the guys flaws from the

20th century and weatherman victorstein when he wrote one's most important work said i have no idea where i got these ideas

i got them from all over the place people said them to me i just don't remember where that came from so don't give me credit it's all these

different people i can't even lift here again just the part of authorship which is in some ways

difficult because it doesn't really fit the real world where ideas come from all over and there's no one generator

of them okay and they have some more questions jane final comments the outstanding

perfect the perfect trees talk this is this is

it was good to see you all bye thank you