

# LSE Principles of Authorship

## Contents

Introduction .....	2
1. What constitutes authorship? .....	2
1.1 The principles of authorship .....	3
1.2 Different contributing roles .....	4
1.3 Author position.....	4
1.4 Corresponding author.....	5
2. Unacceptable authorship-related practices.....	5
3. Good authorship practice.....	6
4. Common authorship disputes .....	6
4.1 Disagreements regarding authorship/authorship roles.....	6
4.2 Concerns regarding unethical behaviour/research misconduct.....	7
5. Affiliation .....	7
6. Acknowledgements .....	8
7. Frequently Asked Questions .....	8
7.1 How might authorship affect Open Access payments? .....	8
7.2 How should taught students be credited in a research publication? .....	9
7.3 Intellectual Property (IP): Who owns the research data? .....	9
7.4 As an author, can I use the research data from my publication?.....	10
7.5 Protecting your IP rights in the innovation of co-authored research.....	10
7.6 Co-authorship in relation to academic promotion .....	10

Annex A: Department-specific authorship practice.....	12
Annex B: Useful resources.....	17
LSE resources.....	17
General guidance .....	17
Funder/ publisher guidance .....	18

## Introduction

Turning research into tangible outcomes is a key aspiration of those involved in research. Authoring articles, books, conference presentations and proceedings enables the dissemination and sharing of one's ideas and findings, and contributes to one's professional progression.

The process of appropriately recognising, agreeing and representing contributions to research that result in authorship must be undertaken in accordance with the LSE Code of Research Conduct<sup>1</sup>, the LSE Research Ethics Policy<sup>2</sup>, and **the core principles of honesty, openness, transparency and research rigour** set out in the School's Ethics Code<sup>3</sup>.

Supporting and engaging in a process with these principles in mind will facilitate a culture of accountability, the management of expectations, and the due consideration of contributions in ethical collaborative research by:

- Raising awareness of good practice in claims to authorship in the context of research collaborations
- Encouraging a fair and safe environment for the exchange of ideas and for the co-production of publications
- Supporting and valuing the contributions of all researchers – from PhD students to senior faculty – who engage in collaborative research
- Preventing the most common queries/ disputes surrounding authorship by encouraging all researchers to have open conversations about co-authorship at the outset of any research collaboration
- Guarding against the possibility that unequal power relations (e.g., between Principal Investigators (PIs) and junior researchers on their grants) may compromise the accurate and fair recognition of the contribution of junior researchers
- Helping researchers to meet funders' criteria, which may require evidence of good research collaboration

## 1. What constitutes authorship?

<sup>1</sup><https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/codResCon.pdf>

<sup>2</sup><https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/resEthPolPro.pdf>

<sup>3</sup><https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/ethCod.pdf>

## 1.1 The principles of authorship

The School expects researchers to follow best practice in publication, embedding the principles set out above together with the relevant disciplinary guidelines and standards (see Annex A for links to disciplinary authorship norms).

**LSE researchers should, as a minimum:**

- have made a substantial contribution to the work, and
- be accountable for the work in its published form<sup>4</sup>.

Although authorship conventions vary across disciplines, a substantial intellectual or scholarly contribution must include one and ideally a combination of two or more of the following:

- conception and design of the project or output
- significant input into the development and/or design of project methodologies
- acquisition of research data where the acquisition has required significant intellectual judgement, planning, design, or input
- contribution of knowledge, where justified, including Indigenous knowledge
- analysis or interpretation of research data
- drafting significant parts of the research output or critically revising it so as to contribute to its interpretation.

This is the minimum threshold for authorship, and researchers should recognise that practice varies e.g., journals, disciplines, and institutions may require a higher threshold. Therefore, additional criteria may be applied for authorship in some fields and Departments will be responsible for identifying relevant authorship standards within their disciplines (Annex A).

The above principles are not intended for use as a means to disqualify colleagues from authorship who otherwise meet authorship criteria by denying them the opportunity to review and approve the final version to be published (see Section 2: Unacceptable authorship-related practices). Therefore, **all individuals who have made any of the above listed contributions should be given the opportunity to participate in the review, drafting, and final approval of the manuscript.**

The following activities do **not** give rise to a claim to authorship (but they should be acknowledged<sup>5</sup>):

- Provision of training and basic technical support for users of equipment or software
- Routine collection of raw data using standard techniques and methodologies, where some technical skill is needed, but the personnel were not involved in advising or choosing which method, materials and equipment to use, nor in any analysis or interpretation of the data

---

<sup>4</sup> Committee of Publishing Ethics (COPE): <https://publicationethics.org/authorship>

<sup>5</sup> See Section 6: Acknowledgements

- General supervision and/or mentorship of research group members and/or the provision of funding or other resources in the absence of any intellectual input into the project

## 1.2 Different contributing roles

Researchers often employ the CRediT – Contributor Roles Taxonomy<sup>7</sup> – to help describe each contributor’s specific contribution to the scholarly output, thus clarifying on which basis they have been included (or excluded) as co-authors.

Researchers will benefit from creating an ORCID ID<sup>8</sup>, which they should add to their publication(s). This free, unique, persistent identifier distinguishes researchers from one another across disciplines, borders and time will help to avoid any ambiguities which may arise, e.g., between authors with the same name.

Given that roles and contributions can change over the lifecycle of a research project, these should be reviewed periodically and a written record of any resulting decisions and agreements may prove useful in case these need to be revisited.

Keeping a clear, accurate and fair record of each co-author’s contribution is of particular importance when it comes to their career progression and academic promotion. (See further guidance under the FAQs).

Some journals, publishers and some learned societies have their own rules regarding who can or should be recognised as an author; so it is important for the corresponding author (see section ‘Corresponding Author’) to check with co-authors and against previous agreements before any submission to a journal is made.

## 1.3 Author position

It is good practice for PIs to consult all co-authors at the earliest opportunity to decide on and manage expectations for the order of authorship. Following this and in advance of publication, the lead author may find it useful to prepare a concise, written description of how the order of authorship was decided, which can be shared among, and approved by, all co-authors.

The way of determining order of authorship varies across disciplines, research groups, journals and countries, and while the significance of a particular order may be understood in each disciplinary or publishing setting, order of authorship needs to be agreed and negotiated on a case-by-case basis.

Except in disciplines which have a specific norm regarding order of authorship (for example, that authors are presented alphabetically), the order and other publication

---

<sup>7</sup> [Elsevier journals require a CRediT statement](#) during the submission process although other publishers may not.

<sup>8</sup> <https://info.orcid.org/benefits-for-researchers>

credit should accurately and fairly reflect the relative scientific and intellectual contribution of the individuals involved, regardless of their relative status and position in the academic hierarchy. For example, a student should be listed as first author on any multiple authored article that is substantially based on their dissertation or thesis.

## 1.4 Corresponding author

A corresponding author takes the lead in the manuscript submission and the entire publication process, as the primary contact between the publisher and all the other authors of the paper. While the corresponding author is not necessarily the first author and may not have contributed the most to the writing of the manuscript, they are usually a more experienced researcher, e.g., a Principal Investigator. The corresponding author is responsible for:

- Keeping to deadlines during each phase of the publication process
- Ensuring that all authors have reviewed and approved the final version<sup>9</sup> of the manuscript prior to submission
- Providing the correct name, affiliation<sup>10</sup> and contact details for each co-author
- Distributing communications from the journal such as decision letters, reviewers' reports, etc.
- Ensuring that funders are acknowledged, when required
- Selecting an appropriate route to funding Open Access, which may include deposit of the accepted version in a repository such as LSE Research Online
- Funding the Open Access costs via their institution where payment is required<sup>11</sup>.

As stated in the previous section, the order of authorship must fairly reflect the scientific and intellectual contribution to the project (other than where disciplinary norms dictate otherwise). This means that, as stated above, the corresponding author may not be the same as the first listed author.

## 2. Unacceptable authorship-related practices

The following authorship-related practices constitute a breach of the LSE Code of Research Conduct and could result in allegations of research misconduct. It is the position of the School that these practices are contrary to the principles of research integrity and are thus not acceptable:

- *honorary authorship* where an individual is listed as co-author but does not meet the authorship criteria listed above
- *ghost authorship* where an individual has contributed to the research but is not disclosed in the author's by-line or acknowledgments section (they generally

---

<sup>9</sup> For the avoidance of doubt, the final version is a) submitted to a journal for publication and subsequently b) the peer reviewed paper which may include revisions made prior to publication.

<sup>10</sup> See Section 5: Affiliation.

<sup>11</sup> See Section 7.3: How might authorship affect Open Access payments?

work on behalf of companies, or agents acting for those companies, with a commercial interest in the topic)

- *self-plagiarism* is where there is a high proportion of direct replication of work previously published by the same author, i.e., substantial sections of previous work <sup>12</sup>.
- *denial of authorship*: denying the status of, or opportunity to be, co-author to individuals who would otherwise meet the criteria for inclusion.

Unequal power relations may encourage some of these practices (for example, junior researchers may feel unable to prevent that honorary authorship is assigned to a senior researcher on whose support they depend for their career prospects). However, the knowledge that these practices are in breach of LSE Code of Research Conduct should empower all researchers, whether senior or junior, to oppose them and to report them.

### 3. Good authorship practice

Whilst we recognise that publications and decisions around authorship often arise organically as research develops, we nevertheless recommend that all researchers abide by the following principles of good authorship practice so as to avoid disputes arising later on in time:

- **Ensure you understand what constitutes authorship** and be aware of the unacceptable practices set out above (see also the section below, 'Different contributing roles').
- **Encourage best practice** amongst your own research team, department and/or research centre.
- **Discuss authorship at the earliest possible stage** of any research to manage expectations in a transparent manner. Maintain a written record of changes, e.g., the addition of new researchers, which is shared and regularly reviewed by the whole team. As a project evolves and before any publication or conference presentation is drafted, confirm who will have what role in the publication/presentation to ensure that everyone who has contributed to the research is informed.
- **Challenge any questionable practices**, referring to these guidelines or other relevant best practice guidance.

## 4. Common authorship disputes

### 4.1 Disagreements regarding authorship/authorship roles

---

<sup>12</sup> There are different disciplinary norms regarding self-plagiarism, e.g., in some areas of mathematics, where preliminary material, introducing definitions, notation and standard tools may be copied from earlier articles which are referenced as appropriate.

Disagreements about authorship may arise, particularly where there are different interpretations, for example, of what constitutes a 'substantial' contribution. The best approach is always to discuss and resolve any such disagreements with one's co-researchers at the earliest possible stage and in as open and collegial a manner as possible.

Where a disagreement cannot be resolved within the research team, we recommend the researchers consult their Head of Department (or Research Centre Director). It is best to involve all the research team in this referral/discussion. In exceptional circumstances, where a disagreement can still not be resolved, the Head of Department/Research Centre Director may refer the issue to the Chair of the LSE Research Committee.

## **4.2 Concerns regarding unethical behaviour/research misconduct**

Where a researcher feels that unacceptable/unethical behaviour is being proposed, they should, in the first instance, seek local support and guidance to informally resolve their questions and any resulting situations using these best practice guidelines and highlight the fact that unacceptable/unethical practice may constitute research misconduct. If the issue cannot be resolved informally (or if unethical behaviour has already occurred), they should refer to the LSE Code of Research Conduct<sup>13</sup>. Any questions can be addressed confidentially to [research.conduct@lse.ac.uk](mailto:research.conduct@lse.ac.uk). Where appropriate and where there is no conflict of interest, junior researchers may wish to discuss their concerns with their PI or Head of Department/Research Centre Director in the first instance.

## **5. Affiliation**

It is standard practice for authors to list their institutional affiliation. This information is important for transparency and fairness, ensuring that institutions are duly credited for hosting the research and that potential conflicts of interest can be identified.

While publishers may have their own guidelines, it is the norm for authors to use as their affiliation the institution in which they worked during the time they conducted the research. If the author has moved to a different institution since the research was completed, their new affiliation/ contact can be acknowledged in a footnote.

Authors may report single or multiple affiliations. Multiple affiliations are needed when the author belongs to more than one organisation that has contributed to the research, e.g., universities, commercial research companies, hospitals, non-profit organisations, etc.

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/codResCon.pdf>

For LSE affiliation, the preferred format is: *[Parent department/ centre/ institute], The London School of Economics and Political Science, London, WC2A 2AE, United Kingdom* (if there are constraints on the space available, the phrase *The London School of Economics and Political Science* will be used, omitting the address).

## 6. Acknowledgements

The contributions of anyone who directly assisted or indirectly supported the research need to be acknowledged, e.g., taught students who have assisted with the research, software developers such as a database designer or coder.

It is also good practice, and often a requirement, to acknowledge all research funders. It is the responsibility of each co-author who holds a grant to check whether the project's funders require mention of, for example, a grant reference number/ a specific sentence of acknowledgement/ an EU flag in the publication. Such information is usually a contractual condition with the contract defining the phrase / wording to use in referencing.

## 7. Frequently Asked Questions

### 7.1 How might authorship affect Open Access payments?

Researchers are increasingly required to publish their work open access to meet institutional, governmental and research funder requirements. It is important that researchers consider 'green' routes to Open Access where a version of the work is made available through a repository without payment of an Article Processing Charge<sup>14</sup>. For gold open access<sup>15</sup>, it is usually the responsibility of the corresponding author or their institution to cover the open access costs (either by payment of an Article Processing Charge or through an open access publishing agreement).

Institutions vary in the support offered to researchers for open access, and this means that co-authors might wish to consider available institutional support for open access when deciding who should be assigned the role of corresponding author. It is good practice that, prior to submission for publication, all co-authors understand and agree that if they chose as corresponding author one of the co-authors whose institution covers the open access costs, the corresponding author will also be taking on all the ensuing responsibilities of the role (listed in section 1.3).

Conversely, it is bad practice to:

- change the corresponding author after the paper has been accepted simply to take advantage of an open access publishing agreement at the institution of a different co-author.

---

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.lse.ac.uk/library/research-support/open-access>

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/guides/an-introduction-to-open-access>



- appoint someone as corresponding author where it would not have otherwise been considered appropriate, solely for the purpose of availing of open access funding.

## 7.2 How should taught students be credited in a research publication?

If students, whether undergraduates or taught masters, are involved in data collection but are not actively participating in data analysis or making any other substantive contribution, they should not normally be attributed authorship of the final work. However, they should be included in the Acknowledgements section. It is also good pedagogical practice and highly recommended that their supervisors discuss with them the reasons for the collection and use of the data; that they obtain students' consent for the use of the data they have collected (see also section 7.3 on data ownership and section 7.4 on the use of research data below); and that they keep them informed of how the data they have collected is being used. It may be appropriate for the dataset to be published as a research output in its own right, where recommended by their PI, and enabling direct citation of the student's contribution.

## 7.3 Intellectual Property (IP): Who owns the research data?

Ownership issues may arise when consent is required for the use of copyrighted materials. Therefore, researchers should familiarise themselves with the School's Intellectual Property (IP) Policy<sup>16</sup> and associated FAQs<sup>17</sup> which describes the IP rights of LSE staff, students and visitors in relation to their research.

Data underlying a study should be made as available as possible, subject to ethical constraints, in line with the LSE data management guidelines<sup>18</sup>, and it should be shared within the minimum timing compatible with fair requirements of priority, publication embargoes, etc.

It is important for researchers to discuss and reach an agreement on data ownership as early as possible to ensure that every member of the research team is aware if data is being archived and if there is an expectation that data be transferred to the PI for deposit. While it is often the responsibility of the PI to deposit data, it is important to note that this does not automatically entail that the PI owns the data.

It is good practice for researchers to have access to the data that underlies a publication they have co-authored. Moreover, agreements concerning the intellectual ownership rights over future re-uses of those data and over future publications based on those data should be made in advance by all members of the research team. For example, it should be clarified whether or not a research assistant can claim ownership of the data, or whether, in an inter-research group collaboration, re-use of data collected by one research group may or may not require the agreement by the

<sup>16</sup> <https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/IntProPol.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> <https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/intProPolFAQ.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.lse.ac.uk/library/research-support/research-data-management-and-open-data>

other research group.

## **7.4 As an author, can I use the research data from my publication?**

Being listed as an author of an academic research publication does not necessarily give an individual co-ownership of the publication or the research data on which it is based. Unless agreed prior to data collection, research assistants and research officers cannot publish research data from a project without explicit agreement from the PI. However, this is not the case in some disciplines such as Anthropology which, for example, rely on long-term fieldwork<sup>19</sup>. For the avoidance of doubt, PIs should consult the contractual agreements of research assistants/ officers to clarify expectations around the use of research data.

Furthermore, it is a researcher's responsibility to:

- Check the terms and conditions of the grant (if applicable) to determine whether the funder has claimed ownership of the data or require its release under a specific licence
- Check the terms and conditions of any secondary data sources used in the research
- Consult their LSE Research Awards Manager<sup>20</sup> to understand how their intellectual property rights may be impacted by the terms and conditions imposed by their funders or research collaborators
- Go through LSE legal checks before signing data sharing agreements with secure data suppliers and/or non-disclosure agreements.

## **7.5 Protecting your IP rights in the innovation of co-authored research**

Collaborative research with, for example, (i) a non-academic organisation or (ii) researchers in another university, or non-collaborative research may sometimes be developed for innovation purposes. In all cases, authorship that is not a true reflection of a person's contribution to the research as described by the principles above can potentially lead to IP issues.

In cases like this, the lead or corresponding author of the subsequent research publication should contact the LSE's Innovation team at the earliest opportunity (email: [innovation@lse.ac.uk](mailto:innovation@lse.ac.uk))<sup>21</sup> for further advice.

## **7.6 Co-authorship in relation to academic promotion**

Publications play a crucial role in a researcher's career progression. For this reason, a researcher's self-interest may come into conflict with the principles of co-authorship

---

<sup>19</sup> <https://easaonline.org/publications/guidelines>

<sup>20</sup> <https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/research/meet-the-team>

<sup>21</sup> <https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/innovation>

outlined in these guidelines, e.g., by wanting to be listed as first author when this is not a fair reflection of their contribution or by demanding to be listed as co-author even when their contribution does not meet the criteria for authorship. Additionally, where leads or line managers would like a publication to have a positive impact on a researcher's career and so include them as an author where it is not warranted due to their contribution, these may have longer-term unforeseen implications if, for example, the research is later adopted for innovation. It is therefore important to fairly align authorship with contribution.

While the ethical responsibility for following good practice with regards to authorship lies with individual researchers, it is important to note that Higher Education Institutions, via their internal promotion processes, can play a significant role in supporting and encouraging good practice. They can do so by:

- having reasonable expectations with regards to co-authorship, i.e., recognising that collaborative research necessarily leads to co-authorship
- recognising and supporting researchers' ability to clearly, accurately and fairly represent their contribution to the co-authored publication and to the research process that underpins it

## Annex A: Department-specific authorship practice

Guidance from the Departments of Economic History, Statistics, Philosophy, Logic and Scientific Method, and the International Inequalities Institute does not differ from the LSE Principles of Authorship.

Department	Disciplinary Area	Discipline-specific guidance
Accounting	N/A	The Department expects researchers to, at a minimum, have made a substantial contribution to the work and be accountable for the work in its published form.
Anthropology	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please see discipline specific guidance at: <a href="https://easaonline.org/newsletter/79-1021/guidelines.shtml#:~:text=Every%20member%20of%20a%20research,should%20all%20appear%20as%20authors">https://easaonline.org/newsletter/79-1021/guidelines.shtml#:~:text=Every%20member%20of%20a%20research,should%20all%20appear%20as%20authors</a>.</li> <li>The 2021 Association of Social Anthropologists ethics guidelines states:</li> </ul> <p><b>7.6 Authorship and acknowledgements</b> The support and intellectual input of colleagues should be appropriately acknowledged. Researchers should publicly acknowledge student/researcher assistance in research and preparation of their research and give appropriate credit for co-authorship to students/researchers and encourage publication of worthy student/researcher papers; and compensate students/researchers justly for their participation in all professional activities. <a href="https://theasa.org">ASA Ethics (theasa.org)</a></p>
Economic History	Economic History, History, Economics, Economic Geography	None that differs from the LSE guidance

Department	Disciplinary Area	Discipline-specific guidance
Health Policy (including LSE Health)	Economics, sociology, medicine, political science, international relations, policy studies, anthropology, law, statistics, epidemiology, development studies, criminology and demography.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In some outlets for health policy research alphabetical order is the norm, but conventions differ and a candidate's contribution to a paper will be made clear in the submission for promotion.</li> <li>• It is common that journals in this field require multi-authorship statements, using conventions such as <a href="#">CRediT</a> authorship statements or the four criteria <a href="#">ICMJE</a> set out by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. The Department encourages staff to use such or similar conventions in setting out the nature of their contributions to multi-authored papers.</li> <li>• While single author pieces are common in some areas of health policy and associated relevant disciplines, multiple-authored publications are common in others. For multi-authored work, main authorship is ideal, supported by evidence of a substantial contribution, e.g., in an authorship contribution statement.</li> </ul>
International Development	Orthodox economics and political science, as well as more institutional approaches to politics and governance, anthropology, and some scholars who define their discipline as "development studies."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usually, alphabetical order is adopted or priority is given to the author who undertook most work on the paper/book.</li> <li>• Co-authorship is common, but there are few general rules about this.</li> <li>• Papers with a large number of co-authors are relatively rare.</li> <li>• Some parts of the department are more likely to undertake multiple-authored outputs, particularly the Health and Development unit. These scholars, however, follow the same general principles outlined above.</li> </ul>

Department	Disciplinary Area	Discipline-specific guidance
Mathematics	Mathematics, Computer Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good guidelines relevant to publication in Mathematics are the “<a href="#">Ethical Policy for the Journals of the London Mathematical Society</a>”<sup>5</sup> and the “<a href="#">Ethical Guidelines of the American Mathematical Society</a>”<sup>6</sup></li> <li>• As stated there, all the authors listed for a paper must have made a significant contribution to its content, and all who have made such a contribution must be offered the opportunity to be listed as an author.</li> <li>• If one of the authors receives a grant from a funding body that requires the research output to be published open access, and that author’s host institution supports such open access publication, then it is reasonable for the authors to jointly decide to change corresponding authorship to that author.</li> </ul>
Media and Communications	The field is by definition inter-disciplinary as issues relating to media and communications intersect with many other sub-fields and disciplines. As such, as an interdisciplinary Department we publish widely in highly ranked Social Science and Humanities journals in the field of media and communications but also in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authors are expected to have contributed significantly and in a meaningful way to the research development, design and data analysis. The Department aligns with the outlined principles in that it understands a significant contribution to be a combination of contributions at the level of knowledge creation, design of the project, data collection, analysis of the data and/or the drafting of the output. The Department would, however, deem a participation in the actual writing-up and drafting of the output to be an essential criterion to qualify as a co-author.</li> <li>• It is also common practice in this field that all co-authors are given the opportunity to approve the final version of a manuscript to be submitted for publication, the responses to the reviewer/editor comments, as well as the final version of the manuscript to be published.</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.lms.ac.uk/sites/lms.ac.uk/files/Publications/EthicalPolicy.pdf>)

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.ams.org/about-us/governance/policy-statements/sec-ethics>

Department	Disciplinary Area	Discipline-specific guidance
	related fields such as Sociology, Cultural Studies, Economics, International Relations, Development Studies, Psychology, Linguistics, Political Science, Social Studies of Science, Geography and Area Studies, as well as in interdisciplinary social science publications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When an equal proportion of contribution has been made towards production of the output, it is common in our field for author names to be ordered alphabetically. If this equity is not the case, which happens more often, the order of the authors should reflect the proportion of the contribution made to the output, regardless of status and hierarchy.</li> </ul>
Sociology		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Department also works to the guidelines of the British Sociological Association whose guidance on authorship can be found here: <a href="https://www.britisoc.co.uk/publications/guidelines-reports/authorship-guidelines">https://www.britisoc.co.uk/publications/guidelines-reports/authorship-guidelines</a></li> <li>The Department would additionally reference the British Sociology Association's guidance, which states:  "More senior BSA members are encouraged to give more junior colleagues opportunities to be first author when appropriate."  And furthermore, on the order of authors, which is as follows:  1. The person who has made the major contribution to the paper and / or taken the lead in writing is entitled to be the first author</li> </ul>

Department	Disciplinary Area	Discipline-specific guidance
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Decisions about who should be an author, the order of authors and those included in the acknowledgements should usually be made by the first author in consultation with other authors.</li> <li>3. Those who have made a major contribution to analysis or writing (i.e. more than commenting in detail on successive drafts) are entitled to follow the first author immediately; where there is a clear difference in the size of these contributions, this should be reflected in the order of these authors.</li> <li>4. All others who fulfil the criteria for authorship should complete the list in alphabetical order of their surnames.</li> <li>5. If all the authors feel that they have contributed equally to the paper, this can be indicated in a footnote.</li> </ol>



# Annex B: Useful resources

## LSE resources

LSE Code of Research Conduct

<https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/codResCon.pdf>

LSE Ethics Code

<https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/Secretarys-Division/Ethics/Ethics-Code>

LSE Innovation

<https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/research-and-innovation/innovation>

LSE Intellectual Property

<https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/IntProPol.pdf>

<https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/intProPolFAQ.pdf>

LSE Promotion of research staff

<https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/Human-Resources/Review-reward-and-promotion/Review-and-Promotion-of-Research-Staff>

LSE Research Ethics Policy

<https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/services/Policies-and-procedures/Assets/Documents/resEthPolPro.pdf>

LSE Review and promotion of academic staff

<https://info.lse.ac.uk/staff/divisions/Human-Resources/Review-reward-and-promotion/Review-and-Promotion-of-Academic-Staff>

## General guidance

Committee of Publishing Ethics (COPE)

<https://publicationethics.org/authorship>

Council of Science Editors

<https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/>

European Association of Social Anthropologists

<https://easaonline.org/newsletter/75-0120/guidelines>

UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO)

<https://ukrio.org/new-guidance-from-ukrio-authorship-in-academic-publications/>

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE)

<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html>

Singapore Statement on Research Integrity  
<https://wcrif.org/guidance/singapore-statement>

Montreal Statement on Research Integrity in Cross-Boundary Research Collaborations  
<https://wcrif.org/documents/354-montreal-statement-english/file>

## **Funder/ publisher guidance**

Academy of Management  
<https://aom.org/about-aom/governance/ethics/code-of-ethics#general>

British Educational Research Association (BERA)  
<https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018>

British Psychological Society  
[http://www.bps.org.uk/sites/default/files/images/statement\\_on\\_authorship\\_credit.pdf](http://www.bps.org.uk/sites/default/files/images/statement_on_authorship_credit.pdf)

British Sociological Association  
<https://www.britsoc.co.uk/publications/guidelines-reports/authorship-guidelines/>

Elsevier  
[https://www.elsevier.com/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0012/856659/Ethics-in-Research-and-Publication-March-2019.pdf](https://www.elsevier.com/_data/assets/pdf_file/0012/856659/Ethics-in-Research-and-Publication-March-2019.pdf)

Medical Research Council  
<http://www.mrc.ac.uk/news-events/publications/good-research-practice-principles-and-guidelines/>

National Institute for Health Research  
<https://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/information-for-authors/our-policies/authorship.htm>

Nature  
<http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/authorship.html>

Open Research Europe  
<https://open-research-europe.ec.europa.eu/about/policies#authorship>

Springer  
<https://www.springer.com/gp/authors-editors/book-authors-editors/your-publication-journey/publishing-integrity>

Wellcome Trust  
<http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Policy-and-position-statements/WTD002757.htm>

Wellcome Open Research  
<https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/about/policies#aaa>

Wiley-Blackwell  
<https://authorservices.wiley.com/ethics-guidelines/index.html#5>

**Authors (in alphabetical order)**

Rita Astuti, Department of Anthropology & former Director of the PhD Academy  
Lyn Grove, Research and Innovation  
Wendy Leung, Research and Innovation  
Helen Porter, LSE Library

The authors would like to thank David Ai, Hannah Boroudjou, Nathalie Cornée, Claire Delahunty, Daniele Fanelli, Jen Fensome, Emily Jackson, Ahmed Khan, Grace McConnell, Susana Mourato, Niamh Tumelty and members of the School's Research Ethics Committee, the Research Policy and Staff Committee, the Deputy Heads of Research, Research Centre Directors, Departmental Heads Forum, and Research Committee for their expertise and input into the guidance.

## Review schedule

These principles are a live document which will be updated as and when required, and at a minimum as per the review schedule below.

Review interval	Next review due by	Next review start
Every 3 years	February 2027	October 2026

## Version history

Version	Date	Approved by	Notes
1	February 2024	Research Committee	

## Links

Reference	Link

## Contacts

Position	Name	Email	Notes
Director of Research & Innovation	Dr Jen Fensome	<a href="mailto:j.fensome@lse.ac.uk">j.fensome@lse.ac.uk</a>	
Director of LSE Library	Niamh Tumulty	<a href="mailto:n.tumulty@lse.ac.uk">n.tumulty@lse.ac.uk</a>	

## Communications and Training

Will this document be publicised through Internal Communications?	Yes/ No
Will training needs arise from this policy	Yes/ No
If Yes, please give details	