

Publication Policy

Version Control

1. Full Document Number:	POL-030
2. Version number:	V3.0
3. Superseded version number:	V2.1
4. Document owner job title:	Dean Research Culture and Integrity
5. Department / function:	Research Governance
6. Approved by:	Research Integrity and Governance Committee
7. Date of approval:	16 September 2024
8. Next review date:	15 September 2026
9. Date of Equality Impact Assessment (assessment enclosed):	28/02/2022
10. Accessibility checked: Yes/no	Use the Accessibility Checker in the Word Toolbar, or see Accessibility guide
11. Does this policy apply to LSTM Group (LSTM and subsidiaries?) Yes / no	Yes
12. All policies will be added to the LSTM website unless an exception is provided here	
13. If this policy has been reviewed, has this resulted in a minor or major changes?	Minor (as v2.1 & v3.0, reviewed and approved by RIGC 16 July 2024)
14. Does this policy ensure that there is no modern slavery or human trafficking in our supply chains or in any part of our business?	N/A

Always view the current version of the document via the Knowledge Exchange Policy Hub.

Modifications from previous version of document

Version	Date of issue	Details of modification
2.0	Feb 2022	Updated to new format
		EIA completed
		Inclusion of text on equitable partnerships
		Inclusion of more detailed guidance on authorship conventions
		Clarified LSTM's position on authorship order and LSTM's approach to assessment of publication quality
		Added guidance on when and what to publish
		Updated open access guidance and information on pre-prints
2.1	June 2024	Updated to include new Rights Retention Policy
3.0	June 2024	Updated procedures for managing authorship disputes & policy reformatting and version control

Contents

Publication Policy	1
Modifications from previous version of document	2
1 Introduction and Context.....	4
2 Equality and Diversity	4
3 Safeguarding	5
4 Scope	5
5 Definitions.....	6
7 Authorship	6
7.1 Assigning authorship.....	6
7.3 Author Contributions	8
7.4 Authorship Order.....	9
8 Authorship Disputes	9
9 Publication.....	11
9.1 Journal Choice	12
9.2 LSTM Rights Retention for authors	12
9.3 Funding Body acknowledgment and compliance.....	13
9.4 Plagiarism and copyright.....	13
9.5 Disclosure of competing interests.....	14
9.6 Quality of Submissions.....	14
10.1 Open Access.....	14
10.2 Study registration and reporting guidelines	14
10.3 Pre-print submission	15
11 LSTM approach to assessment of publication quality	15
12 Breaching the Policy	16
13 Related documents and resources	16
Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) template	17
Equality Impact Assessment: Section 1 (to be completed for all Policies).....	17
Section 2: To be Completed if your policy has an impact on people, or if you are unsure of the impact of a Policy or Procedure and need to engage with stakeholders (note: you do not need to use this template – only use it if it’s helpful)	18
Conclusion	22

1 Introduction and Context

LSTM recognises publication of research outputs as an essential part of the research process, having a vital role in the dissemination and generation of knowledge and in the promotion of individual researchers and the institution. We are committed to maintaining the highest standards of ethics and integrity in our research, and as part of this commitment require all those involved in research and publication to understand, and adhere to, good research conduct with regard to authorship practices.

All members of LSTM undertaking research are expected to complete the [research integrity online course 'Scholarly Publication'](#) which covers good practice in publishing, authorship and peer review.

Increased emphasis within the UK higher education sector on public accountability and impact assessment has made it increasingly important for LSTM to be able to manage information about, and access to, research outputs, and to help researchers maximise the dissemination of their research outputs and comply with funder requirements. All researchers should endeavour to present findings derived from reliable research irrespective of what they show in a prompt, responsible, objective and accurate manner. As an organisation, we are committed to ensure that research is published in accordance with any commitments set out at the start of the project and adheres to relevant research ethics protocols and funder requirements.

2 Equality and Diversity

This policy required an Equality Impact Assessment which can be found at the end of this policy document.

LSTM is committed to promoting equality of opportunity, combatting unlawful discrimination and promoting good community relations. We will not tolerate any form of unlawful discrimination or behaviour that undermines this commitment and is contrary to our equality policy; we expect staff and students to respect all individuals and partners, whatever their role in the generation or publication of the research.

All researchers should consider authorship at an early stage of the project and be mindful of groups that may be marginalised in authorship attributions (e.g., early career researchers, collaborators from low-income countries, women).

Investigators of projects with partner organisations in low or middle-income countries (LMICs) are encouraged to consider their obligations for research capacity development. LSTM requests that all staff prospectively consider how equity is promoted within their collaborations at research inception (grant application and award stage); research implementation (protocol, sponsorship and ethical approvals stage); and at research reporting (publication, presentation and dissemination stage) and have endorsed a consensus statement promoting equity in collaborations involving high and low-income partners (<https://doi.org/10.1111/anae.15597>). The following table, adapted from the consensus statement, sets out specific questions that LSTM staff should consider and address during this process:

	Question
Study conceptualisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does this study address national and regional research and policy priorities? • How were in country researchers involved in study design?
Research management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has funding been used to support the in-country research team(s)?
Data acquisition and analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are research staff who conducted data collection acknowledged? • How have members of the research partnership been provided with access to study data? • How was data used to develop analytical skills within the partnership?
Data interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How have research partners collaborated in interpreting study data?
Drafting and revising for intellectual content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were research partners supported to develop writing skills? • How will research products be shared to address national and regional needs?
Authorship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the leadership, contribution and ownership of this work by in country researchers recognised within the authorship? • How have early career researchers across the partnership been included within the authorship team? • Has gender equality and principles of equity and inclusion been considered within the authorship?
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has the project contributed to training of researchers across the partnership?
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has the project contributed to improvements in local infrastructure?
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What safeguarding procedures were used to protect local participants and researchers?

3 Safeguarding

LSTM recognises its role in safeguarding and protecting research participants, patients and communities with whom we have direct and indirect contact through our work and also our staff, students, volunteers and other representatives.

4 Scope

This policy applies to all academic and academic related staff and students in the LSTM Group (LSTM, IVCC, Well-Travelled Clinic and subsidiaries), including anyone publishing using an LSTM affiliation.

Publications include (but are not limited to) all academic publications in peer-reviewed journals and other journals or research repositories, pre-print servers and conference abstracts.

5 Definitions

LMIC: Low and Middle Income Countries

OA: Open Access

REF: Research Excellence Framework

6 Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of all research active staff and students to be aware of this policy and to abide by its principles

It is the responsibility of any employee of LSTM, who observes, receives, or is informed of actions that contravene this policy to raise these concerns using the mechanisms outlined in section 7.4

7 Authorship

7.1 Assigning authorship

Authorship should demonstrate contribution, responsibility and accountability for scientific work. It is central to academic credibility. Listing the authors tells readers who did the work and should ensure that the right people get the credit - and take responsibility - for the research. Denying authorship to somebody who deserves it (ghost authorship) denies recognition and academic credit since publications are used to assess academic productivity. Including an undeserving author (guest authorship) is unfair since this person gets credit for work they have not done. Omitting a deserving author from an author also list misleads readers (including journal editors) and may mask conflicts of interest.

Whilst there are no universally accepted standards for attributing authorship the <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html> authorship criteria are a useful example

(Box 1).

Box 1. ICMJE authorship criteria

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

In addition to being accountable for the parts of the work he or she has done, an author should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible

These guidelines set a high standard and are widely accepted but should be used in an inclusive manner and not as a strategy to exclude authors. For example, at LSTM we support the inclusion of technicians in research publications, provided they have made a substantial contribution to data acquisition, and we require all authors to consider issues of equity, particularly relating to partners from LMIC, as outlined above. It should be noted that supervision of a research group/department is not considered a valid criterion for authorship at LSTM. Suggestions about how these ICMJE criteria can be used in an inclusive manner this can be found here: <https://gh.bmj.com/content/bmjgh/6/10/e007632.full.pdf>.

In reality, the responsibility for decisions about authorship falls on the researchers who conducted the research reported in the publication. These decisions are best communicated early and transparently in each project and renegotiated regularly as necessary, to avoid misunderstanding and later disputes. Where the work has more than one author the researchers should:

- agree among all authors the contribution each will make to reporting the work and authorship order, reviewing this commitment regularly as the work progresses
- appoint a lead author or a member of the programme team for communication on the work and keep written records of decisions made regarding authorship
- report the work fairly according to each author's contribution, and neither omit, underplay nor overplay a contributor's input
- comply with the definition of author and co-author given by the journal or by international organisations (e.g., the ICJME guidelines above).
- provide a formal offer of authorship (which should be accepted or declined in writing) to those meeting the agreed definitions
- maintain copies of correspondence (for example exchanges of emails, notes of meetings) in case of disputes.

All researchers should be mindful of barriers to speaking up, or power imbalances, that may mean contributors do not feel equally empowered to act (e.g. junior and LMIC researchers) and may therefore need support from colleagues.

Any individual who contributed to the research, but whose input was not sufficient for them to be listed as an author should be recognised in the acknowledgements of the publication rather than as an author.

7.2 Authorship Agreement

As soon as possible in a research collaboration, conversations among the collaborators about authorship should be initiated by the PI or intended First/Corresponding Author, as appropriate. This should include a discussion of general expectations for various roles even if the exact authorship order is not yet clear or may change. In cases of theses and dissertations, the Supervisor should facilitate authorship discussions with the student, starting during the proposal stage and continuing, as appropriate, throughout the process.

Agreements about authorship order should be transparent, and ideally, a written authorship agreement should be developed and shared with all collaborators. (Creating a project on the [Open Science Framework](#) may also provide an opportunity to initiate authorship discussions as collaborators are named and listed in an initial order.)

Because research roles can change throughout the lifecycle of a collaboration, it is important to revisit authorship agreements as circumstances warrant. For example, authors may want to agree that after a specified period of time, a subset of collaborators may proceed with dissemination of results even if one or more collaborators fails to respond to a request for approval as to relevant elements of the dissemination (authorship order, manuscript text, publication selection, etc.).

LSTM Authorship Agreement template can be found on this page of the [LSTM Knowledge Exchange](#)

7.3 Author Contributions

To ensure a given author's publications are accurately attributed to them, all authors should register for an [ORCID](#) account (a unique digital identifier that distinguishes researchers from every other researcher) and ensure that their ORCID number is referenced in their published research.

The [CASRAI CRediT \(Contributor Roles Taxonomy\)](#) sets out 14 roles that can be used to represent those typically played by contributors to a scholarly output. This has been widely adopted by a range of publishers to improve accessibility and visibility of the range of contributions made to published research outputs. However, for some publications, other roles may merit authorship that are not listed in the CRediT

taxonomy; in this instance the authorship team should discuss these roles and apply in an equitable, consistent and transparent manner.

When research is funded by commercial companies, more formal authorship agreements may be required. These may also cover aspects such as intellectual property rights, data ownership, rights to publish, and requirements to review publications.

Researchers' affiliations at the time they performed the bulk of the work should be listed on any publication (so the appropriate institution is credited). If researchers subsequently move to another institution, their new contact information should also be included, usually as a footnote. If an author has more than one affiliation (for example clinicians, government employees) both affiliations should be listed; this is particularly important if the author has a non-academic affiliation (e.g. industry, governmental role) as these data are collated for LSTM's Knowledge Exchange Framework submission.

7.4 Authorship Order

The requirements and status of first, last and corresponding author, although generally poorly defined, are often considered important. Typically, the last author is a senior person that guided the research throughout the process. The first author(s) have made the greatest contribution to the generation of the findings reported in the publication and conduct of the research, as well as in drafting the manuscript in question. The criteria for designation of First Author may vary by discipline. LSTM supports Co-First Author positions where appropriate.

In recognition of the importance of 'team science' formal recognition of authorship order is becoming less common. For example, the Research Excellence Framework 2021 (REF2021) did not distinguish between authorship position if there were less than 15 authors; LSTM takes the same approach in our reading panels (see section 9.0). However, funders or external partners may have different viewpoints on authorship order and hence it is important that this is discussed in an open and transparent way within the authorship team. It may be reasonable to share positions of significance, e.g., joint first, or joint senior authorships.

Journals usually require one author to be designated as the 'corresponding author'¹ who receives all correspondence and liaises with the other authors. The corresponding author should also be available after publication to respond to critiques of the work, any questions that arise and to co-operate with requests for additional data or information. The corresponding author should be somebody whose contact details are unlikely to change, who is normally reachable, and able to respond promptly.

8 Authorship Disputes

8.1 Informal Dispute Resolution

¹ Some journals may allow more than one corresponding author when two (or more) teams are collaborating.

Disputes about who is listed as an author, or the order of listing, need to be dealt with before journal submission. Good communication in the team can help prevent problems and can address concerns at an early stage. If possible, roles should be discussed and assigned early in the process with clear written communication as to what is expected. Written communication is preferred over verbal as this is a recorded form that can assist with any disputes that may arise later. If disputes occur, colleagues are encouraged to first resolve within the team, ensuring that all partners are consulted (for larger projects, with management boards and/or advisory panels, these should be consulted if the matter cannot be resolved within the authorship team).

If authorship issues cannot be resolved within the team then independent advice should be sought. Where possible, it should be made clear to the corresponding author that the concerns with the authorship decisions remain, and that you are intending to escalate the concerns for the purposes of obtaining a resolution. Collaborators should consult any written authorship agreement to inform such resolution. If there is no such agreement or if the terms of the agreement do not sufficiently resolve the matter, the collaborators might involve a neutral third party, such as Research Governance Manager or the Dean of Research Culture and Integrity, who may facilitate discussions but whose role is not to render a decision. Authorship issues may also be raised using Vault / the Freedom to Speak Up Portal.

8.2 Formal Dispute Resolution: Authorship Dispute Panel

1. Initiation of a Formal Dispute Resolution: If an authorship dispute cannot be resolved with the informal steps suggested above, a disputant may initiate a formal dispute resolution process by contacting the Dean of Research Culture & Integrity in cases where a real or perceived conflict exists, this will be delegated to an alternative Dean in writing with a summary of the dispute and any supporting documents. The Dean will review the dispute and any supporting documents to determine whether a formal resolution is appropriate. If the Dean determines that formal resolution is appropriate, the Dean will appoint an Authorship Dispute Panel to consider the matter and make recommendations.

2. Authorship Dispute Panel: From a standing pool of Research Integrity Champions as agreed by the Dean of Research Culture & Integrity (including researchers from senior, early career and student levels), the Dean will charge a three-person Panel to hear the dispute. The Dean will ensure that there is appropriate expertise and representation to carry out a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the dispute, and will require that the Panel maintain confidentiality of all parties, deliberations, and documentation. The Panel may also consult other members of the LSTM community for required expertise without disclosing any identifying information about the disputant, but those consulted will not participate in adjudicating the dispute.

The disputant is responsible for presenting the authorship dispute in good faith, for maintaining confidentiality of the parties to the dispute and of all documentation, and for cooperating with the Panel's deliberative process. The disputant will have an opportunity to present documentation to the Panel, and to review the draft report.

The Panel will notify the respondent(s) of the dispute when the Dean appoints the Panel. The respondent(s) are responsible for making their case in good faith, for maintaining the confidentiality of the parties to the dispute and of all documentation, and for cooperating with the Panel's deliberative process. The respondent(s) will have the opportunity to present documentation to the Panel, and to review the draft report.

LSTM will protect the confidentiality of the parties to the dispute, any deliberations, and any related documents to the extent permitted under law. Retaliation against individuals for raising authorship dispute claims in good faith or for cooperating in good faith in LSTM's review of any such claims is strictly prohibited and subject to disciplinary action in accordance with applicable policies.

3. Resolution: The Panel will make a written recommendation to the Dean of Research Culture & Integrity summarising the dispute, documentation considered, and recommended resolution, along with its rationale. The Dean will notify the disputant and respondent(s) of the Panel's recommendation.

The Panel's recommendation is not binding on the parties to the dispute but may be considered as presumptive evidence of the appropriate authorship designation if either the disputant or respondent fails to implement the recommendation. The Dean may notify the non-complying party's supervisor, Head of Department, or other appropriate manager if the Dean determines that the party's failure to implement the recommendation warrants consideration of disciplinary or other appropriate action.

8.3 Research Misconduct

Deliberate or reckless misrepresentation of authorship (i.e. excluding honest errors and differences of opinion remaining after arbitration) breaches LSTM's [Research Integrity Statement](#). When allegations are of a serious nature, or where mediation and/or arbitration has been refused or proved unsuccessful, then the formal research misconduct process should be used (see section 10).

9 Publication

Researchers should seek to publish their results in accordance with current best practice and funders' terms and conditions. They should ensure that they:

- use the most appropriate means to publish the results of their research, typically as papers in refereed journals
- publish a coherent report of the work and do not report the data more than once (unless in a secondary analysis) or sub-divide the data (unless this was a predefined approach)
- consider negative results of research as important as positive when disseminating research and avoid exaggerating the importance of conclusions obtained
- analyse the data using appropriate methods of statistical analysis
- acknowledge and cite the work of others where appropriate, fully and accurately attributing relevant sources

- give notice of intention to publish and seek approval, where appropriate, from all partner organisations
- take steps to ensure the accuracy of the data reported and act immediately to correct any genuine errors or misunderstanding prior to and after publishing
- ensure personal data is appropriately anonymised, where appropriate (contact the data protection officer for guidance)
- handle the release of research data which might have high and/or commercial impact with care and sensitivity, consulting the LSTM contracts department (LSTMcontracts@lstmed.ac.uk) for advice prior to publication.
- Ensure all supporting data is made fully accessible in open access repositories.

9.1 Journal Choice

Journal choice should seek to maximise likelihood of reaching its widest relevant audience and ensure it complies with funders requirements, where applicable (see Open Access section 8.5). The standing and 'visibility' of the journal in its field of science will often help to maximise citation count. Other factors, including the speed of editorial processing, are often worth considering. Predatory Journals should be avoided; for further information see

<https://lstmed.sharepoint.com/Departments/Information-Services/Pages/Predatory-Publishers.aspx> and also <https://ambulance.libguides.com/predatoryjournals>.

If in any doubt about the validity of the journal you are considering submitting to please contact library@lstmed.ac.uk

9.2 LSTM Rights Retention for authors

From **January 2025** LSTM will implement a Rights Retention Strategy. Rights Retention aims to ensure that authors can deposit their paper where they see fit and disseminate their work as widely as possible while also meeting funder and any future REF requirements.

Traditionally, publishers require that authors sign a Copyright Transfer Agreement. The only way to access the article after publication is to pay for it. Rights Retention is based on the simple principle that authors and institutions should retain some rights to their publications.

LSTM asserts a non-exclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to deposit the work under a CC BY licence. This allows authors to post the Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) in the LSTM Archive with no embargo, share it among colleagues, and use it in their own teaching.

From January 2025, LSTM authors can include the following statement at the point of submission in the 'acknowledgements' section of the manuscript as well as the

publisher cover letter to inform publishers of your intentions. This step is not necessary to deposit your paper in the Archive.

LSTM Rights Retention Statement:

“For the purpose of open access, the author(s) has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

This work was funded by XXX, grant number XXX.”

It is important to note that inclusion of this statement ensures funder compliance without the need for separate Rights Retention Statements, such as those listed by Wellcome and UKRI.

LSTM's rights retention applies automatically to papers authored by LSTM Staff, regardless of inclusion of the Rights Retention statement. Where it is not possible to comply with the policy e.g. there is significant use of third party copyrighted material, or is a cross sector work that other organisations' policies prevent this, an opt-out is available. Please contact library@lstmed.ac.uk in the first instance prior to submission if you believe your article may require this or you have any concerns regarding eligibility.

Opting out of the policy may also render an article ineligible for REF submission if the journal embargo exceeds the maximum allowed by the REF Open Access Policy.

9.3 Funding Body acknowledgment and compliance

When publications are a result of an externally funded project, authors should be fully aware of the funding body's publication requirements and must comply with the funders' policies relating to open access and research data management. The source(s) of funding (including LSTM funding) must be stated on all publications, and the award grant number provided by the funder must be added to the acknowledgement so outputs can be identified by datamining.

It is the responsibility of LSTM authors publishing under grants from UKRI or Wellcome Trust to ensure that the necessary Rights Retention statements are included in their manuscript and cover letter at submission. The new LSTM Rights Retention Statement removes the requirement for the author to provide additional statements for funders such as Wellcome and UKRI. However, it is good practice to ensure these funders are acknowledged and the grant numbers provided in the acknowledgement section of the published work.

9.4 Plagiarism and copyright

All LSTM publications must respect copyrighted material and seek appropriate permission to re-publish any such material. Authors must use direct quotations from previously published work (from the same or other authors) and cite appropriately. Plagiarism, including self-plagiarism, is academic fraud.

9.5 Disclosure of competing interests

In addition to clearly disclosing the funding source, authors of publications must disclose all relevant competing interests they may have, as required by the journal or conference. Competing interest declarations aim to make the authors' position transparent.

9.6 Quality of Submissions

We expect the quality of the English to be excellent, and the presentation should be consistent with international publishing standards. Poor quality submissions to journals are a reputational risk to LSTM with the journal and referees. Staff are strongly advised to seek informal peer review prior to submission, and all senior academic staff should provide advice on publishing and feedback on draft articles without any assumption of authorship (unless they meet the criteria for authorship as described above). However, it is good practice to recognise the contribution of peer review in the acknowledgments section of the final publication.

10. Open Research Practices

10.1 Open Access

LSTM is committed to supporting Open Access (OA) publication. Our position on OA is consistent with the open access policies of major funders including UKRI and WT and the principles of Plan S. Further details can be found [here](#).

All publications must be deposited in the [LSTM institutional repository](#) (which will respect embargo periods set by publishers) within **3 months of acceptance** for publication (this is a requirement set by REF). This is the author's responsibility. LSTM has compiled [guidance](#) to help staff implementing this policy.

Authors must also ensure that research data collected during the course of the project is publicly shared. The only permissible exceptions are if there is a legal (e.g. data protection), ethical, intellectual property or commercial reason not to do so. Data sharing enables data to be re-used in other projects and to make conclusions from the research publicly verifiable. The public sharing of research data is a requirement of most of major funders, including UKRI and Wellcome, as well as most publishers. For more information about how to share your research data, please see the Centre for Data [website](#).

To ensure compliance, support can be obtained from Data Protection, the [Centre for Data](#) and from guidance in the [Research Data Management Policy](#). The LSTM online archive has some limited storage for data too. This can be discussed as needed with the library team when the publication is being deposited.

10.2 Study registration and reporting guidelines

LSTM is a signatory to the [AllTrials Campaign](#). LSTM endorses the principle that all trials are registered, and the results of such studies are published as quickly as

possible following their completion. Trials should be registered on a suitable, publicly accessible Clinical Trials Registry that is approved by the [WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform \(ICTRP\)](#) (such as [Clinical Trials](#) or [the Pan African Trials Registry](#)).

All research involving animals must adhere to the [ARRIVE guidelines](#) in relation to conduct and reporting. See also link below to access Registry Platforms for animal research.

Journals often require authors adhere to specific reporting guidelines, including PRISMA for systematic reviews, and CONSORT for randomised trials. An inventory of such guidelines is available from the Equator network: www.equator-network.org.

LSTM expects that systematic reviews will adhere to basic standards of good science. Authors are expected to prepare protocols (a priori) with clear inclusion criteria and register these with the International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO <https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/>). Systematic reviews should meet with international standards of conduct and reporting, such as those outlined in the AMSTAR checklist criteria (https://amstar.ca/Amstar_Checklist.php).

Please refer to [LSTM SharePoint page Registration Platforms](#) for more information.

10.3 Pre-print submission

Authors may wish to submit their research articles as preprints to servers such as bioRxiv, medRxiv, Research Square or OSF to aid open access and open data sharing and to ensure a public record of research outputs is made available in a timely manner (for example prior to grant deadlines). Further information and resources on pre-printing can be found at: <https://asapbio.org/preprint-info/preprint-faq>. Authors should familiarise themselves with their funders' Open Access policy (which can be found on their website) regarding preprints. This is because effective 1st January 2025, some funders expect articles to be published as preprints in a recognised preprint server, under a CC-BY licence.

11 LSTM approach to assessment of publication quality

For the purposes of preparation for submission to REF, and for evaluation of individual promotion and career progression, researcher publications are periodically reviewed by an LSTM reading panel. Further information on our approach to scoring papers can be found here on the [LSTM SharePoint page 'Assessing Academic Performance'](#). The process is designed to be compliant with the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) and considers the quality of the paper, rather than where it is published. In line with REF guidance, authorship order is not taken into account, but, where there are more than 15 authors evidence of a significant contribution to the manuscript will be sought by reviewing the author contribution statements. Hence

authors of papers with large numbers of co-authors should take particular care to ensure their contribution to the manuscript is correctly acknowledged in the final publication.

12 Breaching the Policy

Some anticipated breaches of this policy will be minor and merit no sanction. If a publication is found to include an honest error (for example a difference in interpretation, errors unrelated to the research), it is advised that authors seek a correction (erratum) or retraction of work as appropriate, providing the reason for this action. Such errors are not uncommon in research, with [The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity](#) (All European Academies, 2017) stating that authors should be 'given credit for issuing prompt corrections post-publication' if required.

Some breaches (for example allegations of plagiarism or falsification) could be interpreted as Research Misconduct (RM), in which case LSTM's [RM policy](#) will be followed.

13 Related documents and resources

COPE – Committee on Publication Ethics <https://publicationethics.org/>

UK Research Integrity Office - <https://ukrio.org/wp-content/uploads/UKRIO-Guidance-Note-Authorship-v1.0.pdf>

The Authorship Project - <https://www.authorshipproject.org/>

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) template

(Please refer to the [EIA guidance document](#))

Equality Impact Assessment: Section 1 (to be completed for all Policies)

Title of policy/process:	<i>Publication Policy</i>
Policy owner job title:	<i>Dean of Research Culture and Integrity</i>
Date of EIA:	<i>28th February 2022</i>
Policy relevant to: Staff / students / visitors etc:	<i>All academic and academic related staff and students in the LSTM Group including anyone publishing using an LSTM affiliation.</i>
Summary of any consultation with stakeholders (e.g., date and type of consultation):	<i>LSTM authors of Equitable Research Publication https://doi.org/10.1111/anae.15597 (Dec 2021) Research Integrity Working Group (Jan 2022) Information Services (Jan 2022) Early Career Researchers and Technicians Group (March 2022 (planned)) Research Committee (March 2022 (planned))</i>
This policy has been checked for accessibility on: (date)	

<p>I confirm that this policy does/does not impact people, and therefore does not require an EIA (delete as appropriate)</p>	<p>Does impact people (<i>continue to Section 2</i>)</p>
---	---

Section 2: To be Completed if your policy has an impact on people, or if you are unsure of the impact of a Policy or Procedure and need to engage with stakeholders (note: you do not need to use this template – only use it if it’s helpful)

Ref.	Protected Characteristic (Equality Act 2010)	Yes (positive/negative) / no	Potential issues to consider, any data obtained	Potential actions that can be taken to mitigate against impact
1.1	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on a group depending on their <i>ethnicity</i> ?	<i>Possible</i>	<i>Researchers from different social contexts and cultural backgrounds (who may be from the UK or non-UK countries) may feel less confident in reporting authorship concerns as a result of structural power imbalances</i>	<i>The changes made to the updated publication policy are intended to ensure a more equitable approach to authorship which we may redress imbalances previously negatively impacting our African and Asian partners</i>

1.2	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on a group depending on their <i>gender identity/assignment</i> ?	<i>Possible</i>	<i>Researchers from different genders (who may be from the UK or non-UK countries) need to have confidence to challenge proposed authorship where appropriate</i>	<i>The changes made to the updated publication policy are intended to provide clearer guidance on authorship criteria; specification of multiple routes for reporting concerns over authorship may engender greater levels of reporting.</i>
1.3	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on people during <i>pregnancy or maternity</i> ?	<i>Not likely that this policy will directly disadvantage this group</i>		
1.4	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on <i>people with disabilities</i> ?	<i>Not likely that this policy will directly disadvantage this group</i>		
1.5	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on people due to their <i>sexual orientation</i> ?	<i>Not likely that this policy will directly disadvantage this group</i>		

1.6	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on people due to their <i>religion, belief, or lack thereof</i> ?	<i>Not likely that this policy will directly disadvantage this group</i>		
1.7	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on people who are <i>trans</i> ?	<i>Not likely that this policy will directly disadvantage this group</i>		
1.8	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on people due to their <i>age</i> ?	<i>Possible</i>	<i>More junior colleagues may feel less able to challenge authorship decisions</i>	<i>The changes made to the updated publication policy are intended to provide clearer guidance on authorship criteria; specification of multiple routes for reporting concerns over authorship may engender greater levels of reporting.</i>
1.9	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on people due to <i>marriage or civil partnership</i> ?	<i>Not likely that this policy will directly disadvantage this group</i>		

Ref.	Other groups who could be impacted (acquired characteristics)	Yes (positive/negative) / no	Potential issues to consider, any data obtained	Potential actions that can be taken to mitigate against impact
2.1	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on people due to their <i>contract type (part-time or full-time)</i> ?	<i>Not likely that this policy will directly disadvantage this group</i>		
2.2	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on people due to their <i>contract status (fixed-term or indefinite)</i> ?	<i>Possible</i>	<i>Delays in publication, or unfair decisions on authorship can negatively impact staff on fixed term contracts; staff may feel they have less control over authorship order if they have left LSTM</i>	
2.3	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on people due to <i>their grade</i> ?	<i>Possible</i>	<i>More junior colleagues may feel less able to challenge authorship decisions</i>	<i>The changes made to the updated publication policy are intended to provide clearer guidance on authorship criteria; specification of multiple routes for reporting concerns over authorship may engender greater levels of reporting.</i>

2.4	Is it likely that the policy or framework could have a positive or negative impact on people with dependents or caring responsibilities?	<i>Not likely that this policy will directly disadvantage this group</i>		
Ref	PREVENT Duty	Yes /no	Potential issues to consider, any data obtained	Potential actions that can be taken to mitigate against impact
2.5	PREVENT: Does this policy/proposal impact on any of the following areas of PREVENT duty: (a) staff and student welfare (b) events and external speakers (c) training in relation to PREVENT	no no no		
2.6	Is a separate risk assessment required?	no		

Conclusion

a. What issues are highlighted by the EIA process? Summarise the action you will take to mitigate against them, or how you've changed your policy to remove the issues.	The policy has been re-written to make the process for assigning authorship more
---	--

	transparent, and to clarify routes to raise concerns over authorship
b. If you consider intersectionality of protected characteristics, are the issues compounded? Summarise the action you will take to mitigate against the issues.	
c. Are there are groups of people who aren't recorded so far, who may be adversely impacted by this policy/framework?	
d. Are there any opportunities within the policy/framework to particularly promote equity?	The inclusion of guidelines for embedding equity at all stages of the research process are intended to promote more open discourse on equity in publishing
e. Does the policy/framework need amendment after the outcome of the EIA process?	The policy has been amended as described above, following the initial EIA.
f. Timeline for amendment, review and further consultation with key stakeholders.	The revised policy has been to Early Career Researchers, Research Integrity Working Group, Research Committee, Information Services, Research Integrity and Governance Committee and to colleagues at MLW for their input. Further comments from staff and PGR students across LSTM will be considered when the updated policy is disseminated.
g. Any additional comments	

Please share the final document with inclusion@lstmed.ac.uk prior to internal publication.