

NSTX Publication – Authorship Policy (from inception)

- First author
 - Those who contributed directly (in alphabetical order, irrespective of institution)
 - Those who contributed indirectly (in alphabetical order, irrespective of institution)
- Pros
 - Well defined guideline
 - Minimizes discussion over who should be in front of whom
 - Does not allow for institutional bias
 - Promotes NSTX as a team of scientists
- Cons
 - Inflexible (several people have mentioned this)
 - Does not allow for crediting a true partner/mentor in the specific work

Proposed Modification to Policy

- First author
 - Up to **n** “second-authors” in order appropriate to direct contributions (n=2?)
 - First alphabetical tier (irrespective of institution)
 - Second alphabetical tier (irrespective of institution)
- Allows more flexibility and acknowledgement of work partners
- Want to minimize the discussion/debate over who goes where
 - The **n** second authors are ones who have provided significant input/advice/mentoring/influence on this specific work
 - Should acknowledge true partners in the work
 - It should not be used to (e.g.) place PIs in a high place if they did not have significant input (should not be used for institutional “bias”)
- If more than **n** pulled out, then these should constitute first alphabetical tier (and there would be no level between first author and first alphabetical tier)
 - More than **n** will make the second author level less meaningful
- S. Kaye will be first line of mediation for any authorship disputes