**Ethical Authorship Guidelines for *Nuytsia***

Under the *Australian* *Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research*1 it is expected that scientific research is undertaken in an ethical and honest manner. While the responsibility for this lies with the individuals involved in undertaking research, it is appropriate that *Nuytsia* also employs clear guidelines that support a culture of transparency and integrity by clearly stating the standards expected to justify Authorship. Resources are also available from the Committee on Publication Ethics ([COPE](https://publicationethics.org/about/our-organisation)) regarding best practices for ethical authorship.

Ethical guidelines for *Nuytsia* have been developed to ensure all authors:

* agree to the final manuscript and revision(s) submitted to the journal;
* disclose any potential conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial interests that may be a perceived, potential, or actual conflicts of interest);
* meet conditions to ensure they warrant authorship (see Author contributions);
* acknowledge others who have contributed to the research; and
* cite other relevant work accurately.

Corresponding authors will need to complete a [**submission form**](https://florabase.dbca.wa.gov.au/nuytsia/documents/submission-form.docx) for any manuscript submitted for publication in *Nuytsia*.

**Author contributions**

Recommendation 25 of the *Australian* *Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research*1states that authors “are all those, and only those, who have made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to the research and its output, and that they agree to be listed as an author.”

To provide guidance as to what constitutes a significant contribution, *Nuytsia* generallyfollows the criteria outlined by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) 2 necessary to warrant authorship.

 Authors must meet the following conditions:

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work;
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content;
3. Final approval of the version to be published;
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.

A researcher should not be attributed Authorship simply based on the provision of infrastructure, equipment, technical support, financial support, and materials or data. Authorship should also not be influenced by the following:

* the position or profession of an individual, such as their role as the author’s supervisor or head of department (“gift authorship”);
* whether the contribution was paid for or voluntary; nor
* the status of an individual who has not made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution but would elevate the esteem of the research (“guest authorship”).

Furthermore, all researchers that meet the conditions above in any given research should be awarded authorship. For example, it is unethical if the contribution of a junior researcher (e.g., postgraduate student, postdoc, volunteer etc.) is unrecognised even though they have participated in data generation, analyses, and writing/reviewing (“ghost authorship”).

A perceived grey area can arise if collaborators provide significant intellectual input in early discussions and in obtaining the data but are perhaps less involved in the analyses and writing of a paper (but may still contribute more time and expertise than other authors). In these cases, *Nuytsia* recommends that it is still important they are included as an author, as the research would not have been completed without them.

Provision of financial support, infrastructure, equipment etc. should be appropriately recognised through the acknowledgements.

**ORCID**

Authors may also provide their unique ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID)4 number, which will be included in the author address section of the paper.

**Acknowledgments**

It is expected that any contributors that do not meet the criteria for authorship should be included in the Acknowledgments section. It is also understood that those being acknowledged in this manner will have given their consent. Acknowledgement of the Traditional Owners of the country where the research was conducted or compiled is also welcomed.

**Nagoya compliance and collecting permits**

The Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing was adopted in 2010 and came into force on 12 October 2014. While Australia is yet to formally ratify the protocol, current legislations are coming into alignment to ensure compliance5. One outcome of this is that all herbarium specimens collected after 12 October 2014 must have been collected under an appropriate collection licence, in accordance with most state’s legislation. As such, we encourage all authors to ensure specimens sited in their paper are collected under legal permits.

**Use of indigenous words**

*Nuytsia* encourages the respectful use of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledge and language, for example in constructing epithets to name novel taxa. However, this should only be done in close consultation and involvement with the relevant communities from which these names are derived and who are also acknowledged.

**Management of submissions**

Manuscripts submitted to *Nuytsia* undergo a peer review process and are treated in a confidential manner. Each paper is handled by an Editor who will decide to accept or reject the submission based on the review and their own assessment. A paper can also be rejected prior to the review process if it has been deemed to not meet minimal standards or the scope of the journal. An Editor may confer with the Managing Editor or other members of the Editorial committee to seek advice if necessary. Editors, like the Authors, must declare any conflict of interest in relation to a submission (e.g., previous differences with the authors or research conflicts) and the submission may be reassigned to a new handling Editor.

Authors may also request that their manuscript not to be sent to a specific reviewer(s) if they believe their submission will not be treated without bias. We are not required to follow the author’s suggestions but will take the information under advisement. Editors are also encouraged to ensure manuscript reviews are fair, constructive, and the reviewer’s comments are worded appropriately such that they do not contain unprofessional langue or personal criticisms. Editors may request a reviewer to address any issues or may “soften” the language directly if deemed inappropriate.

The Editor’s decision on a manuscript should be considered as final; however, if the author believes the manuscript has not been dealt with appropriately or does not warrant rejection (and can provide sound justification) then they can appeal the decision. This can be addressed to the Managing Editor (nuytsia@dbca.wa.gov.au).

**Further information**

For a more in-depth discussion on Ethical Authorship see: K.A. Shepherd (2022). *Australasian Systematic Botany Society Newsletter* 191: 25–29 https://asbs.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/22-jun-191.pdf
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