

horship Change during the Revision Stage: *cienceGuardians* Guidelines for

Cite this protocol as: ScienceGuardians Guidelines for Authorship Change during the Revision Stage, New Author Inclusion, Review Paper, Implementation Process, Doc. No.: SG-Rev-24-02-02

©2024 ScienceGuardians (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) www.scienceguardians.com

Authorship Change during the Revision Stage: New Author Inclusion

Review Paper Post Peer-review & Upon Receiving an Editorial Decision

Decision-Making Process Doc. No.: SG-Rev-24-02-01

Inclusion of new author(s) is necessary and is classified as the best practice.

The Steps to the **Implementation Process** of Including New Author(s) During the Revision Process of a Review Article Without Exposing Authors to Ethical and Legal Misconducts.

Implementation Process Doc. No.: SG-Rev-24-02-02

Identification of potential collaborator(s) based on the additional disciplines/contents/analyses/resources required to address major revisions

The is no fixed rules about the number of new authors one can add but the inclusion must precisely align with the additional disciplines/contents/analyses/resources required to address the major revisions requested and should be well justifiable from the technical point of view, should and when it is deemed necessary, such as in the case of post-publication queries/investigations. This is of utmost importance as otherwise, it could expose the authors to ethical/legal liabilities.

Contacting the identified collaborator(s) for briefing and to obtain their consent in writing

All co-authors must unanimously agree with the potential inclusion of the identified new author(s) and provide the corresponding author(s) their consent in writing.

This is a delicate process and needs to be meticulously conducted through providing the invited new collaborator(s) with the following information to inform them of the details and to avoid unknowingly being exposed to Conflict of Interest (COI): i. Complete history of the project, including details of the literature survey, key findings from previous research, and the evolution of the research objectives.

ii. Full list of original authors and their affiliations, while the corresponding author(s) are clearly designated.

iii. Complete history of the article, including the date of submission and date of receiving the decision, name of the handling editor (& name of the reviewers in case of Open Review Systems).*

iv. Full list of editorial and reviewers` comments.

v. Expectations for inclusion in the project, including contributing to additional disciplines/contents/analyses/resources required to address the requested major revisions.

* This is of significant importance allowing the invited new author(s) to understand their potential COI with the original authors and/or the handling editor (reviewers in Open Review Systems) and to make informed decisions.

The new author(s) has/have been included in the project and the revised manuscript, and is classified as the best practice.

> **Submission Process** Doc. No.: SG-Rev-24-02-03

