

Commentary

Honorary Authorship in Biomedical Journals: The Endless Story

Mohamed Kandil^{1,2}

1. Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Suez University, Suez, Egypt; 2. Faculty of Medicine, Menoufia University, Egypt

Honorary authorship is when a scientist has been listed as a co-author without significant contribution to the manuscript. Although unethical, honorary authorship is on the rise. The motive behind it is different for scientists at different stages of their careers. It helps juniors to get more publications and thereby have faster promotions and probably better employment opportunities. For scientists more advanced in their careers, it helps in gaining more scientific recognition and possible financial gains. Honorary authorship is not without disadvantages. It is probably held responsible for the overinflation in the number of authors per article in different publications. On an individual level, it dilutes the contribution of each author and may ruin the reputation of an honorary author if the data integrity is found questionable after publication.

Correspondence: papers@team.qeios.com — Qeios will forward to the authors

Several studies have shown that the average production of publications grows exponentially with age, reaches a peak probably at mid-career, and then declines until retirement ^{[1][2]}. The average production of publications per author per year in the biomedical field is less than one, and the production rate differs according to gender. Men have a higher publication rate than their female counterparts. A male researcher within medicine publishes 0.63 articles per year ^[3].

In order to increase an individual's number of publications, honorary or gift authorship is becoming a common practice in medical literature. Honorary authorship is when a scientist has been listed as a co-author without significant contribution to the manuscript. In 1994, Shapiro *et al.* ^[4] surveyed authors of 184 research articles and found a rate of approximately 26% of honorary authorships. Wislar *et al.* in 2011 found evidence of honorary authorship in 25% of original research reports, 15% of review articles, and 11.2% of editorials published in six major medical journals in 2008 ^[5]. In 2014, Kennedy *et al.* ^[6] reported

that in the nursing literature, the prevalence of honorary authorship was 42%. This rising trend may indicate an aggressive progression of the phenomenon over a few years.

Honorary authorship can be held responsible, at least partially, for the overinflation in the number of authors per article in biomedical journals ^{[7][8]}. Articles with more than five listed authors are more likely to have “honorary authors” than those with three or fewer authors ^[9]. The average number of authors per paper has increased more than 5-fold in the last century, going from 1 author per paper in 1913 to 5.4 authors per paper in 2013. By fitting the data between 1913–2013 to a polynomial function analysis, it was predicted that papers written in 2034 will feature 8 authors on average ^[10] if the same policy for guiding authorship continues.

Many authors, whether in their early career, mid-career, or senior positions, seek honorary authorship. The motives for this type of practice differ between junior and senior researchers. Juniors may add each other’s names on their publications aiming at improving their chances of getting a promotion and career opportunities. They may add the name of a prominent scientist to boost the chances of getting their paper published ^[11]. The situation differs for more senior authors. Seniors, such as chairs of departments, may seek honorary authorship for more peer recognition and possible financial gains. Occasionally, honorary authors are added without their knowledge, a case in which the corresponding author should be subjected to legal and disciplinary

actions. To clarify how unethical this practice is, I would like to remind the scientific community of Professor Chamberlien, the president of the RCOG in the early 90s, who resigned from his academic, editorial, and presidential posts following his acceptance of honorary authorship ^[12] on a research paper written by one of his colleagues.

The disadvantages of honorary authorship are multiple and include:

1. It dilutes the contribution of each author.
2. It jeopardizes the reputation of an honorary author if the data accuracy and integrity are found questionable after publication.
3. An honorary eminent coauthor might increase the significance of poor research, thus altering clinical decision-making ^[13].
4. It falsely increases the H index and gives a false impression about the contributions of a particular author.

The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) established the following criteria for authorship in biomedical research:

1. Significant involvement in study conception/design, data collection, or data analysis/interpretation;
2. Involvement in drafting or revising the manuscript;
3. Approval of the final version of the manuscript for publication; and
4. Authors should be held responsible for the accuracy and integrity of all aspects of the research.

Anyone listed as an author should fulfill all the above criteria. Contribution to one criterion does not qualify for authorship ^[14].

Gift authorship can be considered as a subtype of honorary authorship or as a separate entity. One example is when one scholar provides a gift for another scholar, in the form of adding his name on a manuscript, in return for a previous favor. Another example is when two scientists agree to put their names on the authors' list of each other's work for mutual benefit ^[15].

To the contrary, ghost authorship is omitting naming someone who significantly contributed to a manuscript ^[16]. The victim is usually a junior researcher, and the most common cause for ghost authorship is to enhance the relative weight of each senior scholar in a particular manuscript at the expense of juniors. Every effort should be made to combat this unethical conduct ^[17].

To conclude, it is obvious that honorary authorship is on the rise, and probably this trend will continue in the coming years if the publishing policy continues. In order to put an end to this unethical story, I invite medical editors to adopt a simple standardized author contribution index to exactly identify the role of each listed author in collaboration with the most different institutes and responsible authorities to better assess authorship credentials in medical publications. Editors should critically review all submissions with too many authors, from authors with an unusually high number of publications, or with a skyrocketing H index to maintain the ethics of scientific research.

Statements and Declarations

Author Contributions

MK conceived the idea and was responsible for writing and revising the manuscript.

References

1. [△]Barjak F (2006). "Research productivity in the internet era." *Scientometrics*. **68**(3):343–360.
2. [△]Cole S (1979). "Age and scientific performance." *The American Journal of Sociology*. **84**(4):958–977.
3. [△]Rørstad K, Aksnes DW (2015). "Publication rate expressed by age, gender and academic position – A large –scale analysis of Norwegian academic staff." *Journal of Informetrics*. **9**(2):317–333.
4. [△]Shapiro DW, Wenger NS, Shapiro MF (1994). "The contributions of authors of multiauthored biomedical research papers." *JAMA*. **271**:438–442.
5. [△]Wislar JS, Flanagan A, Fontanarosa PB et al. (2011). "Honorary and ghost authorship in high impact biomedical journals: a cross sectional survey." *BMJ*. **343**:d6128.
6. [△]Kennedy MS, Barnsteiner J, Daly J (2014). "Honorary and ghost authorship in nursing publications." *J Nurs Scholarsh*. **46**:416–22.
7. [△]Borry P, Schotsmans P, Dierickx K (2006). "Author, contributor or just a signer? A quantitative analysis of authorship trends in the field of bioethics." *Bioethics*. **20**:213–20.
8. [△]Slone RM (1996). "Coauthors' contributions to major papers published in the AJR: frequency of undeserved coauthorship." *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. **167**:571–9.
9. [△]Weeks WB, Wallace AE, Kimberly BC (2004). "Changes in authorship patterns in prestigious US medical journals." *Soc Sci Med*. **59**:1949–54.
10. [△]Aboukhalil R. "The rising trend in authorship." *The Winnower*. <https://www.thewinnower.com/papers/the-rising-trend-in-authorship>. Last accessed Feb 1, 2021.
11. [△]Fong EA, Wilhite AW (2017). "Authorship and citation manipulation in academic research." *PLoS ONE*. **12**(12):e0187394. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0187394.
12. [△]https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geoffrey_Chamberlain. Last accessed Feb 1, 2021.
13. [△]O'Brien J, Baerlocher MO, Newton M, Gautam T, Noble J (2009). "Honorary Coauthorship: Does It Matter?" *Canadian Association of Radiologists Journal*. **60**:231–236.
14. [△]International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (2008). "Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals: writing and editing for biomedical publication." *ICMJE*. <http://www.icmje.org>. Accessed March 3, 2009.
15. [△]"The gift of paper authorship." *Nature Index*. <https://www.nature.com/nature-index/news-blog/gift-ghost-authorship-what-researchers-need-to-know>. Last accessed November 30, 2022.

16. [△]Wislar JS, Flanagan A, Fontanarosa PB, DeAngelis CD (2011). "Honorary and ghost authorship in high impact biomedical journals: a cross sectional survey." *BMJ*. **343**:d6128.
17. [△]Ali MJ, Jalilian A (2022). "Readership Awareness Series – Paper 1: Ghost Authorship." *Seminars in Ophthalmology*. doi:[10.1080/08820538.2022.2112852](https://doi.org/10.1080/08820538.2022.2112852).

Declarations

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.