

Authorship, Publication, Peer Review Case Study Reaction Paper

Dr. Marcus initially requested Rosaline make only a few changes to her manuscript. However, upon Rosaline showing her a revised version Dr. Marcus has asked for multiple changes, including a substantial reduction in length. Rosaline feels she should not have to make so many changes, and has asked another student, Judith, for advice. Rosaline is unsure whether this is simply differences in taste or issues with conducting ethical and responsible research.

The latter is true, although the exact issues depend on the context. If there was prior agreement that this manuscript would be sole-authored by Rosaline, then Dr. Marcus is acting unethically by requesting substantial changes to a manuscript she has no authorship role in. However, it seems more likely there was no prior discussion on authorship, a failure to maintain a responsible mentor/mentee relationship. In either situation, Dr. Marcus's sudden request for substantial changes is not constructive and does not follow responsible peer review practices. Finally, Rosaline is in danger of not responsibly following journal author guidelines on length.

Rosaline could have prevented these issues by ensuring Dr. Marcus and herself had a full understanding of their expected authorship roles prior to beginning their research relationship. Judith also should not have given advice unless she fully understood the context. At this stage, Rosaline needs to agree with Dr. Marcus what their authorship roles on this manuscript will be. If Dr. Marcus expects to be listed, then she needs to contribute more constructively and responsibly to the article's drafting and completion, as per the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors recommendations. If the manuscript will be sole-authored by Rosaline, then Dr. Marcus cannot expect Rosaline to implement all of the suggested changes. Rosaline should shorten the article some, however, to ensure she meets the journal's length requirements.