Co-Creating Asset and Place-Based Approaches

to Tackling Refugee and Migrant Health Exclusion

(short Project title: MigRefHealth)

Authorship Protocol for Publications

Governing Academic and Academic–Community

Collaborative Writing

November 2025

Authors: Margaret Greenfields, Eglė Dagilytė

Contents

1. Purpose and Shared Values

Purpose: This Protocol is based upon best practice recommendations and dispute resolution procedures prepared by the United Kingdom Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) and widely recognised and used tools for recording contributions to outputs (Elsevier CRediT[1]). The Protocol sets out equitable, transparent and best practice aligned approaches to authorship, acknowledgements of contribution to research and dissemination to be used in the Project. The Protocol is framed to take account of collaborations between academics and community partners.

Shared Values: principles of co-creation and equity are core to design and development of the Project's outputs:

- **Lived experience is expertise, and Project community partners are equal contributors.** Where possible, all publications should include at least one community partner. When planning Project publications, community partners and advisory board members with relevant experience and expertise should be invited to contribute as full authors.
- **Transparency.** When planning and producing Project outputs it is important to clarify the aims, outputs, uses, and data flows. Funders will be acknowledged as per contractual and ethical obligations in all outputs.
- **Equality of opportunity to contribute to outputs.** It is fundamental to principles of equity that all partners and collaborators (and advisory board members where specific expertise relevant to a specific output exists), have the opportunity to co-author and engage in the delivery of published outputs. As such, when an opportunity to submit a publication, blog or other output (beyond core contractual deliverables allocated to particular work package teams) is identified, information will be disseminated to the whole MigRefHealth team with an invitation for members to submit a statement of interest in participating.
- It will be made clear to potential contributors what is required of them to be a co-author (see section 3 below). The lead/coordinating author will explore the contribution proposed and ensure

---

[1] Elsevier (n.d.). *CRediT Author Statement*. Elsevier Author Hub, available at:
https://www.elsevier.com/researcher/author/policies-and-guidelines/credit-author-statement

that it is aligned to the experience and needs of the authorial team (for example, practicalities which may pertain over numbers of authors).

- It is important to ensure that not only 'experienced' or 'academic' authors contribute to outputs. Where it is not possible for an interested potential author to substantively participate in delivery of a particular output, they will be invited (as a priority) to take a more substantive role in delivery of future outputs which are aligned to their interest and experience.

- All contributions from authors will be measured and recorded as detailed below in the authorial agreement (Per Section 3 below).

- **Accessibility.** Plain-language drafts and inclusive document and media formats should be produced wherever possible and shared for review by community partners, participants (as appropriate) and disseminated appropriately. For example, policy briefs will by necessity use professional language and be targeted at separate audiences, as opposed to community-facing outputs which will summarise key findings in an accessible manner; whilst academic papers and outputs will be aimed at specified audiences and aligned to the requirements of individual subject disciplines or journals.

- A variety of publication formats are to be considered and delivered where possible, to ensure accessibility and Project output sharing with wide and diverse audiences. This could include, for example, outputs in community languages, providing translated materials, use of infographics or recorded vlogs as appropriate.

- **Duration of this Protocol.** This protocol primarily concerns outputs arising during the lifespan of the project and in the three years following completion of the study (until March 2030), during which time it is expected that collaborative writing of academic articles and other outputs may still occur. During this time-span decisions pertaining to authorship and opportunities to collaborate in publications should be aligned to this protocol.

- However, should any team member subsequently (eg some years after the completion of this project when collaborative team writing is likely to occur less frequently) writing as a sole author or in collaboration with others who may be external to the MigRefHealth team, anticipate reusing data, or making use of findings or theoretical innovations emerging from the MigRefHealth study for academic publications; it is crucial that they acknowledge both funding provided by UKRI and the work of the fuller MigRefHealth team in generating data and prior interpretation of findings.

- Further, good practice would require notifying the (former) PI or senior academic colleague from the institution of which they were a member of the locality based research team (LBRT) when the data was generated, that such a solo author (or member of a group of authors) have sought to re-

use data or findings in subsequent outputs; and to provide an opportunity for the (former) PI or such colleagues from the MigRefHealth LBRT to who they were formerly aligned, to comment on how they have used or re-interpreted the findings, in case these vary significantly from collaboratively agreed and approved outputs emerging from the MigRefHealth study.

2. Author Roles and Responsibilities

- **Early agreement**: The authorial team should define roles at an early stage and record these in the agreement for each Project output (see template at Appendix B). Elements to be recorded in the output agreement include: the name of lead author, section leads, data analysis, quality control, reviewers etc. and decision pathways (consensus/majority + mediation as required). See Appendix B for proposals on rotating lead authorship and factors to be considered when deciding alphabetical authorship or attribution.
- **Flexibility**: Roles may evolve; and as such it is important to log such changes (see template at Appendix C) with dates and rationale for such amendments.
- **Ethics & safeguarding**: Team reviews of evolving outputs and independent review prior to submission are likely to flag up concerns over confidentiality which may be missed by the authorial team or a sole/lead author, not least as separate ethical agreement has been reached within each University team in addition to overall ethical approval obtained by ARU for the entire project. For these reasons, it is important to revert to ethics approvals - as originally granted - and to identify the limits and concerns which pertain around confidentiality; and where required to agree redaction protocols and risk mitigation processes.

3. Authorship Criteria: Significant Contributions and Accountability (aligned to UKRIO best practice)

Authorship in Project outputs will reflect significant contributions and accountability. The below summary adapts **ICMJE criteria and the CRediT taxonomy** for social policy/collaborative community research contexts. All contributions should be recorded in the Contribution Recording Table file (see Appendix C).

The minimum criteria to be attributed as an author (with precise extent of contribution to a specific output impacting on authorial order) requires that the individual should fulfil the criteria A **or** B, **plus** C **and** D:

A. Substantial contribution to conception/design; OR data acquisition; OR analysis/interpretation.

B. Substantial contribution to cultural/experiential interpretation, community engagement design, or policy translation.

C. Drafting the work or contributing to reviewing and revising and providing critical input for important intellectual content and community engagement practice.

D. Final approval of the version to be published and agreement to be accountable for own contribution.

In addition to the agreement completed by the authorial team - which may refer to authorial order/alphabetical authorship etc (see Appendix B) to enable formal attribution of authorship - **mapping each contributor to CRediT roles** will be undertaken as per the table below:[2]

CRediT Role	Role Definition
Conceptualization	Ideas; formulation or evolution of overarching research goals and aims
Methodology	Development or design of methodology; creation of models
Software	Programming, software development; designing computer programs; implementation of the computer code and supporting algorithms; testing of existing code components
Validation	Verification, whether as a part of the activity or separate, of the overall replication/ reproducibility of results/experiments and other research outputs
Formal analysis	Application of statistical, mathematical, computational, or other formal techniques to analyse or synthesise study data

---

[2] Reproduced from Brand, A., Allen, L., Altman, M., Hlava, M. and Scott, J. (2015). Beyond Authorship: Attribution, Contribution, Collaboration, and Credit. Learned Publishing, 28: 151-155. https://doi.org/10.1087/20150211

CRediT Role	Role Definition
Investigation	Conducting a research and investigation process, specifically performing the experiments, or data/evidence collection
Resources	Provision of study materials, reagents, materials, patients, laboratory samples, animals, instrumentation, computing resources, or other analysis tools
Data Curation	Management activities to annotate (produce metadata), scrub data and maintain research data (including software code, where it is necessary for interpreting the data itself) for initial use and later reuse
Writing - Original Draft	Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically writing the initial draft (including substantive translation)
Writing - Review & Editing	Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work by those from the original research group, specifically critical review, commentary or revision – including pre-or post-publication stages
Visualisation	Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically visualisation/ data presentation
Supervision	Oversight and leadership responsibility for the research activity planning and execution, including mentorship external to the core team
Project administration	Academic management and coordination responsibility for the overall research activity planning and execution
Funding acquisition	Acquisition of the financial support for the project leading to this publication

4. Contributions & Acknowledgements

In line with Appendix C, recognition as a contributor & acknowledgement for input to the project will follow the following principles:

a) The **CRediT statements** of contribution should be identified within the manuscript (post review/following un-anonymisation)

b) **ORCID IDs** should be included where these exist to enable linkage to academic outputs;

c) **Enabling equity**. Account should be taken of the necessity of enabling 'rotation' of lead authorship; the principle of encouraging community partners to act as lead (or first authors); and that some academics may, as a result of their roles or personal responsibilities, have less dedicated time for writing in their contracts than other academic colleagues or collaborators. It is crucial that such contributors are not disadvantaged, particularly given the necessity for academics to produce publications, and in such circumstances alphabetical authorship should be considered (and stated as such) in submissions to achieve equity. All authors must however have contributed substantively as required under the CRediT taxonomy, and such (exceptional) variation as may be agreed in the main protocol e.g. where unexpected severe illness or bereavement or other event impacts on contribution to the full extent anticipated, when agreement was reached to co-author a publication.

d) **Acknowledgement**: In each output, it is important to explicitly acknowledge advisory, facilitation, translation, outreach, logistics, and technical support delivered by team members, regardless of whether they are formal authors or not.

e) **Wider Project work and funding acknowledgements**: To include details of funders (UKRI/AHRC/Mobilising Community Assets to Tackle Health Inequalities); identify the overall project, and record that the output arises as part of the programme of work which includes multiple contributors working across diverse field sites. Information adequate to enable the project to be identified (e.g. flagging the #MigRefHealth website and/or including as possible the Project Manager's email so that further information can be provided on research collaborators) and hence acknowledgement that the publication has arisen as a result of activities undertaken within the project which depends on the full project team to operationalise a suite of activities, should be incorporated. Where an output/publication deals only with findings from a single or small group of field sites (e.g. London; East of England) this should be specified in the Acknowledgments, and also that teams are working across other sites, gathering similar data.

f) **Gift or Ghost authorship must not occur**. However, where a substantial contribution to the publication has been made by a collaborator who for substantive reasons beyond their control (e.g. significant ill-health or bereavement during the latter phase of the writing and publication process) cannot fully contribute to elements C and D of the process as greatly as initially intended, consideration should be given by the remaining authors to ensuring that they are acknowledged as an author. Where named authorship is declined, this should be fully

documented, and in the case of dispute, the UKRIO Model Authorship Dispute Procedure process should be followed to seek resolution (see further below and Appendix D).

5. Writing Process, Version and Quality Control

- The **lead author** should take responsibility for ensuring that smooth collaborative writing processes occur.
- **Collaborative platforms**, such as SharePoint or shared Teams folders, should ideally be used to facilitate ease of co-writing, unless the team agree to share 'word' documents by email. Where **email sharing** occurs, document versions should be clearly dated and identified by version number. Where information which might potentially identify a participant (for example if a side-bar editorial note provides a code number, name or recognisable data for co-authors to check information) then it is crucial that document sharing only occurs via pre-approved methods aligned to GDPR and ethics approvals.
- Aligned to Appendix B (authorial agreement) each output agreed for development should, prior to writing, require the lead author to draft a brief guidance note which summarises named section leads and deadlines for completion; an outline of the approach to be taken; aim of the output, and what is expected to be included within each section, along with an indicative length of each segment of the publication, and overall submission length including references.
- It is important for **version control** to maintain an accessible change-log of decisions pertaining to amendments/alterations and variability – e.g. if a sudden policy change requires amendments to timeline or content, or authorial responsibilities are amended, etc.
- An **iterative review** of drafts should be undertaken by all authors. Where an output will not automatically be subject to external peer review (e.g policy briefs, outputs which are not submitted to academic journals), at least two other individuals who are not members of the authorial team should review the output to ensure **quality control**. Such pre-publication reviews will ideally ensure input is received from a community partner and/or an independent reader before the output is formatted for submission. Agreed timelines should incorporate appropriate and timely feedback cycles.
- Where **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** tools are used in any way to support the development of an output it is the responsibility of the team to check for accuracy and (see further below, Section 8) to acknowledge use of such tools.

6. Ethical and Data Considerations

- **Consent and confidentiality** must be respected and aligned to ethics approvals as granted. Plain-language consent must have been secured from contributors for publication of materials gathered/images etc. Anonymisation options will have been incorporated in ethics approvals as granted by university research ethic panels, but also must be considered on an output-by-output basis depending on circumstances which pertain in field-sites/across localities and dependant on the output (e.g. being included in photographic images create a greater risk for participants than do anonymized quotes).
- **Data governance**: All storage, sharing, and access to data or materials must be aligned to funder/institution policies. It is crucial to ensure community control of sensitive narratives and take account of current political or policy concerns which may require redaction of certain elements of a planned output.

7. Attribution, Authorial Ordering and Recognition of contributions

- For each of the Project's outputs, agreement will be made on determination of authorial order **either by extent of contribution or by alphabetical order with contribution statement**. This will align to the agreement of contributing authors prior to production of outputs.
- In line with the **authorial agreement** – see Appendix B – first/last/corresponding roles of the authorial team will be explained clearly to all contributors, along with the implications of such placement. It is crucial such authorial agreements recognise **non-text outputs** (policy briefs, workshops, podcasts; audiovisual and training materials; interactive maps etc) and appropriately credit community partners and technical leads across all formats.

8. Use of Artificial Intelligence in the preparation of outputs

- Whilst the use of **AI** is discouraged within the MigRefHealth team, where it has been used to support the preparation of an output it is crucial that this is **acknowledged** both within the authorial team and when a submission is made for review and publication.
- It is the responsibility of the entire authorial team to ensure that AI supported outputs (where this methodology is utilised) reflects the state of literature, policy or legal context; does not

incorporate 'hallucinations'[3] and **provides an accurate and appropriate summary or analysis of data gathered within the project**.

- It is crucial to be specific about the Role of AI in preparing the output: e.g whether AI was used for summarising literature, language editing, generating diagrams, figures and charts, or drafting text.

- Many **journals** (e.g., Elsevier, Springer, Taylor & Francis) have **specific policies on AI use**. Some require explicit statements in the Methods or Acknowledgements section of the use of AI. In such circumstances the authors of an output should check journal Guidelines and ensure that they formally acknowledge use of AI in the format required.

9. Dispute Prevention and Resolution

- For transparency, it is important to **keep written records** of discussions, decisions, and outcomes both through a process log and completion of the contribution record (see Appendix C).

- A pre-agreed pathway on **dispute resolution** is included in the authorial agreement template (addended as Appendix B). This is as follows: informal discussion → mediation by neutral party → institutional research integrity route. This three-step process dispute resolution is aligned to the UKRIO Model Authorship Dispute Procedure (at Appendix D).

10. Dissemination and Impact

- **Dual dissemination routes** should always be sought: both via academic (journals etc) and community formats (briefings, infographics, meetings; practice-based outlets; blogs etc).

- **Accessibility of publications**. As per the REF[4] requirements (crucial for academic partners) there should be a preference for open access of outputs, subject to specific safety concerns which may arise, for example, those identifying community assets in some settings. Open Access may also be impacted by the available Project budget for Article Processing Charges. Alternatively

---

[3] AI hallucination is a phenomenon where, in a large language model (LLM) often a generative AI chatbot or computer vision tool, perceives patterns or objects that are non-existent or imperceptible to human observers, creating outputs that are nonsensical or altogether inaccurate (https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/ai-hallucinations)

[4] REF2029 (2025). *Guidance: Section 5 - Open Access Policy*, available at: https://2029.ref.ac.uk/guidance/ref-2029-open-access-policy/

the option for 'no-fee' Open Access should be used where possible. It is necessary to deposit all accepted manuscripts in institutional repositories.

- Agreement should be reached with partners as to the public accessibility of **certain (sensitive) outputs**, with expert community advice sought as necessary.

11. Documents Consulted and Further Guidance

UKRIO

UK Research Integrity Office. (2025). *The authorship integrity toolkit*. UKRIO.

UK Research Integrity Office. (2025, September 17). *Good authorship practice* (Guidance note version 1.0). UKRIO.

UK Research Integrity Office. (2023, January; revised 2025, April). *Introductory guide to the Concordat to support research integrity*. UKRIO.

UK Research Integrity Office & UK Reproducibility Network. (2025, April 4). *Statement on the 2025 refreshed Concordat*. UKRIO.

UK Research and Innovation. (2024). *Policy and guidelines on the governance of good research conduct*. UKRI.

Other widely used guidance

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2022). *Recommendations: Defining the role of authors and contributors*. ICMJE.

CASRAI/NISO. (n.d.). *Contributor Roles Taxonomy (CRediT)*. Elsevier. (n.d.). *CRediT Author Statement*. Elsevier Author Hub.

BMJ Publishing Group. (n.d.). *Authorship and Contributorship Policy*. BMJ Author Hub.

REF2029 (2025). *Guidance: Section 5 - Open Access Policy*

12. Alignment to UKRI/UKRIO & Concordat

This Protocol aligns with the UKRI governance of good research practice and the Concordat to Support Research Integrity (2019; updated in 2025).

It incorporates guidance from the UKRIO Authorship Integrity Toolkit: good authorship practice, dispute procedure, authorship strategy agreements.

It encourages use of CRediT taxonomy and ICMJE criteria interpreted for interdisciplinary/community contexts.

13. Practical Tools/Appendices

See Appendix A, Appendix B, Appendix C and Appendix D below.

Appendix A: MigRefHealth Funder-Agreed Outputs (Contracted Deliverables)

Outputs required as detailed in the submitted proposal/funding awarded or by subsequent inter-team agreement:

WP1: Governance and Framework Development

Output: Accessible publication on use of models of co-production for public governance of projects supporting place-based health initiatives

Output: [agreed subsequently to contract being awarded]: Authorial Protocol

WP2 : The Social Ecology of Community Assets

Output 1: Report on audit and synthesis of literature, data and community assets

Output 2: Version 1 of a digital counter-cartography living community asset map on project website

WP3:   Mobilising Community Voices

Output 1: Version 2 of 'digital' counter-cartography community asset map for each locality

Output 2: Collation of community created exhibition materials for locality based dissemination events

Output 3: Written report of methodological issues + findings from WPs 2/3

Output 4: Journal articles on methodologies/co-production and utilisation of models of co-creation of public governance in context of social determinants of health (SDOH)

WP4: Place-based models: Embedding system change and building capacity within institutions.

Report on/production of models collaboratively identified in field-site locations to assess for transferability. Capture of impact

Appendix B: MigRefHealth Template Authorship Strategy Agreement

For each Project output, the MigRefHealth Authorship Agreement will include:

- Project title, outputs, target audiences
- Contributors and CRediT roles
- Authorship criteria and order policy
- Review timetable
- Consent and confidentiality provisions
- Dispute resolution steps
- Signatures and dates

<mark>**Exemplar Authorship Agreement - for completion by authorial team of each planned output**</mark>

Project Title	**Co-creating asset and place-based approaches to tackling refugee and migrant health exclusion (short title: MigRefHealth)**
Target Output	*List the output(s) as detailed within the contracted deliverables for Work Packages 1-4 contained within the project plan (see appendix A) and any additional publications proposed by members of the research team and agreed as appropriate by the Academic/Project Driving Leadership Group).* *These can include non-text outputs (policy briefs, workshops, podcasts; audiovisual and training materials; interactive maps etc) and appropriately credit community partners and technical leads across all formats.*
Target Audiences	*Please specify the audience, depending on output (see Appendix A – e.g. accessible 'good practice' guidance on governance; academic journal articles; policy briefs; practitioner publications; media articles for The Conversation etc)*
Contributors and Roles of Authors	Each Author/Contributor role will be documented in the Contribution Recording Table (see Appendix C), using CRediT taxonomy. When submitting this output, the following information will be detailed to the publisher/journal: Name; Affiliation; ORCID; Roles; Tasks undertaken.

Authorship Criteria and Order	We confirm that each Author/Contributor publishing this output meets the minimum Project criteria to be attributed as an author, fulfilling the criteria A **or** B, **plus** C **and** D:
	A. Substantial contribution to conception/design; OR data acquisition; OR analysis/interpretation.
	B. Substantial contribution to cultural/experiential interpretation, community engagement design, or policy translation.
	C. Drafting the work or contributing to reviewing and revising and providing critical input for important intellectual content and community engagement practice.
	D. Final approval of the version to be published and agreement to be accountable for own contribution.
	The authorship order will be determined based on …
	Explain how author order will be determined, e.g., contribution-based or alphabetically if equal contributions apply. Explain first/last/corresponding roles of the authorial team, along with the implications of such placement.
	Single author academic papers and publications must be agreed and approved in advance and justification logged for why (in rare occasions) single authorship may be considered appropriate given the extent of collective engagement with the programme of work and shared intellectual copyright.
	Enabling equity. Account should be taken of the necessity of enabling 'rotation' of lead authorship; the principle of encouraging community partners to act as lead (or first authors); and that some academics may as a result of their roles or personal responsibilities have less dedicated time for writing in their contracts than other academic colleagues or collaborators. It is crucial that such contributors are not disadvantaged, particularly given the necessity for academics to produce publications, and in such circumstances alphabetical authorship should be considered (and stated as such) in submissions to achieve equity. All authors must however have contributed substantively as required under the CRediT taxonomy, and such (exceptional) variation as may be agreed in the main protocol e.g. where unexpected severe illness or bereavement or

	other event impacts on contribution to the full extent anticipated, when agreement was reached to co-author a publication.
Acknowledgements	This publication will acknowledge the funding provided by UKRI/AHRC, and specifically the Mobilising Community Assets to Tackle Health Inequalities thematic programme.
	A standard form of wording will be made available to authorial teams in relation to acknowledging both the funders and alignment to the NIHR ARC.
	The overall project (MigRefHealth) will be named and acknowledged as generating the research underpinning the publication/output.
	This publication will explicitly acknowledge advisory, facilitation, translation, outreach, logistics, and technical support delivered by team members, regardless of whether they are formal authors or not. *The author(s) when making a submission/within publications/outputs must indicate that there is a wider team participating in the overall research and indicate where information can be found which identifies the entire research team engaged in the study, even where such team members are not authors of the publication/output in question.*
	Where AI has been used to support the development of the output this will be explicitly identified.
Review Timetable	Reviews of drafts of the publication shall be undertaken in a timely manner, and where an output will not automatically be subjected to peer review, the timeline must incorporate external review by an appropriately knowledgeable individual who is outside of the authorial team.
	Contributions to the review and revision process will be governed by the requirements of the editorial board/journal (for academic publications) or as necessary to meet timelines specified within the initial funding application for contracted deliverables outlined in Appendix A.
	Insert Review Timetable as per journal/publisher requirements.

Research Ethics, Consent and Confidentiality	The authors confirm that, for the purpose of this output, all ethical approval conditions specified for this Project will be adhered to. *All ethical processes and regulations agreed at the outset of the project and GDPR regulations will be adhered to in relation to all outputs arising from #MigRefHealth. Whilst overarching ethical approval has been obtained by ARU University, additional local ethical requirements may also pertain depending on data gathered in individual fieldsites by locality-based research teams (LBRTs).*
Dispute Resolution	Where agreement cannot be reached as to authorial contribution, or where any dispute in relation to authorship arises, the authors will rely upon the UKRIO model guidance - as detailed in the MigRefHealth Project's Authorship Protocol for Publications, included as Appendix D - and agree to be bound by the decisions reached through that procedure.

Signatures and Dates:

Lead Author: _____ Date: _____

2nd contributing authors (community partner/academic): _____ Date: _____

3rd contributing authors (community partner/academic): _____ Date: _____

4th contributing authors (community partner/academic): _____ Date: _____

Add additional authors as required

Appendix C: MigRefHealth Contribution Recording Table (Excel Document)

All Project outputs, authorships and contributions will be recorded in a shared Excel document, located on the Project Teams channel, securely managed by Anglia Ruskin University.

The data to be included on this Excel document and its timely completion by the authors will be shared with the Project Manager at an early stage to enable them to ensure that the process is completed as required.

The Excel document has the following headings, to comply with the Values and Principles outlined in this Protocol:

- Project Output
- Author Name
- Affiliation
- ORCID
- CRediT roles
- Tasks
- Dates
- Evidence
- Authorship Yes/No
- Acknowledgement text

Appendix D: MigRefHealth Authorship Dispute Procedure Guidance

The authorship dispute procedure and resolution

The MigRefHealth Project authorship dispute procedure follows the UKRIO Model Authorship Dispute Procedure Guidance, version No.1, published on 17/09/2025, DOI: https://doi.org/10.37672/UKRIO.2025.08.modelauthorshipdisputeprocedure

Definitions such as the 'Organiser'; 'Impartial Party' etc incorporated into the agreement below are included in the above document.

The authorship dispute procedure consists of the following steps:

Step 1: Informal discussions – Resolution will be achieved by informally discussing the situation and coming to an agreement, using a human-centred approach grounded in empathy, emotional intelligence and collegiality, while considering and protecting the well-being of all those involved and preserving working relationships. The 'Organiser' of the informal discussion (typically the first author or others concerned about authorship) will arrange for a collegiate meeting to attempt to resolve disputes or concerns informally. A note will be taken of the discussions held; agreements reached and will be approved by all parties to the meeting.

If there is a 'Research Contributor' or 'Organiser' who feels intimidated, vulnerable, lacks confidence to convey their concerns or perceives a power imbalance, it may be advisable to invite an 'Impartial Party' (e.g., a trusted colleague) to support and accompany them to any meeting(s). Ideally, the Impartial Party should be respected and trusted by all parties, and their inclusion in the meeting mutually agreed.

Any agreement must be grounded in the principles of research integrity, with a focus on honesty, transparency, care, respect and accountability in support of equitable and fair authorship practices.

Step 2: Informal discussions with assistance – Resolution to be achieved by informally discussing the situation with the help of an individual ('the Responsible Person') who can act as an impartial 'Mediator' to facilitate an agreement.

If there is a 'Research Contributor' or 'Organiser' who feels intimidated, vulnerable, lacks confidence to convey their concerns or perceives a power imbalance, it may be advisable to invite an 'Impartial Party' (e.g., a trusted colleague) to support and accompany them to any meeting(s). Ideally, the Impartial Party should be respected and trusted by all parties, and their inclusion in the meeting mutually agreed.

Any agreement must be grounded in the [principles of research integrity](#), with a focus on honesty, transparency, care, respect and accountability in support of equitable and fair authorship practices.

Step 3: Formal authorship dispute investigation and adjudication – Where Steps 1 and 2 do not result in a satisfactory outcome or are not deemed suitable, a formal process is followed, and an adjudicator will be appointed by the 'Responsible Person'. Typically this will be a senior academic external to the team will be asked to make a decision on behalf of the research contributor(s) to settle the disagreement.

Cross-organisational scenarios

The MigRefHealth Project is delivered between three collaborating Universities - Anglia Ruskin University, Middlesex University and the University of Greenwich - and Project Partners: Great Yarmouth Refugee & Outreach Support (GYROS), Barnet Citizens, MigrationWork, Local Government East (LGA), Cambridge Refugee Resettlement Campaign (CRRC), Lewisham Refugee and Migrant Network (LRMN), Greenwich Citizens, Queen's Nursing Institute (QNI). Collectively, these are referred to as '**organisations**' in Annex D.

If all the authors involved in the dispute are located at the same organisation, the Organiser should contact the Responsible Person.

If the lead author (also known as corresponding, executive or responsible author) is located at a Project collaborating organisation, that organisation will have lead responsibility for formally investigating and adjudicating the dispute. They should keep the other collaborating institutions informed of the progress of the investigation. This arrangement will be mutually agreed on in advance, and it will be clearly established in writing that the organisation has the authority and oversight to resolve the dispute.

All parties involved will commit to accepting the outcome of the investigation.

The Responsible Person will be informed of these arrangements and notified of the outcome of the collaborating organisation's investigation via email. They may also serve as a liaison for authors within their home organisation.

Questions

If any questions arise during authorship disputes, all relevant parties will consult and follow the UKRIO Model Authorship Dispute Procedure Guidance, version No.1, published on 17/09/2025, DOI:

https://doi.org/10.37672/UKRIO.2025.08.modelauthorshipdisputeprocedure