

Dry Rivers Research Coordination Network Authorship Policies

These policies apply to papers, presentations, and other appropriate collaborative products resulting from activities supported by the Dry Rivers RCN. These policies were originally developed by Walter Dodds as part of his SCALER collaborative project, later modified by Jay Jones and Matt Whiles for their Stream Resiliency Research Coordination Network (SRRCN). The Dry Rivers RCN steering and advisory committee made some minor revisions to the SRRCN guidelines, which we present below.

Our overall authorship philosophy: *We strive to be inclusive of all project participants, to offer junior project members leadership roles on papers, and to freely share our data while protecting publication priority of individual RCN members.*

General guidelines:

1. As primary author be inclusive.
2. As a potential coauthor, honestly consider your contribution and only accept co-authorship if warranted (see authorship criteria detailed below).
3. Conceptual, review, or synthesis papers that are the result of progress towards overarching workshop goals, should offer authorship to all working group members, PIs, and instructors/mentors (if present).
4. Empirical or modeling papers that are the result of research questions developed during RCN activities should be as inclusive of fellow working group members as well as all PIs and instructors/mentors (if present).
5. Any individual or group from outside the working group that contributes data should be offered authorship.
6. Discuss authorship early, often, and openly when developing and working on projects. Plans for authorship should be clearly outlined for each project as soon as possible.
7. **Any paper, presentation, or other product that results from RCN activities should acknowledge the Dry Rivers RCN and include a statement similar to: "This manuscript is a product of the Dry Rivers Research Coordination Network, which was supported by funding from the US National Science Foundation (DEB-1754389)." If multiple funding sources are acknowledged, this one should be the first listed.**

More detailed guidelines:

Primary author: Be very inclusive in listing potential co-authors on the first draft of the manuscript or presentation abstract. Consider as potential coauthors anyone involved in the development of the conceptual foundation of the project, the study design, data collection and/or analysis, writing of the paper, as well as substantial guidance or

financial support. Then send the manuscript out for review by each potential coauthor. The inclusive list of potential authors should be guided by early, often, and open discussion. If publicly available data was used, we suggest contacting the author of that data to invite them as a co-author if appropriate. We suggest drafting a plan at the outset of the project and then sending an early outline of the paper with the preliminary results to confirm authorship. Individuals can opt in to authorship by adding their name to the cover sheet of the preliminary work if they choose. Primary authors are responsible for providing a draft of the manuscript to co-authors who are interested in reviewing it and providing a final version of the manuscript once it has been submitted.

If a co-author is employed by an institution that requires internal review prior to public dissemination of papers or conference abstracts, please be aware that this review may be needed and give your co-authors enough time to be able to arrange for the review. Finally, we encourage the use of collaborative documents such as google docs that make editing manuscripts as a group more effective.

Co-authors: Each potential co-author is expected to make substantial contributions to the manuscript (see criteria below). If you feel that someone else should be added to the author line that is not already on it, please send this information to the primary author ASAP. Potential co-authors should acknowledge receipt of the initial draft manuscript and note whether they wish to be included as an author within a reasonable period set by the primary author (e.g. 2-3 weeks). If they do not respond in this time frame, and the primary author has made a reasonable effort to contact them (e.g. follow-up e-mail(s) and/or calls/texts), then they will be omitted as an author so that the manuscript can proceed. Co-authors that are interested in reviewing the manuscript should make this known, along with a reasonable timeline for completing the review and returning any comments, when sending out the initial draft of the manuscript. If the manuscript has not been returned in the stated timeframe and after the primary author has made a reasonable effort to contact them (e.g. follow-up e-mail(s) and/or calls/texts), the primary author may decide to proceed without the feedback from the co-author.

Criteria for accepting authorship:

Working group members should **meet two or more of the following criteria** to fulfill the criteria for authorship:

- Significant intellectual contribution to the concept and hypotheses of the research
- Significant intellectual contribution to the design and presentation of the research and analyses
- Supervision regarding the organization and progress of the manuscript
- Provision of data, materials, or additional resources necessary for the project
- Responsibility for data collection, analysis, and presentation of results
- Substantial contribution in writing the manuscript (writing, figures, etc.)

- Critical and constructive review of manuscript drafts
- Significant contribution to the intellectual environment of the working group.
- All authors should be able to explain and defend the methods and results in the paper and should generally agree with them.

Therefore, one only accepts authorship when one feels like they've made a real contribution to the work, can defend the work, and perhaps most importantly, has (or will make) the time to be actively involved in the process of writing (may involve mostly critically reviewing) the paper.

Note: Individuals from outside of the working group that provide datasets critical to project analyses earn authorship based on those contributions alone. Additionally, individuals providing substantial financial, administrative, or analytical support should be considered for authorship on those merits.

Individuals accepting authorship should only do so if they are willing and able to commit the time necessary to be actively involved in the research process as outlined by the bulleted list above. We will use an opt-in model of authorship, where the authors approved the final version and document their contribution at the time of submission.

Authors must provide feedback and revisions in a timely manner. **All co-authors should see and approve a manuscript prior to submission, and submission, all coauthors should be sent a copy of the final manuscript and cover letter.** At decision time, the primary author should forward the decision and reviews to all coauthors. The primary author (or corresponding author, if they differ) is responsible for keeping all coauthors fully informed in regard to the progress of the manuscript.

Acknowledging additional funding sources:

NSF's RCN program is designed to provide funds for a network of researchers to collaborate, and individual members frequently have their own individual funding sources. If other funding sources were important in producing a manuscript they should be acknowledged. But we would like to limit individual funding sources acknowledged to the following cases: 1) if an RCN member was specifically supported during the paper by a particular grant, or 2) if the paper included unpublished research generated from another grant.

Data sharing outside project:

Some journals will require making data publicly available or open-access upon publication. Release of the data prior to 1 year after the project will require approval of all lead investigators involved in collection of those data. If data are to be shared outside the project before the deadline, all lead investigators in the labs that created those data need to agree before data are shared. Our goal is that all data will be made publicly available within 2 years of the end of the project or sooner, but as a

secondary research organization that does not produce our own data we are ultimately limited share data according to the terms of the data contributors. That being said, we are a staunch advocate for open science and open data as a vehicle to promote the advancement of science, and we encourage all data contributors to make their data open access.