

SEACO Authorship Policy

Ethical, equitable, and globally responsible authorship for SEACO research

Draft for consultation, May 2026

Preamble

The South East Asia Community Observatory (SEACO) is a health and demographic surveillance system (HDSS) based in Segamat, Johor, Malaysia, managed by the Global Population Health (GPH) department at Monash University Malaysia (MUM). Since 2011, SEACO has collected longitudinal data on approximately 40,000 individuals across five sub-districts, providing a research platform for focused studies on population health.

This authorship policy reflects SEACO's commitment to advancing ethical, equitable, and globally responsible research. It addresses systemic inequities in global health research -including extractive and parachute research practices -and promotes fair recognition of all contributions, with particular attention to the staff based in SEACO and the Segamat community whose participation makes SEACO's work possible.

The policy applies to all publications arising from SEACO data, infrastructure, and/or fieldwork, regardless of where the lead author or lead institution is based. The policy is a living document, subject to biennial review and revision as international standards evolve.

1. Alignment with international standards

This policy is informed by and aligned with:

- ICMJE - Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals (January 2025 update)
- COPE - Committee on Publication Ethics guidelines on authorship, contributorship, and AI tools
- CRediT - Contributor Roles Taxonomy (ANSI/NISO Z39.104-2022), the 14-role standard for describing contributions
- The Lancet Group - authorship, accountability, and equity standards, including the editorial position on parachute research
- IDRC - Canadian International Development Research Centre principles on equitable research partnerships
- Saleh et al. (2022) - consensus statement on author reflexivity statements for North–South research partnerships
- INDEPTH Network - ethical framework for health and demographic surveillance systems
- Using scientific authorship criteria as a tool for equitable inclusion in global health research
<https://gh.bmj.com/content/6/10/e007632>

Where SEACO-specific provisions exceed these standards, the higher standard applies.

2. Core principles

- Transparency -authorship decisions are documented, justified, and open to scrutiny at every stage of the research process
- Fairness -credit reflects actual intellectual contribution, not seniority, institutional affiliation, or funding status
- Accountability -all authors take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole and for the accuracy of their own contributions
- Equity -local and LMIC researchers are appropriately represented in authorship, including in prominent positions (first and last author)
- Community respect and recognition - the Segamat community's ongoing participation in SEACO is acknowledged as essential infrastructure, and community contributions are recognised through appropriate mechanisms
- Capacity strengthening -research processes are designed to develop future authors, particularly among junior researchers, field staff, and local collaborators
- Anti-extractivism - SEACO actively opposes parachute, parasitic, and extractive research practices, and this policy encodes structural protections against them

3. Applicability: three collaboration tiers

Not all SEACO research carries the same equity risks. A project led entirely by GPH colleagues faces different dynamics from one involving a visiting researcher from an overseas institution. This policy uses a tiered framework to ensure that provisions are proportionate to the collaboration context, while maintaining core standards across all work.

3a. Tier definitions

Tier 1 -Internal (GPH/SEACO-led, all MUM)

All investigators and contributors are employed by or affiliated with Monash University Malaysia, including GPH academic staff, SEACO staff, and MUM-enrolled postgraduate students. The primary equity focus at this tier is on career-stage and role-based inclusion: ensuring that junior researchers, field staff, and support staff are not sidelined by senior faculty, and that seniority or supervisory authority does not distort authorship decisions.

Tier 2 - Monash cross-campus

The research involves collaborators from other Monash campuses (Clayton, China, Indonesia, or Monash-affiliated institutes). While these are intra-university partnerships, they carry the potential for some of the same power asymmetries as external collaborations: the larger campus may have more resources, stronger publication incentives, or different expectations about authorship norms. The equity focus at this tier includes both the internal protections of Tier 1 and structural safeguards against the MUM/GPH team being relegated to a data-provider role.

Tier 2 collaborations require the collaboration MoU or project agreement to reference this policy explicitly.

Tier 3 - External (non-Monash)

The research involves investigators or institutions outside the Monash system — whether other Malaysian universities, international research organisations, or overseas institutions. This tier carries the potential for the highest risk of extractive or parachute research and triggers the full suite of equity protections. Where

the collaborating partner is overseas, Tier 3 collaborators must complete a reflexivity statement addressing power dynamics, benefit-sharing, and the risk of parachute research before data access is granted; all Tier 3 collaborators must formally acknowledge this policy.

How to classify a project: use the highest applicable tier. A project involving GPH staff, a Clayton co-investigator, and an external partner from a European university is Tier 3, not Tier 1 or 2.

3b. Provision applicability by tier

The following table summarises which provisions apply at each tier. “✓” indicates the provision applies in full; “Adapted” indicates a lighter-touch version applies (detailed in the relevant section).

Provision	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
Authorship criteria (s.4)	✓	✓	✓
Local authorship requirement (s.5a)	—	✓	✓
Visiting researcher obligations (s.5a)	—	—	✓
Author reflexivity statement (s.5b)	—	Adapted	✓
Internal equity review (s.5c)	✓	✓	✓
Community acknowledgment (s.6)	✓	✓	✓
AI disclosure (s.7)	✓	✓	✓
Field staff pathway (s.8)	✓	✓	✓
CRedit statement (s.9)	✓	✓	✓
Author order provisions (s.10)	✓	✓	✓
ORCID (s.11)	✓	✓	✓
Authorship agreement (s.12)	✓	✓	✓
Data sharing statement (s.13)	✓	✓	✓
Open access / APC equity (s.14)	Adapted	✓	✓
Policy reference in MoU (s.5a)	—	✓	✓
Data access agreement clause (App. D)	—	—	✓
Capacity strengthening (s.17)	✓	✓	✓

4. Authorship criteria [All tiers]

Consistent with ICMJE recommendations (2025), all individuals listed as authors must satisfy all four of the following criteria:

1. Substantial contribution to the conception or design of the work, or to the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data
2. Drafting the work or reviewing it critically for important intellectual content
3. Final approval of the version to be published
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work, ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part are appropriately investigated and resolved

All four criteria must be met. Meeting only one or two criteria (for example, providing data without contributing to interpretation or writing) does not qualify an individual for authorship. However, the policy on field staff recognition (section 8) establishes pathways for such contributors to become eligible.

These criteria must not be used as a gatekeeping mechanism to deny eligible contributors the opportunity to satisfy criteria 2, 3, or 4. At Tier 1 in particular, senior researchers must actively ensure that junior colleagues and field staff are offered the opportunity to participate in writing, review, and approval.

5. Equity, inclusion, and anti-extractivism

5a. Structural protections against parachute research [Tiers 2 and 3]

- Local authorship requirement -every publication using SEACO data or infrastructure must include at least one author with a primary affiliation at MUM or a SEACO field site. Publications based primarily on SEACO data should normally include a SEACO-affiliated researcher in a prominent authorship position (for example, first or last author). This provision applies to Tier 2 and Tier 3 collaborations. At Tier 1 it is inherently satisfied.
- Policy reference in collaboration agreements -all Tier 2 collaboration MoUs and project agreements must reference this authorship policy. At Tier 3, the data access agreement must incorporate the authorship clause in Appendix D, and external collaborators must formally acknowledge this policy before data access is granted.
- Visiting researcher obligations (Tier 3 only) -external researchers using SEACO infrastructure must demonstrate meaningful collaboration with SEACO staff at the design, analysis, and writing stages. Data extraction without local intellectual partnership is not permitted. A named SEACO liaison must be designated at the outset of every Tier 3 collaboration, with responsibility for monitoring that this obligation is met.
- Early and inclusive authorship planning -at all tiers, authorship discussions must begin at the study inception stage (not at manuscript preparation), and must include all potential contributors from the outset, regardless of career stage or institutional affiliation.

5b. Author reflexivity statement [Tier 3 mandatory; Tier 2 adapted]

Tier 3 (external collaborations): All manuscripts must include a structured author reflexivity statement, following the framework proposed by Saleh et al. (2022). This statement should address:

- How the research question was developed and by whom
- How authorship was determined and whether local researchers were involved from inception

- The composition of the author team (geography, career stage, gender, disciplinary background)
- Whether the research was designed to build local capacity
- How results will be shared with the study community

Where a journal publishes the statement, it should be included. Where it does not, the statement must still be prepared and filed with the project's authorship agreement.

Tier 2 (Monash cross-campus): A lighter-touch reflexivity checklist is required, documenting: (a) the rationale for authorship composition across campuses, (b) whether MUM/SEACO staff are represented in prominent authorship positions, and (c) whether the project includes capacity strengthening for MUM-based researchers. This checklist is filed with the authorship agreement; it is not published.

Tier 1 (internal): No formal reflexivity statement is required, but the authorship agreement itself serves as the accountability mechanism for equitable inclusion.

5c. Internal equity review [\[All tiers\]](#)

Regardless of tier, before any manuscript is submitted the project lead must review the author list against the following checklist:

- Have all individuals who meet the authorship criteria been included?
- Have all individuals who could meet the criteria been offered the opportunity to do so?
- Is the author order justified by contribution rather than seniority or institutional status?
- Are junior researchers, field staff, and women appropriately represented?
- At Tier 1: has the supervisory relationship between any co-authors created an unexamined power dynamic in the authorship decision?
- Has Malaysian naming convention preference been confirmed with each author?

This review is documented in the authorship agreement and is the responsibility of the corresponding author.

6. Community data governance and acknowledgment [\[All tiers\]](#)

SEACO's longitudinal data is a shared asset built on the sustained, voluntary participation of the Segamat community. This carries obligations regardless of collaboration tier:

- Standard acknowledgment - every SEACO publication must include a community acknowledgment statement (template in Appendix C) recognising the people and communities of Segamat district
- Community dissemination - findings must be communicated back to the Segamat community in accessible form (e.g. community briefs, presentations, or translated summaries).
- Publication of research findings, even in open-source journals, is not sufficient
- Community advisory engagement - for studies with direct community implications, research plans should be discussed with relevant community representatives before publication
- Data sovereignty - SEACO data remains the custodial responsibility of SEACO/GPH. External researchers do not acquire ownership of SEACO data through use. Publications must not disclose data at a level of granularity that could identify individuals or communities

7. Use of artificial intelligence tools [\[All tiers\]](#)

Consistent with ICMJE (2025) and COPE positions:

- Confidentiality. Authors must not input unpublished SEACO data, participant information, or confidential research materials into commercial AI tools unless the tool's data handling policies have been reviewed and approved by the SEACO data governance lead.
- Mandatory disclosure. Authors must disclose the use of any AI tools at submission, both in the cover letter and in the manuscript itself. Consistent with ICMJE, AI used for writing or language assistance is disclosed in the Acknowledgements, while AI used for data collection, analysis, or figure generation is disclosed in the Methods. The disclosure must specify which tool or tools were used, the version, the purpose (for example literature search, drafting, language editing, data analysis, figure generation), and the extent of use. A template disclosure is provided in Appendix C.
- Human responsibility. All AI-generated or AI-assisted content must be critically reviewed, verified for accuracy and originality, and checked for potential bias by the human authors. The corresponding author bears ultimate responsibility for the accuracy of all content.

8. Recognition of field and support staff contributions [All tiers]

SEACO's research depends on field staff who recruit participants, collect data, manage community relationships, and ensure data quality. Their contributions are essential and must be recognised appropriately regardless of the collaboration tier.

8a. When field staff qualify as authors

Field staff contributions qualify for authorship when they extend beyond data collection to include:

- Substantive input into study design or adaptation of instruments to the local context
- Interpretation of findings drawing on local or community knowledge
- Contribution to drafting or critically reviewing the manuscript
- Agreement to be accountable for the relevant aspects of the work

Where a field staff member's contribution meets or could meet the four ICMJE criteria, project leads are obligated to offer them the opportunity to participate in writing and review (criteria 2–4). This obligation applies with equal force to external project leads (Tier 3) as to internal ones (Tier 1).

8b. When acknowledgment applies

Field staff whose contributions are limited to data collection, logistics, or fieldwork coordination -and who do not engage in interpretation, writing, or review -must be named individually in the Acknowledgements section. Generic team acknowledgments (e.g. "we thank the SEACO field team") are not sufficient.

8c. Pathway to authorship

Project leads must actively create opportunities for field staff to develop authorship-eligible contributions. This may include, but is not limited to:

- Involving field staff in data interpretation workshops
- Co-writing findings summaries before formal manuscript drafting
- Pairing field staff with experienced writers as mentors during the manuscript process
- Providing writing skills training as part of SEACO's capacity strengthening programme

9. Contributorship statement (CRediT taxonomy) [\[All tiers\]](#)

All SEACO publications must include a contribution statement using the CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) standard (ANSI/NISO Z39.104-2022). The 14 CRediT roles are:

Role	Description
Conceptualization	Formulation of overarching research goals and aims
Methodology	Development or design of methodology; creation of models
Software	Programming, software development, testing
Validation	Verification of results/experiments
Formal analysis	Statistical or mathematical analysis of data
Investigation	Conducting research and data collection
Resources	Provision of study materials, instrumentation, computing
Data curation	Data management, annotation, scrubbing, maintenance
Writing – original draft	Preparation of the initial manuscript
Writing – review & editing	Critical review, commentary, or revision
Visualization	Data presentation and figure preparation
Supervision	Oversight and leadership of the research activity
Project administration	Coordination and management of research activities
Funding acquisition	Obtaining financial support for the project

Each contributor’s role(s) should be designated as lead, equal, or supporting where possible. CRediT statements apply to all contributors including those listed in Acknowledgements.

10. Author order and corresponding author [\[All tiers\]](#)

10a. Author order

- First author -the individual who led the intellectual work and manuscript writing. Where two individuals contributed equally, joint first authorship is designated with a footnote (e.g. “These authors contributed equally”).
- Last author -the senior researcher who provided intellectual oversight, mentorship, and/or principal funding. Joint last authorship may be designated where appropriate.
- Middle authors -listed by magnitude of contribution (highest first). Where contributions are broadly comparable, alphabetical ordering is acceptable if agreed by all parties and noted.
- Group authorship -where SEACO-wide work warrants it, publications may be authored under a group name (e.g. “the SEACO Collaborative Group”) with individual contributors listed in a footnote or appendix. All named individuals must still meet the four authorship criteria.

10b. Corresponding author

The corresponding author has specific additional responsibilities:

- Ensuring all authors have reviewed and approved the final manuscript and the CRediT statement

- Managing all communication with the journal during submission, peer review, and post-publication
- Maintaining the authorship agreement and responding to post-publication queries
- Ensuring compliance with data sharing requirements

Tier 1: The corresponding author will normally be the GPH staff member who led the work.

Tiers 2 and 3: The corresponding author should normally have a SEACO or MUM affiliation. Where an external or cross-campus researcher serves as corresponding author, a SEACO-affiliated co-author must be designated as the SEACO liaison for platform-related queries.

11. ORCID identifiers [\[All tiers\]](#)

All authors on SEACO publications are strongly encouraged to register for and maintain an ORCID iD (Open Researcher and Contributor ID). ORCID ensures persistent identification of researchers across institutions, name changes, and career transitions. SEACO will provide support for staff and field researchers to register.

12. Authorship agreement (mandatory) [\[All tiers\]](#)

Every SEACO research project must maintain a living authorship agreement (template in Appendix B). This agreement:

- Must be initiated at the study design stage -not delayed until manuscript preparation
- Must record the names of all prospective contributors, their expected roles (using CRediT categories), and the planned author order
- Must be reviewed and updated at key milestones: protocol finalisation, data collection completion, analysis completion, and before manuscript submission
- Must be signed or confirmed by all listed authors before submission to any journal
- Must include a record of changes -if contributors are added, removed, or re-ordered, the reasons must be documented
- At Tiers 2 and 3, must include the internal equity review checklist (section 5c) and, where applicable, the reflexivity statement or checklist (section 5b)

13. Data sharing and access statement [\[All tiers\]](#)

In line with ICMJE requirements, all SEACO publications must include a data availability statement. SEACO's position:

- SEACO datasets are available to approved researchers under a formal data access agreement
- Data sharing must comply with Malaysian data protection law, namely the Personal Data Protection Act 2010 as amended by the Personal Data Protection (Amendment) Act 2024, and with Monash University ethics requirements. Researchers should note in particular the data breach notification and Data Protection Officer obligations that took effect from 1 June 2025
- Individual-level data that could identify participants will not be shared publicly
- At Tier 3, the data access agreement must specify authorship expectations for any publications arising from shared data (see Appendix D)

14. Open access and publication costs [All tiers; adapted at Tier 1]

SEACO is committed to ensuring that authorship decisions are not influenced by ability to pay article processing charges (APCs). Accordingly:

- Publication cost responsibility should be discussed and agreed during the authorship planning stage
- SEACO/GPH will seek to cover APCs for publications led by SEACO field staff or junior local researchers, subject to available funds
- Authors should prioritise journals with APC waiver policies for LMIC-affiliated researchers where appropriate
- The inability to contribute to APCs must never be a basis for excluding an otherwise eligible author

At Tier 1, APC costs are normally managed within GPH's existing budget and the equity provisions here are less critical. At Tiers 2 and 3, APC cost-sharing must be explicitly addressed in the project agreement to prevent MUM/GPH bearing a disproportionate share.

15. Prohibited practices [All tiers]

The following practices are strictly prohibited in all SEACO research:

- Gift authorship -listing individuals who have not met all four authorship criteria, regardless of their seniority, funding contribution, or institutional status
- Ghost authorship -failing to list individuals who have met the authorship criteria, including writers, analysts, or consultants who made substantive intellectual contributions
- Coercive authorship -using institutional power, supervisory authority, or funding leverage to demand authorship or a particular author position. At Tier 1, this includes supervisors using the student-supervisor relationship to claim unwarranted authorship positions.
- Exclusionary practices -denying eligible contributors (particularly local researchers, field staff, or junior staff) the opportunity to fulfil authorship criteria
- Extractive data use -using SEACO data or infrastructure to produce publications without meaningful intellectual collaboration with SEACO-affiliated researchers. This applies primarily to Tiers 2 and 3.
- AI misrepresentation -listing AI tools as authors, or failing to disclose AI-assisted content generation

16. Dispute resolution [All tiers]

Authorship disputes should be resolved at the earliest possible stage through the following stepwise process:

1. Direct discussion between the individuals involved, facilitated by the project lead if necessary (within 10 working days of the dispute being raised)
2. If unresolved, referral to the SEACO Director or GPH Head of Department for mediation (within 15 working days)
3. If still unresolved, referral to the SEACO Authorship Committee for a binding decision (within 20 working days). The committee must include at least one member external to the project.

All disputes and their resolution must be documented in writing and appended to the authorship agreement. No manuscript may be submitted while a dispute is unresolved.

Conflicts of interest in the dispute process

Where the SEACO Director or GPH Head of Department is a co-author on the disputed publication, they must recuse themselves from Step 2 and the dispute proceeds directly to the Authorship Committee. In such cases, the committee must include at least one member from outside GPH (e.g. from another MUM department, or from Monash's research integrity office).

Where a dispute involves allegations of prohibited practices (section 15), the matter should be referred directly to the SEACO Authorship Committee and, if warranted, to the relevant institutional research integrity office.

17. Capacity strengthening [All tiers]

Authorship development is not incidental to SEACO's mission -it is central to it. All research projects using SEACO infrastructure are expected to contribute to building the next generation of authors, particularly among:

- Junior researchers (postdoctoral fellows, research assistants, postgraduate students)
- SEACO field staff with research potential
- Local collaborators from Malaysian institutions

Concrete mechanisms include:

- Writing mentorship -senior authors pair with junior contributors to co-develop sections of the manuscript
- Authorship apprenticeship -junior researchers are included in authorship planning from inception, with a clear role trajectory leading to a named authorship position
- Skills workshops -SEACO/GPH provides regular training in academic writing, statistical reporting, and publication ethics
- First-author opportunities -project leads actively identify publications (e.g. descriptive analyses, methodological papers, sub-studies) that can be led by junior or local researchers
- Tracking and reporting -SEACO maintains records of authorship development activities and includes this in its annual report

At Tier 3, external collaborators are expected to contribute to capacity strengthening as a condition of the partnership -for example, by co-supervising a MUM postgraduate student, involving SEACO staff in analysis workshops, or co-authoring with a junior SEACO researcher.

18. Preprint policy [All tiers]

SEACO encourages the posting of preprints to recognised servers (e.g. medRxiv, SSRN) as a means of accelerating access to findings. All co-authors must approve the preprint before posting. Preprint authorship must be consistent with the planned journal submission. Community-sensitive findings should be discussed with relevant community representatives before preprint posting.

19. Policy review and governance

This policy will be reviewed biennially by the SEACO Authorship Committee, with input from GPH staff, field staff, and external collaborators. Reviews should consider:

- Changes to ICMJE, COPE, or CRediT standards
- Evolving best practice in equitable authorship (particularly from The Lancet, BMJ Global Health, and PLOS)
- Feedback from SEACO researchers and collaborators on the policy's effectiveness
- Developments in AI tools and their implications for authorship and integrity
- Any authorship disputes or complaints arising during the review period
- Whether the tier definitions remain fit for purpose

Appendix A: Authorship decision flowchart

Step 1: Did the individual make a substantial intellectual contribution to the conception, design, data acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of the work?

→ If NO: → Named acknowledgment (not authorship)

→ If YES: → Proceed to Step 2

Step 2: Did they contribute to drafting or critically reviewing the manuscript?

→ If NO: → Were they offered the opportunity? If not, they must be offered it. If they decline after being offered, named acknowledgment applies.

→ If YES: → Proceed to Step 3

Step 3: Have they approved the final version of the manuscript?

→ If NO: → They must be given the opportunity to review and approve before submission.

→ If YES: → Proceed to Step 4

Step 4: Have they agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work?

→ If NO: → Discuss and resolve. If they cannot take accountability, named acknowledgment with contribution specified.

→ If YES: → Author.

Critical safeguard: At no point should this flowchart be used to exclude a contributor who could meet the criteria if given the opportunity. The default is inclusion, not exclusion.

Appendix B: Authorship agreement template

Project title: _____

SEACO project ID: _____ Date initiated: _____

Principal investigator: _____

Collaboration tier (circle): 1 (internal) / 2 (Monash cross-campus) / 3 (external)

Instructions: Complete this form at study inception. Update at each milestone. All listed authors must confirm before manuscript submission.

Contributor name	Affiliation	CRediT roles (lead/equal/support)	Proposed position	ORCID iD

Internal equity review (complete before submission):

- All individuals meeting authorship criteria included? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- All potential contributors offered the opportunity to meet criteria? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Author order justified by contribution (not seniority)? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Junior researchers/field staff appropriately represented? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Naming convention preferences confirmed with each author? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- [Tiers 2–3] Reflexivity statement or checklist attached? ☐ Yes ☐ N/A

Change log:

Date	Change description	Agreed by

Appendix C: Standard acknowledgment and disclosure templates

Community acknowledgment (required in all SEACO publications)

"We gratefully acknowledge the people and communities of Segamat district, Johor, Malaysia, whose sustained and voluntary participation in the South East Asia Community Observatory (SEACO) makes this research possible. We also thank the SEACO field team for their dedication to data collection and community engagement."

This text may be adapted but should retain the core elements: recognition of the Segamat community's voluntary participation and the SEACO field team's contribution.

SEACO platform acknowledgment (required in all SEACO publications)

"SEACO is a health and demographic surveillance system managed by the Global Population Health department, Monash University Malaysia. SEACO receives core funding from Monash University Malaysia and Monash University Australia."

AI disclosure template (where applicable)

"[Tool name, version] was used to [specific purpose, e.g. assist with language editing / generate initial literature summaries / support data visualisation]. All AI-generated content was critically reviewed, verified for accuracy, and revised by the authors. The authors take full responsibility for the content of this manuscript."

Appendix D: Authorship clause for data access agreements and MoUs

The following clause (or substantive equivalent) must be incorporated into all Tier 3 data access agreements and all Tier 2 collaboration MoUs:

"The parties agree that all publications arising from SEACO data, infrastructure, or fieldwork will comply with the SEACO Authorship Policy (current version available from the SEACO Director). In particular: (a) Authorship will follow ICMJE criteria as interpreted by the SEACO Authorship Policy; (b) At least one author with a primary affiliation at Monash University Malaysia or a SEACO field site will be included on every publication, and will normally hold a prominent authorship position (first or last author) on publications based primarily on SEACO data; (c) An authorship agreement will be initiated at the study design stage and maintained throughout the project; (d) A structured author reflexivity statement will accompany all manuscripts arising from this collaboration; (e) The SEACO community acknowledgment statement will be included in all publications; (f) Field staff who meet authorship criteria will be offered authorship; those who do not will be named in the Acknowledgments; (g) Disputes regarding authorship will be resolved in accordance with the SEACO Authorship Policy dispute resolution procedure. By signing this agreement, the external collaborator(s) confirm that they have read, understood, and agree to be bound by the SEACO Authorship Policy."

This clause should be adapted as needed for the specific collaboration but must retain all seven substantive commitments (a–g).

References and further reading

- ICMJE. Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals (updated January 2025). www.icmje.org
- COPE. Position statement on authorship and AI tools (2023, updated 2024). publicationethics.org
- CRediT. Contributor Roles Taxonomy (ANSI/NISO Z39.104-2022). credit.niso.org
- Saleh S, Masekela R, Heinz E, Abimbola S, et al. Equity in global health research: a proposal to adopt author reflexivity statements. *PLOS Glob Public Health* 2022; 2(3): e0000160
- The Lancet Global Health (Editorial). Closing the door on parachutes and parasites. *Lancet Glob Health* 2018; 6: e593
- Rees CA, Ali M, Kisenge R, et al. Where there is no local author: a network bibliometric analysis of authorship parasitism among research conducted in sub-Saharan Africa. *BMJ Glob Health* 2021; 6: e006982
- Partap U, Young EH, Allotey P, Soyiri IN, Jahan N, Komahan K, Devarajan N, Sandhu MS, Reidpath DD. HDSS Profile: The South East Asia Community Observatory Health and Demographic Surveillance System (SEACO HDSS). *Int J Epidemiol* 2017; 46(5): 1370–1371g