

CHAPTER 6

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW**Introduction**

6.1 ADHREC oversees the ethical conduct of human research within Defence and monitors the conduct of human research which has received ethical approval over the life of the research protocol (Chapter 5). Part of the monitoring process includes ensuring manuscripts intended for publication are subjected to a Defence approval process

6.2 There is a need to disseminate scientific research results widely, not only to provide a sharing of potentially useful information, but also to permit peer review of research processes. Additionally publication ensures that all results are made available, not only predicted or favourable results. Consequently, one of the conditions of approval by ADHREC is that researchers acknowledge their intention to publish the results of their studies. However, the review process detailed in this policy is a mandatory step in the dissemination process. It is important to recognise the need for information protection as required by national security considerations, the *Privacy Act 1988* and other relevant legislation.

6.3 The appropriate Defence sponsor, in conjunction with the relevant Defence agencies, should review the results of endorsed research and any publications arising from endorsed research prior to their dissemination.

Aim

6.4 This chapter details the requirements for the review of manuscripts, consequent to the conduct of approved human research, and their approval for publication.

Procedure

6.5 Personnel who wish to publish articles in journals or other publishing forms including submissions as a thesis or treatise, based on information acquired through approved human research involving Defence personnel and/or resources, are first required to obtain approval from the appropriate sponsor in Defence. This requirement includes the submission of abstracts of verbal presentations that are to be published but does not include the verbal presentation *per se*. In the event of a request for copies of slides or other visual aids used in a verbal presentation, the diligence of the researcher is required. If any doubt exists advice is to be sought from the coordinating officer for human research in DHSD.

6.6 Manuscripts consequent to the conduct of approved human research are to be submitted in final draft form for approval prior to publication. Manuscripts are to be forwarded, preferably in electronic format, to the relevant Defence sponsor of the subject research. Advice of this submission is to be provided to the ADHREC Secretariat in order to meet human research protocol monitoring requirements (Chapter 5). Final Defence sponsor approval should normally be provided at least at 1-Star equivalent level. Approval for publishing manuscripts consequent to health-related research will normally be provided by Director-General Strategic Health Policy and Plans (DGSHPP) in DHSD. Where doubt exists as to who is the Defence sponsor to act as the appropriate approving authority, advice should be sought from the coordinating officer for human research in DHSD or the ADHREC Secretariat (Chapters 3 and 4).

6.7 Review of human research conducted by DSTO is to be undertaken as required in Procedures for the Production and Distribution of Scientific and Technical Documents Written by Defence Science and Technology Organisation Officers (DESTMAN 1). Further Defence sponsor approval is not required.

6.8 In accordance with the *Defence Protective Security Manual* (SECMAN 4) no classified material is to be included in any manuscript which is to be published as open source material. **Defence retains the right to prohibit or place conditions on the publication of a submitted manuscript.**

6.9 Where Defence approval has been provided to a draft manuscript and there is a subsequent amendment to the final manuscript to be published, the amended manuscript must be further submitted for Defence approval. This requirement does not apply if the amendments are of a minor nature not affecting the substance of the manuscript.

6.10 All authors are to include the following in the body of the manuscript:

- a. a statement that ethical approval of the study was received from ADHREC prior to its commencement,
- b. an acknowledgment of the use of Defence resources and personnel where appropriate, and
- c. a disclaimer stating that the opinions expressed herein are those of the author/s and do not necessarily reflect those of Defence or any extant policy.

6.11 The reviewing officer should also ensure that the following issues are or have been addressed:

- a. There is documented evidence of ethical approval from ADHREC and other ethics committees as appropriate.
- b. That there is a statement that the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (developed jointly by the National Health and Medical Research Council, Australian Research Council and the Australian Vice Chancellors Committee, March 2007) has been adhered to.

6.12 Depending on the circumstances, the reviewing officer might also consider whether the following issues are, or have been addressed:

- a. the standard of the record is such that it is not likely to bring discredit to Defence;
- b. the authorship reflects the participation in, and responsibility for the work reported;
- c. the chosen publication medium (where indicated) is appropriate; and
- d. that there is no evidence of serious research misconduct, which includes, but is not limited to:
 - (1) Fabrication (invention of data or cases);
 - (2) Falsification (wilful distortion of data);
 - (3) Plagiarism (copying of ideas, data or words without attribution);
 - (4) Failing to get consent from an ethics committee for research;
 - (5) Not admitting that some data is missing;
 - (6) Ignoring outliers without declaring it;
 - (7) Not including data on side effects in a clinical trial;
 - (8) Conducting research on humans without informed consent, or without justifying why consent was not obtained from an ethics committee;
 - (9) Publication of post hoc analyses without declaration that they were post hoc;
 - (10) Gift authorship;
 - (11) Not attributing other authors;

- (12) Redundant publication;
- (13) Not disclosing a conflict of interest; and
- (14) Failure to do an adequate search of existing research before beginning new research.

Authorship

6.13 Authorship of publications resulting from research activities must be on the basis of substantial participation where all the following conditions are met:

- a. Conceptualisation and design, or analysis and interpretation of data, or acquisition of data;
- b. Drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and
- c. Final approval of the version to be published.

6.14 The corresponding author must sign a statement of authorship acknowledging the definitions in paragraphs 6.11.b and 6.12 and indicate that all authors have seen the version of the paper submitted for publication. The *Instructions to Authors* of the relevant publication must be adhered to.

6.15 Any individual who has contributed to the work and is not an author must be acknowledged in the research output.