

Module 2 Assignment: Romero & Reed Case Study¹

Instructions.

Please review the character profiles and scenario provided below. Then answer the questions that follow on the subsequent pages.

Characters.

Dr. Jordan Romero, postdoctoral fellow: Dr. Romero recently finished her Ph.D. and applied for a post-doctoral position at Dr. Alex Reed's laboratory. She received the position and has just recently started working with the group.

Dr. Alex Reed, lab chief: Dr. Reed runs the lab that Dr. Romero has recently joined, which includes overseeing most lab activities and running weekly meetings.

Ms. June Jones, technician: Ms. Jones knows all the equipment in the lab inside and out; she helps lab members develop methods and run analyses.

Mike, graduate student: Mike is a graduate student who worked with Dr. Reed and other lab members for a time before deciding his interests lay elsewhere. He has since left the group.

Chair: The department chair oversees multiple labs, including Dr. Reed's group. They are heavily involved in obtaining grant funding.

Scenario.

Dr. Jordan Romero is a first-year postdoc in Dr. Alex Reed's laboratory. When she arrived, Dr. Reed suggested that she begin by completing some analyses that were initiated by a graduate student (Mike) who had since left the group.

Ms. June Jones, a technician, taught Dr. Romero the necessary techniques. Dr. Romero then proceeded with the study, working mainly on her own at night. She quickly obtained results that suggested there were actually two steps in a reaction thought to involve just one step. Together with Ms. Jones, she developed a method for testing her hypothesis, and the results confirmed the hypothesis. The graduate student who had begun collecting the data had apparently not examined enough experimental conditions to identify two steps rather than one.

Dr. Romero wrote up the results as a short communication to Science with herself as the author and presented it to Dr. Reed. It was the first time he had seen any of the results. Several weeks later, Dr. Reed returned the paper to Dr. Romero with only a few changes, a note that congratulated her on the fine work but scolded her for not staying in closer touch with him during the experiments, and a new list of authors: Dr. Romero, Mike, the graduate student who began the project, the Chair of their department, and Dr. Reed. In the note, Dr. Reed explained the rationale behind each of his changes, including the fact that the Chair of the department was the principal investigator on the grant that supported the work. Dr. Romero was dismayed at the thought of sharing authorship with anyone. After all, it was her work.

Module 2 Assignment: Romero & Reed Case Study¹

Questions to answer.

Please use the text boxes to answer each question below in complete sentences.

1. Who do you think should be listed as an author on the manuscript? Why?

2. Who do you think should **not** be listed as an author on the manuscript? Why?

3. What, if anything, do you think could have been done to improve the process of deciding authorship on this manuscript?

4. Who, if anyone, do you think should be listed in the acknowledgments of the manuscript?

¹Based on a case by M. Zigmond and B. Fischer [1996].