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## Q1. Would Dr. Danson's advice be appropriate if he knew about Lisa's contribution to Mike's project? Was Mike responsible for informing his adviser about Lisa's contribution?

## Solution Q1. it’s crucial for both advisers and researchers to ensure that all contributions are appropriately recognized and attributed in academic publications. This practice fosters a culture of fairness, collaboration, and integrity in the scientific community.

## Q2. Should Mike have followed Dr. Danson's recommendation concerning authorship?

## Solution Q2. Mike should have discussed the situation with Dr. Danson, explaining Lisa’s critical role in the project, and advocated for her inclusion as a co-author. This approach would have upheld the ethical standards of research and fostered a more positive and productive research environment.

## Q3. Did Mike ask a reasonable favor from Lisa?

## Solution Q3. Mike’s request was not reasonable, as it did not respect the norms of fair and ethical authorship in academia. He should have acknowledged Lisa’s contributions by including her as a co-author, ensuring both the integrity of the research and the maintenance of a positive collaborative environment.

## 

## Q4. What were Lisa’s options when Mike first approached her with his experimental problem? During the experimental process? When Mike stated his wishes to publish as a single author?

## Solution Q4. Lisa had several options at each stage of the process, ranging from agreeing to assist to standing firm on her contributions. Ultimately, the choice of how to proceed would depend on her values, professional goals, and the importance she placed on maintaining her relationship with Mike while ensuring her work was appropriately credited.

## Q5. Should Lisa have continued to help Mike with the experiment after their conversation? Should she have gone to Dr. Danson with her concerns?

## Solution Q5. Lisa’s decision to cease helping Mike after their conversation was appropriate given the lack of recognition for her work. In addition, bringing her concerns to Dr. Danson would have been a prudent step to ensure her contributions were acknowledged and to maintain the integrity of the research environment. This approach would have supported a culture of transparency and fairness, benefiting not only Lisa and Mike but also the broader research community.

## Q6. Why do you think authorship credit can be such a divisive issue among researchers?

## Solution Q6. authorship credit is a critical and sensitive issue in academia and scientific research due to its impact on recognition, career advancement, and ethical standards. Clear communication, transparent decision-making, and adherence to established guidelines can help mitigate conflicts and promote a fair and collaborative research environment.