Supplementary file 2: Dummy OSI report generated by Turnitin

We submitted a dummy text linked to our own work to Turnitin, that generated an OSI report. In this hypothetical example, we demonstrate how we counted copied sentences.

There are few empirical studies on irresponsible research practices from low-and middle income countries (LMICs). Only one of the systematic reviews mentioned above [8] included studies conducted in LMICs – three of the 14 studies that contributed data to the meta-analysis. Published literature focuses on high-income countries and research misconduct in terms of data falsification, data fabrication and plagiarism [6, 9]. In LMICs research outputs are increasing (both locally and with international collaborations), national policies on research integrity are lacking [10] and the pressure to perform and live up to global standards is rising. In this context, adequate systems, processes and guidelines are needed to ensure ethical behaviour, address poor research reporting practices and promote research integrity [11]. Understanding researchers' perceptions of and experiences with good and poor reporting practices is key to inform activities that promote research integrity and further research in this field.

We counted 4 linked copied sentences in this paragraph

We developed and piloted an online questionnaire (Supplementary file 1). We created nine hypothetical scenarios related to guest authorship, ghost authorship, plagiarism, redundant publication and declaration of conflicts of interest. After each scenario, we asked participants to answer three questions in order to elicit responses on participants' understanding and occurrence of acceptable and unacceptable reporting practices. Questions followed a similar pattern for all scenarios. In addition, there was an opportunity to add free-text comments or clarifications after each scenario.

We did not count this sentence as being plagiarised

Results from the survey indicated that guest authorship is a common occurrence. Participants commented extensively on these scenarios, alluding to the relevance and complexity of the problem and providing some reasons for engaging in this practice. Results from the interviews mirrored those of the survey and provided further insight into the magnitude of the problem. Interviewees told many stories describing what happened at institutions and elaborated on the reasons already provided in the survey. Survey respondents thought that omitting an author who had made substantial contributions was unacceptable – yet, they indicated that this did occur at their institutions. Free-text comments on this practice showed that respondents had strong feelings about this, especially where they themselves had experienced omission from publications in the past. These feelings were echoed in the interviews and participants elaborated on the power play between junior and senior researchers. Indeed, this was one of the main themes that emerged from the data.

Survey respondents thought that plagiarism was unacceptable. Quantitative responses were underlined by free-text comments and respondents seemed to be very clear about this form of misconduct. Interviewees reiterated these views. They were very aware of the consequences of plagiarism, one interviewee appropriately saying: *"it's like doping in sports"*.

Of all the irresponsible practices explored, perceptions and occurrence of guest authorship stood out. In light of the availability of international guidelines [20] and journal requirements on contributions of authors, this result is striking although not unexpected when considering results of other studies. A meta-analysis on the misuse of authorship [8] found a self-reported prevalence of 55% (95%CI 45% to 64%) amongst health researchers from countries outside of the USA and UK, including South Africa, India and Bangladesh. A survey conducted amongst medical professionals in India [21] found a high prevalence of guest authorship (65%; 101/155), while in a study conducted in Nigeria, 36% (47/133) of participating health professionals indicated that they had encountered disagreements about authorship [22]. In our survey, 77% (153/198) of respondents indicated that guest authorship occurred at their institutions.

We counted 6 linked copied sentences in this paragraph