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Search for “publicationethics.org” in www.wordcloudit.com
Integrity
Noun (uncountable)

Merriam Webster Dictionary
1. Firm adherence to a code of especially moral or artistic values: incorruptibility
2. An unimpaired condition: soundness
3. The quality or state of being complete or undivided: completeness

Oxford English Dictionary
1. The quality of being honest and having strong moral principles.
2. The state of being whole and undivided.
Integrity: ethical standards / conduct, soundness

- **Personal** & intellectual integrity

- Integrity of a **system**
  - Self-correction of science / research
  - Science as an institution, research enterprise

- Integrity of the **work & record**
  - No bias (eg, in randomised controlled trials)
  - Clinical trial registries, transparency
  - Positive & negative findings
  - Correcting the record
  - Integrity of data, figures, images

Jacob 2013, Scientific Research Integrity,
Integrity: ethical standards / conduct, soundness

- **People & Parties:**
  Researchers, institution staff & students, review boards, editors/publishers, sponsors, funders, government & non-governmental agencies, professional & regulatory bodies, academic societies, managers, administrators, ombudspeople, media, politicians, policy makers, practitioners...

- **Policies & Practices:**
  Education/training in research & business/administration ethics, approvals, regulation, hiring/promotion/tenure, incentives, rewards, budgeting, funding, fund-raising, donations, use of finances, publication/dissemination, technology transfer, knowledge exchange, misconduct investigation & prevention...

- **Processes & Products:**
  Research/analysis, data, articles, journals, books, reports, preprints, conference abstracts/proceedings...
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Professional ethics:

**WHO Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct**

- Integrity

- Accountability

- Independence & impartiality

- Respect for the dignity, worth, equality, diversity & privacy of all persons

- Professional commitment

Research ethics 1:

**Singapore Statement on Research Integrity 2010**
(World Conference on Research Integrity 2010)

- Honesty in all aspects of research
- Accountability in the conduct of research
- Professional courtesy and fairness in working with others
- Good stewardship of research on behalf of others

Research ethics 2:

“Ethics in Scientific Research”, RAND, 2019

Ethical categories & principles

- Ethical scientific enquiry:
  - Duty to society

- Ethical conduct & behaviours of researchers:
  - Conflict of interest, integrity, non-discrimination, professional competence, professional discipline

- Ethical treatment of research participants:
  - Informed consent, beneficence, non-discrimination, non-exploitation, privacy & confidentiality

file:///C:/Users/semin_000/Downloads/RAND_RR2912.pdf
Publishing ethics 1:

*China Association for Science & Technology (CAST)*

- Do not engage ghost writers
- Submit your work yourself
- Revise your paper yourself; if you need, work with editing services/companies to proofread and refine the language but not the intellectual content
- Do not falsify names or identities of peer reviewers you suggest and do not manipulate the peer-review process
- Do not violate ethical standards, including that all authors must agree on what is being published, and all authors must have contributed substantially
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### Publishing ethics 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td>Ethics board approval or waiver; hazard warnings, environmental safety; for <strong>humans</strong>: informed consent, permission to publish, data privacy, preregistration of trials &amp; systematic reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting</strong></td>
<td>Full &amp; transparent methods, complete data reporting / interpretation (no “salami”; use reporting checklist), appropriate citation, data citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No plagiarism</strong></td>
<td>Quote, paraphrase/summarize, cite sources, CC, © permission &amp; note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No data manipulation</strong></td>
<td>Maintain data integrity: data preservation/storage, availability, sharing; do not fabricate or falsify data (eg, do not manipulate parts of images)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorship</strong></td>
<td>(1) Design or data acquisition / analysis / interpretation &amp; (2) Writing / revising &amp; (3) Approval &amp; (4) Accountability. Decide early, including author order and corresponding author; no guests/ghosts; acknowledge help &amp; use personal communications with permission; +/- CRedit contributions, ORCIDs, © awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflicts of interest (COIs)</strong></td>
<td>Funding source, potential (non-)financial / personal COIs; had access to data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission</strong></td>
<td>Submit to only one journal, do not republish, state if previous presentation or similar papers/preprints, do not manipulate peer review; learn how to identify trustworthy journals → ThinkCheckSubmit.org</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Edanz Group, [www.edanzediting.com](http://www.edanzediting.com)

[publicationethics.org](http://publicationethics.org)
## Peer review ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal details, ability</strong></td>
<td>Give correct name, contacts, qualifications, affiliations, CV, areas of expertise; understands publishing and review processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong></td>
<td>Will perform the review within the given deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectivity, honesty</strong></td>
<td>Will be professional; will not slow down process or be unfair; will nominate any alternative reviewers neutrally and truthfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution</strong></td>
<td>Will perform the review without help (or will seek prior permission); no coerced authorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidentiality</strong></td>
<td>Will not use/share any of the author information or confidential peer review report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflicts of interest (COIs)</strong></td>
<td>Will state any potential (non-)financial / personal COIs, public viewpoints, expert witness; self-recusal if needed; no coerced citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editor-only report</strong></td>
<td>Recommendation of accept / revise / reject; any ethical concerns about research/reporting; which sections were (not) reviewed; COIs during review; identity of author became known during double-blind review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Edanz Group, [www.edanzediting.com](http://www.edanzediting.com), [https://publicationethics.org/files/Ethical_Guidelines_For_Peer_Reviewers_2.pdf](https://publicationethics.org/files/Ethical_Guidelines_For_Peer_Reviewers_2.pdf)
What are the issues?

1. wrong observation
2. wrong analysis
3. inadequate record keeping
4. withholding method details
5. double and sliced publications
6. biased or post-hoc revision of study design
7. ignoring previous work of others
8. suppressing own data, dropping data points
9. undeclared conflicts of interest, corruption
10. undeserved authorship
11. unfair review, wrong testimony
12. espionage, giving away secrets
13. misuse of public funds
14. bullying, nepotism
15. overlooking others’ use of flawed data
16. suppressing fraud allegation
17. no informed consent
18. plagiarism
19. falsification
20. fabrication
21. illegal human experiments

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2829174/ (CC BY)
What are the issues?

Reproducibility issues

Reproducibility and reliability of biomedical research: improving research practice
Symposium report, October 2015
(The Academy of Medical Sciences, CC BY)

https://acmedsci.ac.uk/file-download/38189-56531416e2949.pdf
What are the issues?
“Specific research misconduct” (…FFP)
Japan MEXT; US Office of Science & Technology 2000 & federal agencies

- Fabrication—Making up data or research results in record/report
- Falsification—Manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing/omitting data or results
- Plagiarism—Appropriating the ideas, analysis, analytical methods, data, research results, research paper(s), or words of other researchers without obtaining the permission of the researchers or giving appropriate credit

- Misconduct in proposing, performing, or reviewing research or in reporting.
- Misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion

http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/jinzai/fusei/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2015/07/13/1359618_01.pdf
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What are the issues?

“Questionable research practices” (QRPs)

US National Academy of Sciences, 1992

- Inappropriate management of research records and data analysis; not storing data for a certain period
- Dishonest authorship and research presentation / media publicity
- Limiting access to research materials and/or data
- Insufficient research training; exploiting students

➢ **Various agencies & institutions** may count forgery, breach of confidentiality, facilitating misconduct, deviating from acceptable research practice, knowingly misleading readers, stealing/destroying other’s property to alter research record, etc… as misconduct

https://www.nap.edu/catalog/1864/responsible-science-volume-i-ensuring-the-integrity-of-the-research
https://www.jsps.go.jp/j-kousei/data/rinri_e.pdf
https://theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/news/promoting-research-integrity/definitions-and-examples/
What are the issues?

Key concepts in research integrity/ethics statements of 795 professional organisations, by frequency


Inaccuracy, Contributor/Contribution, Ethics, Plagiarism, Credit, Author/Authorship, Conflicts of interest, Integrity, Bias, Honesty, Falsification, Fabrication, Fraud/Fraudulent, Misrepresentation, Misconduct, Manipulation, Questionable Publication Practices (QPP): duplicate publication, Dishonesty, Dual interest/relationship, QPP: redundant publication, Responsible conduct of research, QPP: repetitive publication, QPP: secondary publication, Questionable research practices, (Malpractice, QPP: salami publication)

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4507982/
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What are the issues?

Literature review, research Q → Design (materials, equipment, methods, samples, human resources) → Ethics approval, Funding application

Data, manuscript preparation → Conference presentation → Research & data analysis

Journal submission, publication → Research promotion/use (media, advocacy, synthesis, tech transfer, knowledge exchange) → Impact (policy, practice, education, service, technology…)

Source: Edanz Group, www.edanzediting.com
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What are the issues?

1. Literature review, research Q
2. Design (materials, equipment, methods, samples, human resources)
3. Ethics approval, Funding application
4. Collaborations / agreements

- Reporting guidelines, ORCiD, CRediT, Dataset as research output
- Data repositories: Data journals, Supplementary files, Graphical abstract, Highlights, Lay summary, Metadata, Digital preservation
- Different peer review models, peer review & publishing business models, Open Access
- Trial registration, Registered reports, Upload/publish protocol, Upload preprint
- Hiring, promotion, tenure, awards, fellowships, grants

- Data, manuscript preparation
- Conference presentation
- Research & data analysis
- Research promotion/use (media, advocacy, synthesis, tech transfer, knowledge exchange)
- Impact (policy, practice, education, service, technology...)

Source: Edanz Group, www.edanzediting.com
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What are the issues?

- Inadequate review, useless/flawed research
- Poor/wrong design, unethical HR/recruitment
- Poor trial preregistration, no consent, (errors), misuse resources, bias, stolen data
- Falsification, Fabrication
- No ethics approval sought, unethical work, dishonest funding

- No trial preregistration, no consent, (errors), misuse resources, bias, stolen data
- Cherry picking, fishing/dredging, P hacking

- Predatory conferences, duplication, salami, promoting unreviewed work
- Plagiarism, no confidentiality, libel, © breach, poor reporting/citing, bias, undeclared CoI or help, no data access, guest/ghost/gift authors
- Duplication, salami, self & coerced/paid citation

- Misquoting/inflating, © breach, wrong expertise
- Unethical gain in position, tenure, awards, reputation
- Gaming the system

Source: Edanz Group, www.edanzediting.com
COPE: Promoting integrity in research and its publication

Journal / Article publication

![Diagram of journal/article publication process](https://example.com/diagram.png)

- Submission; desk review; find reviewers (~1 week)
- Peer review (4–6 weeks)
- Revision → Reassessment (Weeks/months?)
- Publication (& Indexing) (0–8 weeks)

What can be shared?
- Submitted version
- Author’s Accepted Manuscript (AAM) (postprint)
- Early online version (+/- editing, artwork)
- Version of Record (VOR)

Overlay journal
Portable review?

What can be shared?
Portable review?

Overlay journal
Portable review?

Overlay journal
Portable review?

Overlay journal
Portable review?

SHERPA RoMEO database of publisher policies:
http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/index.php

Source: Edanz Group, www.edanzediting.com
## Functions of peer-reviewed journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gatekeeping/Curation</strong></td>
<td>Niche/themed or broad scope; defined readership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registration</strong></td>
<td>Who was first to do/discover/invent what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certification</strong></td>
<td>Peer-reviewed and quality-checked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional production</strong></td>
<td>Layout, artwork, formatting, coding, formats (editing?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissemination/Distribution (&amp; Marketing)</strong></td>
<td>Content reaches readers; readers access content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent archiving</strong></td>
<td>Permanent record (+ correction/retraction notices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findability, Navigation, Resources</strong></td>
<td>Metadata, links to (data) repositories, education, apps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journalism, Networking</strong></td>
<td>News, communities, post-publication commenting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Knowledge
- **Journal reputation, but...**
- **DORA statement**
  - [sfdora.org](http://sfdora.org)

### Article citations
- **Scholarly credit**
- **Researcher reputation**
- **Career building**

Source: Edanz Group, [www.edanzediting.com](http://www.edanzediting.com)
• What are the solutions?
What are the solutions?

**MEXT: Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR)**

- “Voluntary self-discipline” by researchers
  研究者による“自己訓練の奉仕”

- Checking/training…in lab, unit, department / faculty
  研究室、ユニット、部門、学部における確認/訓練

- Institutional culture, management, investigations, sanctions
  機関内の文化、管理、調査、承認

- Responsibility to funders: prevent misuse of funding
  助成機関に対する責任：助成金不正使用の防止
COPE: Promoting integrity in research and its publication

What are the solutions?

Publishers, editors:

• Use a **broad range of metrics** to highlight journal and article strengths.

• Tackle **biases in research publishing** by considering ways of ensuring that the findings of a wider range of research meeting standards of rigour can be published.

• Consider ways of adapting to the **increasing multidisciplinarity** of research.

• Consider further ways of **improving the peer review system**, for example by experimenting with new models.

• Ensure **peer reviewers** receive appropriate training and/or guidance and recognition for their work.

• Consider further the role of publishers in **tackling ethical issues in publishing** such as those related to authorship and retractions, and in promoting openness and data sharing among scientists.
What are the solutions? Solutions for reproducibility

Possible strategies

**Open data**
Openly sharing results and the underlying data with other scientists.

**Pre-registration**
Publicly registering the protocol before a study is conducted.

**Collaboration**
Working with other research groups, both formally and informally.
What are the solutions? Solutions for reproducibility 2

Automation
Finding technological ways of standardising practices, thereby reducing the opportunity for human error.

Open methods
Publicly publishing the detail of a study protocol.

Post-publication review
Continuing discussion of a study in a public forum after it has been published (most are reviewed before publication).

Reporting guidelines
Guidelines and checklists that help researchers meet certain criteria when publishing studies.

Also:
Corrections/retractions

EQUATOR Network
www.equator-network.org/
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Solutions need all stakeholders at all stages
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Solutions need all stakeholders at all stages

• Clear guidelines & standards; consensus guidelines (RePAIR)
• Reproducibility, eg, data sharing (TOP Guidelines)
• Open research, open science, open data
• Transparency, including conflicts of interest, ORCiD, CRediT
• Unbiased reporting (reporting guidelines)
• Emphasis on verification & correction
• Emphasis on quality, not quantity or journal prestige; fair assessment (DORA, Leiden Manifesto, UK “Metric Tide”, Hong Kong Principles)
• Incentives & recognition for quality service, peer review (Publons)
• Better technology, training & support
• Platforms for cooperation & consensus (COPE)

publicationethics.org
• Introduction to COPE
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Promoting integrity in research and its publication

COPE provides leadership in thinking on publication ethics and practical resources to educate and support members, and offers a professional voice in current debates.

Read more
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About COPE

• Provides **support**, **leadership**, and a **professional voice** to help preserve and promote the integrity of the scholarly record through policies and practices that reflect current **best principles of transparency and integrity**.

• Is an international membership organisation. Our **>12,000 members** are primarily editors and owners/publishers of scholarly journals of all disciplines. We are exploring **expanding membership**, eg editorial and publishing support services, and have a pilot project with six research institutions.

• Operates, manages, and governs the non-profit organisation with a small group of paid employees and a **group of volunteers** who serve on the Trustee Board and Council.
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About COPE

• **Collective responsibility for integrity of research record; neutral platform for consensus in standards/practice & tackling root causes**

• Not a legal body, not COPE ‘rules’ or ‘standards’ but **core practices & policies**:
  
  o Follow national/international laws & guidelines; Helsinki Declaration
  
  o Create & follow codes of conduct & guidelines of institution, funding/regulatory agency, professional society, publisher (based on COPE recommendations); **GPP3, ICMJE**

• Not for researcher punishment (refer to institution/agency), but COPE sanctions for members

• COPE membership for support & education:
  
  o **Resources/seminars** on preventing, detecting & handling issues
  
  o **COPE Forum** case discussions for complex/new problems (>600 cases):
    
    ➢ Practical advice & consensus
    
    ➢ Education & reference source
    
    ➢ Drives new debate, guidance, resources
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What are the issues?

No. of COPE Forum cases, by category, 1997-2016
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New issues: editors, publishers, services

Unprofessional-looking website

Fake journal metrics & indexing information

Guaranteed publication or short review time; unclear fees / services

Fake/no editorial board; no articles / poor quality articles; unclear peer review process

Fake conferences; keyword stuffing

Check real journal website, URL (not hijacked journal) or submission system

Source: Edanz Group, www.edanzediting.com
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New issues: editors, publishers, services

- Facilitating or ignoring research & publishing misconduct
- Plagiarism, republishing, © breach
- Paper mills; selling papers, authorship, citations
- Coerced citations; misquoting, faking, manipulating citation scores, indexing
- Cheating authors/readers of $; coerced purchase of services, reprints, etc
- Dishonest marketing/website; questionable supplements, conference proceedings, books
- Inadequate peer review process, fake review; questionable editorial/review boards
- Unethical editing & reviewing; editors publishing own papers without review
- Inadequate archiving/backup & correction/versioning process
- Conflicts of interest of publishers, editors, sponsors, editorial services, etc
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Importance of COPE

![THINK][CHECK][SUBMIT]  
https://thinkchecksubmit.org/

…Is the publisher a member of a recognized industry initiative? 
– Do they belong to **COPE,** **DOAJ,** **OASPA**?...

---

**Statement on Article Publication Resulting from NIH Funded Research**


The National Library of Medicine, the NIH entity that maintains PubMed and PubMed Central, encourages publishers to follow established industry best practices including: 
…**COPE,** **DOAJ,** **OASPA,** **WAME**

---

**SCOPUS Journal FAQs: Helping to improve the submission & success process for Editors & Publishers**


*Is there an online publication ethics and publication malpractice statement available for the journal?* For more information…, see, for example,…**COPE**…

---

Also: **COPE** mentioned / endorsed by **MEDLINE,** **Plan S,** …

publicationethics.org
Peer review
“cOAlition S emphasises the need for high quality journals, therefore requiring journals/platforms to have a solid system in place for review according to the standards within the relevant discipline and guided by the core practices and policies outlined by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).”

…The journal/platform must be registered in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) or in the process of being registered.
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https://publicationethics.org/join-cope
### WEBSITE

A Journal's website, including the text that it contains, shall demonstrate that care has been taken to ensure high ethical and professional standards.

- It should:
  - contain an ‘Aims & Scope’ statement and the readership clearly defined.
  - include a statement on what a journal will consider for publication (including authorship criteria e.g. not multiple submissions, redundant publications)
  - ISSNs displayed clearly (separate for print and electronic).

- It must not:
  - contain information that might mislead readers or authors.
  - attempt to mimic another journal/publisher's site.

### NAME OF JOURNAL

The Journal name shall be unique. It must not:
- be one that is easily confused with another journal.
- mislead potential authors and readers about the Journal's origin or association with other journals.

### PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Journal content must be clearly marked as whether peer reviewed or not. Peer review is defined as obtaining advice on individual manuscripts from reviewers expert in the field who are not part of the journal’s editorial staff.

The journal's website should:
- clearly describe this process, as well as any policies related to the journal's peer review procedures including the method of peer review used.

The journal's website should not:
- guarantee manuscript acceptance or very short peer review times.

### OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Information about the ownership and/or management of a journal shall be clearly indicated on the journal's website.

Publishers should not:
- use organizational or journal names that would mislead potential authors and editors about the nature of the journal's owner.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNING BODY</th>
<th>EDITORIAL TEAM/CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
<th>COPYRIGHT AND LICENSING</th>
<th>AUTHOR FEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journals shall have editorial boards or other governing bodies whose members are recognized experts in the subject areas included within the journal's scope. The journal's website should:  - show full names and affiliations of the journal's editorial board or other governing body.</td>
<td>Journals shall provide the full names and affiliations of the journal's editors on the journal website as well as contact information for the editorial office, including a full address.</td>
<td>The policy for copyright shall be clearly stated in the author guidelines and the copyright holder named on all published articles. The journal's website should:  - show licensing information clearly described in guidelines. Licensing terms shall be indicated on all published articles, both HTML and PDFs. If authors are allowed to publish under a Creative Commons license then any specific license requirements shall be noted. Any policies on posting of final accepted versions or published articles on third party repositories shall be clearly stated.</td>
<td>Any fees or charges that are required for manuscript processing and/or publishing materials in the journal shall be clearly stated. This must be:  - in a place that is easy for potential authors to find prior to submitting their manuscripts for review. OR  - explained to authors before they begin preparing their manuscript for submission.  - if no such fees are charged that should also be stated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Allegations of Research Misconduct

Publishers and editors shall take reasonable steps to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred. This includes but is not limited to:
- plagiarism
- citation manipulation
- data falsification/fabrication

In no case shall a journal or its editors encourage such misconduct, or knowingly allow such misconduct to take place. In the event that a journal's publisher or editors are made aware of any allegation of research misconduct relating to a published article in their journal, the publisher or editor shall follow COPE's guidelines (or equivalent).

### Publication Ethics

A journal should have policies on publishing ethics. These should be clearly visible on its website, and should refer to:
- journal policies on authorship and contributorship
- how the journal will handle complaints and appeals
- journal policies on conflicts of interest/competing interests
- journal policies on data sharing and reproducibility
- journal's policy on ethical oversight
- journal's policy on intellectual property
- journal's options for post-publication discussions and corrections.

### Publishing Schedule

The periodicity at which a journal publishes shall be clearly indicated.

### Access

The way(s) in which the journal and individual articles are available to readers and whether there are associated subscription or pay per view fees shall be stated.

COPE: Promoting integrity in research and its publication

**ARCHIVING**

A journal’s plan for electronic backup and preservation of access to the journal content shall be clearly indicated (for example, access to main articles via CLOCKSS or PubMedCentral).

This is in the event that a journal is no longer published.

**REVENUE SOURCES**

Business models or revenue sources shall be clearly stated or otherwise evident on the journal’s website.

For example:
- author fees
- subscriptions
- advertising
- reprints
- institutional support
- organizational support

Publishing fees or waiver status should not influence editorial decision making.

**ADVERTISING**

Journals shall state their advertising policy if relevant including:
- what types of adverts will be considered
- who makes decisions regarding accepting adverts
- (online only) whether they are linked to content or reader behavior or are displayed at random.

Advertisements should not be related in any way to editorial decision making and shall be kept separate from the published content.

**DIRECT MARKETING**

Any direct marketing activities, including solicitation of manuscripts that are conducted on behalf of the journal, shall be appropriate, well targeted, and unobtrusive.

Information provided about the publisher or journal is expected to be truthful and not misleading for readers or authors.
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COPE’s Core Practices
Editors/Publishers should have robust and well-described publicly-documented practices in all the following areas for their journals (to be considered alongside specific national and international codes of conduct for research):

- Core Practices: expectations of all stakeholders (including non-members)
- Framework for COPE resources (10 in alphabetical order)
- COPE “Codes of Conduct” no longer exist; use Core Practices for basis of own codes of conduct

https://publicationethics.org/core-practices
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COPE’s Core Practices and the Principles of Transparency

- Allegations of Misconduct
- Complaints & Appeals
- Data & Reproducibility
- Intellectual Property
- Peer Review Processes
- Authorship & Contributorship
- Conflicts of Interest
- Ethical Oversight
- Journal Management
- Post-Publication Discussions & Corrections

publicationethics.org
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COPE’s Core Practices

1. Allegations of misconduct

Journals should have a clearly described process for handling allegations, however they are brought to the journal’s or publisher’s attention. Journals must take seriously allegations of misconduct pre-publication and post-publication. Policies should include how to handle allegations from whistleblowers.

2. Authorship and contributorship

Clear policies (that allow for transparency around who contributed to the work and in what capacity) should be in place for requirements for authorship and contributorship as well as processes for managing potential disputes.
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COPE’s Core Practices

3. Complaints and appeals

Journals should have a clearly described process for handling complaints against the journal, its staff, editorial board or publisher.

4. Conflicts of interest

There must be clear definitions of conflicts of interest and processes for handling conflicts of interest of authors, reviewers, editors, journals and publishers, whether identified before or after publication.
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COPE’s Core Practices

5. Data and reproducibility

Journals should include policies on data availability and encourage the use of reporting guidelines and registration of clinical trials and other study designs according to standard practice in their discipline.

6. Ethical oversight

Ethical oversight should include, but is not limited to, policies on consent to publication, publication on vulnerable populations, ethical conduct of research using animals, ethical conduct of research using human subjects, handling confidential data and ethical business/marketing practices.
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COPE’s Core Practices

7. Intellectual property

All policies on intellectual property, including copyright and publishing licenses, should be clearly described. In addition, any costs associated with publishing should be obvious to authors and readers. Policies should be clear on what counts as prepublication that will preclude consideration. What constitutes plagiarism and redundant/overlapping publication should be specified.

8. Journal management

A well-described and implemented infrastructure is essential, including the business model, policies, processes and software for efficient running of an editorially independent journal, as well as the efficient management and training of editorial boards and editorial and publishing staff.
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COPE’s Core Practices

9. Peer review processes

All peer review processes must be transparently described and well managed. Journals should provide training for editors and reviewers and have policies on diverse aspects of peer review, especially with respect to adoption of appropriate models of review and processes for handling conflicts of interest, appeals and disputes that may arise in peer review.

10. Post-publication discussions, corrections

Journals must allow debate post-publication either on their site, through letters to the editor, or on an external moderated site, such as PubPeer. They must have mechanisms for correcting, revising or retracting articles after publication.
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COPE’s resources, https://publicationethics.org/resources

• 10 core practices
  o Flowcharts for handling cases of alleged misconduct
  o Infographics on detecting/preventing misconduct
  o Best practice guidelines
  o Discussion documents
  o Newsletter, presentation archives
  o COPE Forum cases

• For COPE members (Editors/Publishers & Associate Members):
  ✓ E-Learning modules
  ✓ Letter templates, Self-audit tool for journals
  ✓ Seminars/workshops and webinars
  ✓ COPE Forum
  ✓ Use of COPE logo in journal/website
  ✓ Fee waivers/reductions possible

Join at https://publicationethics.org/join-cope
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https://publicationethics.org/files/General_Approach_To_Publication_Ethics_For_Editorial_Office.pdf
GUIDELINES FOR MANAGING THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SOCIETY-OWNED JOURNALS, THEIR SOCIETY, AND PUBLISHERS

The journals of ‘Learned Societies’ and ‘Professional Associations’ are an important part of the scientific literature. Regardless of the publication arrangements (i.e., self-published by the society, published under contract with a professional publishing house, or some combination of both) and the number of journals affiliated with that society, the policies of and the relationships among the journals, any publisher and the society – both staff and volunteer leaders – must be of the highest quality, ethically sound, and as transparent as possible.

What to do if you suspect redundant (duplicate) publication

(a) Suspected redundant publication in a submitted manuscript

Reviewer informs editor about redundant publication

Redundancy detected by text-matching software (e.g. CrossCheck screening)

Thank reviewer and say you plan to investigate. Get full documentary evidence if not already provided

Check extent and nature of overlap/redundancy

Major overlap/redundancy (i.e. based on same data with identical or very similar findings and/or evidence that authors have sought to hide redundancy e.g. by changing title or author order or not citing previous papers)

Minor overlap with some element of redundancy or legitimate overlap (e.g. methods) or re-analysis (e.g. sub-group/extended follow-up/discussion aimed at different audience)

No significant overlap

https://publicationethics.org/files/redundant%20publication%20A_0.pdf
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What to do if you suspect plagiarism
(a) Suspected plagiarism in a submitted manuscript

1. Reviewer informs editor about suspected plagiarism
2. Thank reviewer and say you plan to investigate
   Get full documentary evidence if not already provided
3. Check degree of copying
4. Clear plagiarism (unattributed use of large portions of text and/or data, presented as if they were by the plagiarist)
5. Minor copying of short phrases only (e.g. in discussion of research paper from non-native language speaker)
   No misattribution of data
6. Redundancy (i.e. copying from author’s own work)—see flowcharts on redundancy
7. No problem

Note: The instructions to authors should include a definition of plagiarism and state the journal’s policy on it
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RETRACTION GUIDELINES

Summary

Journal editors should consider retracting a publication if:

• they have clear evidence that the findings are unreliable, either as a result of misconduct (e.g. data fabrication) or honest error (e.g. miscalculation or experimental error)

• the findings have previously been published elsewhere without proper crossreferencing, permission or justification (i.e. cases of redundant publication)

• it constitutes plagiarism

https://publicationethics.org/files/retraction%20guidelines_0.pdf
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COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

Irene Hames on behalf of COPE Council
March 2013, v.1

Peer review in all its form plays an important role in ensuring the integrity of the scholarly record. The process depends to a large extent on trust, and requires that everyone involved behaves responsibly and ethically. Peer reviewers play a central and critical part in the peer-review process, but too often come to the role without any guidance and may be unaware of their ethical obligations. The COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers set out the basic principles and standards to which all peer reviewers should adhere during the peer-review process. It is hoped they will provide helpful guidance to researchers, be a reference for journals and editors in guiding their reviewers, and act as an educational resource for institutions in training their students and researchers.

Basic principles to which peer reviewers should adhere

Peer reviewers should:

• only agree to review manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner

• respect the confidentiality of peer review and not reveal any details of a manuscript or its review, during or after the peer-review process, beyond those that are released by the journal

https://publicationethics.org/files/Peer%20review%20guidelines_0.pdf
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COPE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION ETHICS

Who “owns” peer reviews? COPE Discussion Document
Tara Hoke and Elizabeth Moylan on behalf of COPE Council
16 September 2016

This document aims to stimulate discussion about ownership rights in peer reviewer reports. Here we set out some of the issues that have arisen in previous discussions around peer review, some of which are specific to various models of peer review. We hope that the concepts discussed assist journal editors and publishers in establishing guidelines and practices for handling this issue. COPE welcomes additional comments from journal editors, reviewers, researchers, institutions, funders and third party services on this subject. Please email all comments to Natalie Ridgeway, COPE Executive Officer at http://publicationethics.org/contact-us

Introduction
Two trends have recently come together within scholarly publication: open peer review and the desire to give recognition to the work peer reviewers do (see also 1). At the convergence are organisations like Publons® and Academic Karma® who wish to openly acknowledge the work of peer reviewers by recording, not only the amount, but also, in some circumstances, the content of individuals’ peer review activity. Emergence of these services therefore prompts a number of questions as to how best to ensure the interests of the author, reviewer, editor, journal and other stakeholders are protected.

Scope/limitations
Journals will have to determine how this guidance fits into their own peer review guidelines. At a minimum, this document raises issues that editors should consider as they monitor and revise their workflow and internal processes to acknowledge the work of peer reviewers and consider entering into agreements with organisations that publish peer reviews. It also describes considerations that should
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PREPRINTS

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

A preprint is a scholarly manuscript posted by the author(s) in an openly accessible platform, usually before or in parallel with the peer review process. While the sharing of manuscripts via preprint platforms has been common in some disciplines (such as physics and mathematics) for many years, uptake in other disciplines traditionally had been low, possibly influenced by differences in research culture and strong opposition by some journal publishers [1]. The landscape has evolved rapidly in other fields in recent years, however, thanks...
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How to recognise potential manipulation of the peer review process

- Recognised Features or Patterns of Reviewer Activity
  - Report preference of differing individuals
  - Positive review in strong contrast to other reviews
  - Complimentary reviews but point to minor technical issues
  - Similarity to other peer reviewer reports
  - A review that is vague in style
  - Positive review not backed up by minor technical issues
  - Non-institutional email addresses
  - Work in an unlisted subject under the manuscript
  - Extremely quick to agree on peer review

Best practice to minimise peer review manipulation

1. SUBMIT
   - Require that authors submit manuscripts to the journal themselves.

2. VERIFY
   - Try to use institutional emails or institutionally verified ORCIDs when inviting peer reviewers.

3. QUALIFY
   - Always check that suggested peer reviewers are qualified to review the manuscript and their email address is accurate.

4. BEHAVIOUR
   - Check for unusual patterns of behaviour which in combination may suggest peer review manipulation is occurring.

References:
1. COPE Ethical Guidelines to Peer Review.
5. Can You Spot a Faker? The Trend of Fake Peer Reviewers. Allison McCook
6. Organised Crimes Against the Academic Peer Review System. Adam Cohen et al
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How to Recognise Potential Authorship Problems

Authorship Policies:
Clear policies that allow for transparency around who contributed to the work and in what capacity should be in place for requirements for authorship and contribution as well as processes for managing potential disputes.

For further details see: publicationethics.org/authorship

Relevant COPE Cases:
Withdrawal Request by an Author: https://bit.ly/2EjJeAE

Relevant Flowcharts:
How to Spot Authorship Problems: https://bit.ly/2EJx3H4

What to do if you suspect systematic manipulation of the Publication Process: https://bit.ly/3LmJkC6

References:

Detectable Authorship Problems

Best Practice to Minimise Authorship Problems

1. Submit
- Adopt policies that allow for transparency around who contributed to the work and in what capacity

2. Encourage
- Facilitate awareness of emerging standards, e.g., ORCID and CReditT

3. Behaviour
- Check for unusual patterns of behaviour which may suggest authorship problems
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AUTHORSHIP

Introduction
This document, based on the COPE Discussion Document titled What Constitutes Authorship? resulted from a review of the COPE Forum cases related to authorship, comments from COPE members related to the discussion document, and a desire to move past the stage of discussion to providing practical advice on addressing the most common issues around authorship. We are therefore providing specific guidance where there seems to be consensus and asking for further comments from COPE members in some areas.

Please send your feedback to: Natalie Ridgeway, Executive Officer at:
cope_execofficer@publicationethics.org

Definition
The term authorship can refer to the creator or originator of an idea (eg, the author of the theory of relativity)

https://publicationethics.org/files/COPE_DD_A4_Authorship_SEPT19_SCREEN_AW.pdf
Sharing of Information Among Editors-in-Chief Regarding Possible Misconduct

Steve Yentis (former COPE Council member and Editor-in-Chief, Anaesthesia) and COPE Council
March 2015

Introduction

This guidance has been drafted following a COPE Discussion Forum (4 September 2013, http://tinyurl.com/pn43bxk) and Discussion Document (February 2014, http://tinyurl.com/lqag4uh) on the subject, and it was initiated in the wake of a number of high-profile cases of research misconduct in which the sharing of information between the relevant editors-in-chief (EiCs) was crucial to the final settlement of the cases."
Cooperation between research institutions and journals on research integrity cases: guidance from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

Summary

Institutions and journals both have important duties relating to research and publication misconduct. Institutions are responsible for the conduct of their researchers and for encouraging a healthy research environment. Journals are responsible for the conduct of their editors, for safeguarding the research record, and for ensuring the reliability of everything they publish. It is therefore important for institutions and journals to communicate and collaborate effectively on cases relating to research integrity. To achieve this, we make the following recommendations.

https://publicationethics.org/files/Research_institutions_guidelines_final_0_0.pdf
Publication ethics – a complex problem?

Could we aim to move the culture of publishing towards one where ethical practices become the norm—part of the culture itself—not something imposed from outside?

倫理的行動がごく当たり前に出版文化の一部となるのを目指すべきで、外部から押し付けられるものではいけない。

Ginny Barbour, Past Chair COPE
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Thank you!

publicationethics.org
COPE: Promoting integrity in research and its publication

Trevor Lane, MA, DPhil
Education & Engagement Consultant, Edanz Group, and Council Member, Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)
tlane@edanzgroup.com

“The Transformation in scholarly publishing: Research integrity and publication ethics”
21 October 2019, Tokyo, Japan