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Taylor & Francis and COPE

- All Taylor & Francis journals are members of COPE

- T&F editors may attend COPE Forums, access the flowcharts and submit queries to COPE for advice

- T&F are working closely with COPE on AHSS-specific issues and resources
Aim for this session

Discuss guidelines and training from COPE and Taylor & Francis to help with the publishing ethics challenges which you face.

Share your experiences of publishing ethics cases and questions as journal editors.
Ethics cases: some stats

Volume of publication ethics cases seen annually

Base: All with an opinion (0)
* Indicates caution: low base of less than 20 respondents
### Types of ethical problems

Common problems within all disciplines, but sometimes different treatment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Authorship</th>
<th>Libel and defamation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Quotes more often used in AHSS</td>
<td>• Different definitions can apply in STEM and AHSS</td>
<td>• Greater risks in AHSS due to more focus on subjective analyses of other people’s views and the world around us, rather than “raw laboratory data”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM often see overlap in methods/materials sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Types of ethical problems

### New types of problems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online harassment</th>
<th>Political pressure</th>
<th>Issues around research with human subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Especially around topics such as race and gender</td>
<td>• Leading to withdrawal of submitted articles</td>
<td>• Using social media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key findings

Co-authorship is increasingly typical
74% of respondents reported that the typical number of authors per paper in their area of expertise is now two or more. Over half of respondents believe the incidence of co-authorship has increased since the beginning of their research careers. The most common reason identified for this growth of co-authorship was ‘increasing competition and greater performance-based pressures’.

Researchers encounter problems attributing authorship fairly
Co-authorship is not without its challenges. When asked about the most commonly occurring problems associated with co-authorship, the highest scoring responses related to the order in which author names should be listed and determining who should receive an authorship credit. Where no author has made a dominant contribution, respondents believe authors should either be listed jointly as first authors or should be listed alphabetically.

There is an authorship attribution ‘reality gap’
There are conditions regarded as being important for determining an authorship claim in practice which respondents do not believe would have significance in an ideal world. In practice, too much weight is placed on being a senior ranked researcher, the supervisor of a doctoral student, or a research grant holder. As a result, respondents believe that there is a tendency for senior academics to be over-credited and junior ranked academics to be under-credited in comparison to other authors.

Instead, researchers believe that an authorship credit should go to those who are responsible for the conception and/or design of a project; the analysis and/or interpretation of data; or drafting the paper or revising it critically for intellectual content.

Few researchers receive guidance and training on authorship
Only 25% of respondents reported that guidance on authorship is included in the research ethics policy of their institution. Just 18% have received training or guidance from their institution in respect to determining academic authorship.

Editors and reviewers would intervene if they suspected incorrect authorship attribution
The majority of editors surveyed would ask the corresponding author of a paper to amend the authorship list if they believed an uncredited research assistant had made a substantial contribution to the paper. Most reviewers would also give advice to the journal editor to take this course of action.
Steps for dealing with ethics problems

- Keep the case confidential
- Contact your Taylor & Francis Managing Editor for guidance and support
- Use the COPE flowcharts
- Request a Crossref Similarity Check report
- Draw on your editorial board for subject specific expertise
- Take advantage of peer-review systems features
- Use it as an education opportunity
- Keep up-to-date with Editor Resources
Peer Review and Research Integrity team

This new team work with Taylor & Francis Editorial teams to:

- manage peer review policies across all journals
- act as a central point for ethics queries and cases
- monitor and report on change and innovation in industry standards
- take responsibility for new peer review initiatives.

Peer review initiatives include:

- Publons
- Open peer review trial
Deborah Kahn
Publishing Director, Medicine & Open Access
Taylor & Francis
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COPE Council member
COPE’s role is to assist editors of scholarly journals and publisher/owners in their endeavour to **preserve and promote the integrity of the scholarly record** through policies and practices that reflect the current best principles of transparency as well as integrity.

COPE is a membership organisation. COPE’s **12,000 members** are primarily **editors of journals and publishers** and we are currently exploring expanding our membership. Part of this potential expansion is being explored with a pilot project with **five universities around the world**.

COPE operates, manages, and governs the organisation with a small group of paid employees and a **group of active volunteers** who serve on the trustee board and council.
OUR CORE PRACTICES
Policies and practices required to reach the highest standards in publication ethics

View all core practices

publicationethics.org
COPE assists editors of scholarly journals and publishers - as well as other parties, such as institutions - in their work to preserve and promote the integrity of the scholarly record through policies and practices. COPE describes these in 10 “Core Practices”. COPE's Core Practices should be considered alongside specific national and international codes of conduct for research.

Core practices are the policies and practices journals and publishers need, to reach the highest standards in publication ethics. We include cases with advice, guidance for day-to-day practice, education modules and events on topical issues, to support journals and publishers fulfil their policies.

1. Allegations of misconduct
2. Authorship and contributorship
3. Complaints and appeals
4. Conflicts of interest / Competing interests
5. Data and reproducibility
6. Ethical oversight
7. Intellectual property
8. Journal management
9. Peer review processes
10. Post-publication discussions and corrections

https://publicationethics.org/core-practices
Resources

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

• For members:
  – E-Learning modules
  – Letter templates, Self-audit tool for journals
  – Seminars/workshops and webinars
  – COPE Forum

https://publicationethics.org/resources
Infographic


How to recognise potential manipulation of the peer review process

The features or patterns of activity shown are suggested to help recognise potential signs of peer review manipulation.

Often it is the occurrence of these features in combination that may indicate a potential issue.
What to do if you suspect redundant (duplicate) publication

(a) Suspected redundant publication in a submitted manuscript

1. Reviewer informs editor about redundant publication
2. Redundancy detected by text-matching software (e.g., CrossCheck screening)
3. Thank reviewer and say you plan to investigate. Get full documentary evidence if not already provided.
4. 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
Guidelines

https://publicationethics.org/files/retraction%20guidelines_0.pdf

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
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...
Taylor & Francis and COPE

- All Taylor & Francis journals are members of COPE, and editors may attend COPE Forums, access the flowcharts, submit queries
- Taylor & Francis is the leading publisher of AHSS journals through our Routledge brand
- COPE originates from a biomedical tradition
- We have a joint requirement to develop ethical guidelines for the particular needs of AHSS scholars
Rowena Lamb
Head of Research Integrity, UCL
Professor Cynthia Graham, PhD
Editor-in-Chief of *The Journal of Sex Research*
A case of duplicate submission

Prof. Cynthia A. Graham, Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief
The Journal of Sex Research
Impetus for action:
• Received a request to review a manuscript by another journal.
• Recognised the title and abstract of the paper as the same as one that had recently been submitted to JSR.
• Assigned the manuscript to an Associate Editor, but the paper had not yet been sent out for review.
First steps:

• Contacted the assigned T&F editor to ask if the publishers had any policy or guidelines about possible cases of dual submission;
• Consulted COPE for guidance
• Contacted the previous Editor-in-Chief of JSR to ask if there were any journal-specific procedures for dealing with cases of duplicate submission (there were not)
• Emailed the Editor-in-Chief and Managing Editor of the other journal to communicate concerns that this was a case of duplicate submission.
• Quick response from the Editors of the other journal and agreed that this was potentially a case of dual submission.
Actions:

• Both journals suspended the review process for the article;
• Shared author details, submission details, and the manuscripts to confirm that the papers were the same;
• Both journals required authors to “confirm that the manuscript has been submitted solely to this journal, and is not published, in press, or submitted elsewhere” and the submitting author of this paper had signified confirmation of this;
**Actions:**

- Established that the content of both papers was identical (and they were submitted on the same day!), then contact the submitting author to request an explanation;
- The letter was sent jointly to the first author of the paper, and stated that “it had been brought to our attention that a possible incident of dual submission may have occurred.” It also highlighted the fact that simultaneous submission of a manuscript to more than one journal is considered an ethical violation within publishing.
- Informed the author that all further review of their manuscript had been suspended.
- Response from the author (who was a Master’s student): “I'm new to this process and made the mistake. It's probably not the only error in my submission.”
Subsequent steps/Resolution:

• Both journals rejected the manuscript, using this text:

  "Although you said that this was a "mistake" on your part, as part of your submission you did state that the manuscript was not under review with another journal. As Dr X said in his letter, the simultaneous submission of a manuscript to more than one journal is considered an ethical violation within publishing. In view of this I have terminated further review of your manuscript."

• Further actions were considered, such as a ban on future submissions from the authors or notification of the author’s host institution but decided against these. The T&F editorial contact agreed that this was the best course of action for this case.
Group Work

A. On your table, discuss:
   - The steps you would take to resolve your case
   - The questions you would ask
   - Where you would look for guidance

B. How do your steps compare with advice from COPE?

C. Does your case study have any relevance to:
   - Issues on your journals?
   - Issues in your subject area?
A1: Authorship Dispute Regarding Author Order

- Paper accepted by journal in 2012 but there was a lengthy disagreement between the four authors regarding the order of authorship.

- The paper could not publish until all authors had signed a written agreement on the order of authorship and copyright form, which was finally received in 2015.

- Changes were then made during the proofing stage and approved by the corresponding author; however, these changes were disputed by another of the authors, who has now requested retraction of the paper from Early View.
A2: Withdrawing from Authorship

- A journal published a paper which is now under investigation by the host institution for misconduct
- All authors signed that they agreed authorship and took responsibility for the content of the paper
- An author has now asked to be removed from authorship
P1: A Case of Plagiarism?

- Paper published in journal
- A reader informed the Editor that the whole of the introduction was directly copied from another publication
- Editor-in-Chief wishes to retract the paper immediately
- Author wishes to publish a correction, as a retraction will affect their future career development
Journal has recently introduced systematic analysis of all submitted manuscripts for plagiarised text, using anti-plagiarism software.

30-50% of submitted manuscripts return a positive response to this software, indicating copy values of 25-35% (substantial values beyond fortuitous incidences).

No case of plagiarism of ideas or fraud, but a general question of how to handle manuscripts which attribute one third of their passages to other sources – these are not considered good science writing practice.
P3: Self-plagiarism?

• A paper was published with four authors from two universities.

• After publication, one author contacted the Editor claiming a case of plagiarism: the final paper was a direct copy of an MSc thesis which this author had supervised 7 years previously.

• The authors included the person whose work was being plagiarised as first author and the supervisor of that work, who is also complaining about the publication of the paper.

• The claim was that the other authors had plagiarised the MSc thesis and had no right to publish the material, and the complainant states the work belongs to him and not his student.