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Aim for this session

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

Go through some examples of publishing ethics cases and questions faced by journal editors.
Peer Review Policy & Research Integrity team

This 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.
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Ethics cases: some stats

Volume of publication ethics cases seen annually

- Total (484)
- Engineering, Maths and Tech (18*)
- Other sciences (27)
- Arts, Humanities, Social Sci. (24)
- Econ., Fin., Bus. and Industry (15*)
- Life sciences (45)
- Medicine and Veterinary (120)

Base: All with an opinion
* Indicates caution: low base of less than 20 respondents
Ethics cases in 2018

- Allied & Public Health
- Arts & Humanities
- Behavioral Sciences & Social Care
- Biological, Earth and Environmental Science
- Business, Economics & Sociology
- Education
- Geography, Information Science, Sport, and Heritage
- Medicine & Health Science
- Multiple HOSTs
- Physical Sciences & Engineering
- Politics, IR & Area Studies
Common types of ethical problems

These occur within all disciplines, but sometimes with 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>• Different approaches to authorship globally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerging ethical problems

New types of problems are becoming more common:

<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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Big data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ‘Sokal Squared’ hoax – what are T&F doing?

1. Implementing additional journal editorial office and peer review systems support on selected journals

2. Trialling extended author checks

3. Training for journal editors

4. Peer review consultation with journal editors
So, you’ve got concerns about a paper...

- 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
Deborah Kahn
Publishing Director, Medicine & Open Access
COPE Council Member
Taylor & Francis
COPE
Promoting integrity in research and its publication

- 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. Our >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.

**Our core practices**

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 fulfill 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](https://publicationethics.org/core-practices)
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.

COPE Journal Audit

https://publicationethics.org/resources/audit
Suggested Guide for Approaching Organisation of the Editorial Office to Comply with COPE’s Core Practices

COPE has many resources to assist publishers and editors in making decisions about ethical issues in publication, including guidelines, flowcharts, discussion documents, sample letters, eLearning modules, and an audit tool. This overview is a suggested guide for approaching organisation of the editorial office to comply with COPE guidelines.

**For New Journals Just Establishing an Editorial Office, Begin With the COPE Core Practices and Guidelines From the Publisher.**

- Yes

**Develop Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers Based on Core Practices #2 and #9.**
- Develop internal processes to support identification of ethical concerns, e.g., Core Practices #1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10.
- Develop guidelines for promptly responding to suspected ethical breaches by authors, reviewers, and editors (Core Practice #3).

- Yes

Established and new journals should consider developing a training program for editors and editorial board members using the eLearning course, available for COPE members, on the COPE website (www.publicationethics.org/resources/e-learning) or other appropriate resources.

**For Established COPE Member Journals Wishing to Evaluate Current Processes, Begin With the Publication Ethics Audit Tool.**

- Yes

Based on the results of the audit, develop or locate resources to address issues uncovered.
- If authorship criteria are not clearly articulated in policies, review resources such as the ICME Authorship Criteria and studies on journals’ instructions to authors (Core Practice #2).
COPE AHSS Survey

COPE recognise that approaches to ethics can differ between STEM and AHSS subject area.

COPE are working with an external research agency to survey arts, humanities and social sciences journal editors on their experience of ethics on their journals.

The results of this survey will inform COPE’s approach to AHSS issues and help prioritise resources needed to support these subjects.

We encourage AHSS journal editors to attend COPE events and online forums. Our next seminar will be in Philadelphia on the theme ‘Challenges and Solutions: Issues of Inclusion and Diversity in the Humanities and Social Sciences’
CASE DISCUSSIONS

GO TO: https://www.slido.com

USE CODE: #TFEDITORS
Case 1: A request for authorship on published paper

Journal contacted by an individual who had recently seen a published article and was surprised that they were not listed as an author because it utilised samples from a database that they established.

Journal then contacted the corresponding author of the article for more information. The corresponding author said that the complainant contributed substantially to the development of the cohort, but was not involved in the design, evaluation or preparation of the data.
Case 1: A request for authorship on published paper

Does the complainant meet common guidelines for authorship e.g. ICMJE?

– Yes
– No
– I’m not sure
Case 1: A request for authorship on published paper

If the authors cannot agree, who should make a decision about who should be an author on the paper?

– The journal editor
– The corresponding author
– The publisher
– The authors’ institution
Case 1: A request for authorship on published paper

Is a correction or a retraction an appropriate course of action in this case?

– Correction
– Retraction
– No action
Case 1: A request for authorship on published paper

- One solution in such cases is for journals to list the contributions of each author. When contributions are clearly listed on a paper, it sometimes becomes clear that some of the contributors do not in fact qualify for authorship, so this practice should be encouraged by journals.

- Institutions need to take responsibility for these types of decisions and should have robust mechanisms in place. It is almost impossible for journals and editors to sort out these issues on their own.

- In this case, the issue was escalated to the institution who agreed a correction should be issued acknowledging the contribution of the individual contributing the dataset.

https://publicationethics.org/case/requesting-authorship-after-publication
Case 2: Self-plagiarism/salami-slicing

- Journal A accepted a manuscript with six authors in June, which was published in January the following year.

- Several months later, the editors found a paper published elsewhere, which shared striking similarities to paper A. Journal B accepted paper B in November and published it in February the following year. There was overlap in authors.

- The editorial board of journal A concurred that papers A and B were written (i) in an identical manner or format of presentation; (ii) under the same study design with only minor changes that would make little clinical difference; and (iii) with extensive use of recycled texts which covered most of the papers, including the majority of the materials and discussion sections.

Case 2: Self-plagiarism/salami-slicing

Should the editor inform the other journal editor?

– Yes
– No
– I’m not sure
Should one or both papers be retracted?

– Both papers retracted
– Paper A retracted
– Paper B retracted
– Neither paper retracted
Case 2: Self-plagiarism/salami-slicing

Articles should be retracted to correct the literature not to punish the authors.

Advice was it’s up to journal B to retract the paper for redundant publication or salami publishing because journal A published the article first. Hence it is journal B’s responsibility here to address the misconduct. The editor should contact journal B and inform them of the issue.

Possibility that the authors were inexperienced and did not think their paper was going to be accepted by journal A because of the time between acceptance and publication? The authors may then have slightly altered the paper and submitted it to journal B? It may be that this is an educational opportunity.