



COPE seminar 2006 - March 10
Harvey Room, BMA House, Tavistock Square, London 9.30 am – 4.30 pm

Programme

9.30 Registration

10.00 Welcome – Fiona Godlee

10.05 Panel for Research Integrity (UK) – Michael Farthing

10.20 Publication ethics and research in other countries
- China – Yuan-Fang Chen
- Croatia – Vedran Katavic

10.40 Workshop with discussion of hypothetical cases from other countries

11.15 *Tea Break*

11.30 Workshop feedback – chaired by John Overbeke

12.15 Plenary: What should journal editors consider before they publish studies involving animal research? – chaired by Liz Wager
David R Katz
David Morton

12.45 *Lunch*

1.45 - COPE AGM

2.00 Making the COPE website work for you: real time demonstration of an editor using the website to resolve an issue – Harvey Marcovitch

2.15 Discussion

2.30 Group work on example cases

3.15 *Tea Break*

3.30 Debate: Impact factors: their massaging by journal editors is wrong
For the motion – Pritpal S Tamber
Opposing the motion – Tim Albert

4.00 New Indexing Services – Matthew Cockerill

4.15 General discussion and seminar overview – Harvey Marcovitch

4.30 Summary and Close

Please note that the proceedings of the seminar will be recorded and in some cases reported verbatim in COPE's annual report. By attending the seminar you are agreeing that any feedback you give will be recorded and may appear in print.

COPE Annual Seminar 2006
9.30–16.30 Friday 10 March 2006
Harvey Room, BMA House, Tavistock Square, London

Workshop with discussion of hypothetical cases from other countries

- 1 You receive an email from an Associate Editor to whom a manuscript has been assigned incorrectly. The Associate Editor is a co-author on the paper but has emailed you to say that he had not seen the paper before submission, had not worked on the paper and in fact doesn't know the corresponding (and first) author. The corresponding author is obviously from a developing country but his affiliation and email address is at a prestigious US institute.

You email the corresponding author with the Associate Editor's concerns and the requirements for authorship, asking for an explanation. You receive a reply from the author in which it is clear that he does not understand the requirements for authorship as the Associate Editor is listed as having 'inspired him and provided several of his papers'.

What would you do now?

- 2 You receive a manuscript from authors in another country that describes an intervention in an animal model. Both reviewers draw attention to the fact that the model used in these experiments would not be ethically acceptable in the UK.

You email the corresponding author with the reviewers' concerns, who responds promptly stating that the work has already been presented at an international scientific meeting and that an ethical committee for experiments involving animals had approved the study. Documents in the local language of the author are provided to support the statement.

What would you do now?

- 3 You receive an email from a reviewer complaining that his review of a paper submitted to your journal has appeared on the internet. Although the review is not signed, citations to his own work in it make the reviewer worried that people may be able to recognise him from it. He asks how is it possible that his review has ended up on another publisher's website when he thought it was confidential?

The paper concerned was rejected by you after peer review. As is normal practice, you sent a rejection email with the reviewers' comments appended to it. You contact the corresponding author, who explains what he has done. The website in question is a 'pre-print server' of a publisher based in northern Europe. It encourages authors whose manuscripts have been rejected by a journal to upload them with the reviewers' comments received for an 'interactive open peer review' by readers of the site. If their manuscript is suitably revised, then the publisher will consider (for a fee) publishing it in one of their open-access journals. The author believes he has done nothing wrong as the reviewers' comments were transmitted to him by email by you, as the editor, and he can do what he wants with them.

What would you do now?