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“Where is there dignity unless there is honesty?”

“没有诚信哪有尊严” --古罗马思想家西罗言
- By Cicero, the famous ancient Roman philosopher (106-45 BC)

“Make the purpose sincere” 【Cheng-yi 诚意】
“Cultivate personal virtue” 【Xiu-shen 修身】
- By Confucius, ancient Chinese philosopher (551-479 BC)

“Scientific integrity--editors on the front line”

“科研诚信--编辑在第一线！”
- The main theme of 13th EASE Conference in 2016
An opinion: More police cannot stop all plagiarism, but we can take positive steps to reduce it

In 2010, we applied COPE Research Grant in order to know:

1. What are journal publishers' and editors’ attitudes to, and tolerance of, typical plagiarism in different disciplines?

2. What are the mainstream views and differences between editors in Western countries and non-Western countries?

3. How do journal publishers and editors worldwide use tools such as CrossCheck etc. and how do they handle the statistics that it produce?

Note: In the past few years, JZUS’s team published many papers & a book that record our research results and would be useful references in publishing area (see next slides).
List of editor papers focused on scholarly publishing, academic ethics, etc.

- Anti-Plagiarism policy of JZUS
- Bilingual (multilingual) publications and duplicate publications: for or against? (YH ZHANG)
- Detecting and (not) dealing with plagiarism in an engineering paper: beyond CrossCheck—a case study (YH ZHANG & ZHUO & YH ZHANG)
- A survey on the use of CrossCheck for detecting plagiarism in journal articles (YH ZHANG & XY JIA)
- Be careful! Avoiding duplication: a case study (YH ZHANG & XY JIA)
- Replication of the methods section in biosciences papers: is it plagiarism? (XY JIA, XF TAN & YH ZHANG)
- Republication of conference papers in journals? (YH ZHANG & XY JIA)
- How to stop plagiarism? Blacklist repeat offenders (Yuehong ZHANG & Ian McIntosh)
- Chinese journal finds 31% of submissions plagiarized (Helen ZHANG)
- International, not campus, please (Helen ZHANG)
- CrossCheck: an effective tool for detecting plagiarism (Helen ZHANG)
- On indexing in the Web of Science and predicting journal impact factor (Xiu-fang WU)
- Journal of Zhejiang University (SCIENCE): a new journal for the 21st century (Helen ZHANG)
- An international peer-review system for a Chinese scientific journal (Helen ZHANG)
- The English-language academic journals of China: trends and developments (Helen ZHANG)
- Foreseeing the prospects of China's scientific and technical periodicals from the output of Chinese and foreign scientific and technical articles (Helen ZHANG, in Japanese)
- How many Chinese journals are included in the newly indexed 700 regional journals on Web of Science (Xiu-fang WU)
- 技术创新与诚信并行《浙江大学举报（英文版）》的国际品牌塑造（叶青，缪弈洲，张欣欣，林汉枫，张月红）
- 科研诚信是全球永远的课题——中国科研管理与学术出版的诚信环境（叶青，杨树辉，张月红）
- CrossRef文本和数据挖掘服务（张欣欣，缪弈洲，张月红）
Discipline-Specific Plagiarism Issues

Sample 1: Learned Publishing 26.189-196, 2013

Republication of conference papers in journals?

Yuehong (Helen) ZHANG and Xiaoyan JIA
Zhejiang University, China

ABSTRACT: Conference proceedings are one of the most important forms of communication for computer scientists. This study investigated the policies of a large number of computer science journals with regard to the republication of papers which had already appeared in conference proceedings. Nearly one-quarter of journal editors would not republish such papers other than in special circumstances (such as a special conference issue), and almost all of the remainder would do so only after substantial updating and expansion of the original paper. Many specified the amount of content that should be new: 30% was the proportion most frequently mentioned. Thus,

Introduction

It is well known that conference proceedings play a much larger role in publishing and communication in both computer and electrical & electronics engineering (EEE) sciences than in other fields. However, it is unclear to what extent journal editors in these areas accept articles for publication that have been previously published as conference papers. If editors rely on CrossCheck to detect possible plagiarism, they are likely to find papers with a high similarity score simply because they have been previously published as conference papers; technically, this would be defined as self-plagiarism.

In 2011, the present authors carried out a global survey of authors in a range of disciplines. One of the 22 questions was: ‘Should papers previously published in conference proceedings legitimately be republished in journals?’ 60% of the respondents, across a range of different disciplines, thought that conference papers could properly be republished provided that the author included new content; on average, they indicated that new material should constitute 46% of the republi-
Replication of the methods section in biosciences papers: is it plagiarism?

Xiaoyan Jia · Xufeit Tan · Yuehong Zhang

Received: 28 December 2012 / Published online: 15 May 2013
© Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, Hungary 2013

Abstract  To find out whether replication of methods section in biosciences papers is a kind of plagiarism, the authors firstly surveyed the behavior of authors when writing the methods section in their published papers. Then the descriptions of one well-established method in randomly selected papers published in eight top journals were analyzed using CrossCheck to identify the extent of duplication. Finally, suggestions on preparing the methods sections were given. The survey results show that an author may employ different approaches to writing the methods section within a paper, repeating published methods is more often than give citation only or rewrite complete using one’s own words. Authors are more likely to repeat the description of a method than simply to provide a citation. From the samples of the eight leading journals, plagiarize is very rare in such journals; Learning from Science, attachment may be a considerable choice for papers with common methods.
Discipline-Specific Plagiarism Issues


Detecting and (not) dealing with plagiarism in an engineering paper: beyond CrossCheck – a case study

Xin-xin ZHANG¹, Zhao-lin HUO², Yue-hong ZHANG††¹

¹Journal of Zhejiang University-SCIENCE (A/B/C), 38 Zheda Road, Hangzhou 310027, China
²Guanghua College of Stomatology, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China
¹E-mail: jzus@zju.edu.cn

Received: 16 April 2013/Accepted: 31 July 2013/Published online 30 August 2013

Abstract: In papers in areas such as engineering and the physical sciences, figures, tables and formulae are the basic elements to communicate the authors’ core ideas, workings and results. As a computational text-matching tool, CrossCheck cannot work on these non-textual elements to detect plagiarism. Consequently, when comparing engineering or physical sciences papers, CrossCheck may return a low similarity index even when plagiarism has in fact taken place. A case of demonstrated plagiarism involving engineering papers with a low similarity index is discussed, and editor’s experiences and suggestions are given on how to tackle this problem. The case shows a large

The eleven chapters are divided into three parts:

I. General Plagiarism Issues;
II. Discipline-Specific Plagiarism Issues;
III. What to Do About It

The most interesting portion of the book is the description of the “anti-plagiarism policy of Journals of Zhejiang University-SCIENCE as it describes the types of plagiarism they typically encounter and their “remedies”.”

--- V. Katavic: book reviews, European Science Editing, V42(2), 2016

“In part II of the book some disciplinary conventions are considered in greater detail”


An example: JZUS anti-plagiarism policy
(that has posted in JZUS website since 2015)

How to deal with plagiarism?
This policy includes three parts:

1. Definitions of nine forms of plagiarism with remedy suggestion for authors

2. Anti-plagiarism policies (remedy) according to different problems for editors

3. Display of its CrossChecking workflow process
   a) What to do if you suspect plagiarism
   b) What to do about plagiarism when detected
**How to Crosscheck similarity by tools for detecting plagiarism**

(with the permission of CrossRef)

**What is OSI% & SMSI% ?**

**OSI:** Overall Similarity Index represents the ‘percentage of similarity’ between a submission and information existing in the CrossCheck/iThenticate databases selected as search targets.

**SMSI:** Single Match Similarity Index represents the percentage of similarity from a single source.

**How CrossCheck works**

- Your document
- CrossCheck
- iThenticate
- Produces a report for each of your documents...

When you select the match it shows you where your article duplicates the source

And you can view the entire source article by clicking here

This is unique* to CrossCheck *so far as we know

Note, it uses fuzzy matching – it will pick up word substitutions

**Similarity report**

- Your article
- Summary of matches (highest to lowest)
- You can select a text-only report

How to deal with a similarity report
On JZUS website (http://www.zju.edu.cn/jzus/Policy.php) there are “the Anti-Plagiarism Policy” & a detailed “pdf (file)” for all reference.

Anti-Plagiarism Policy of JZUS-A/B&FITEE


Nine basic forms of plagiarism

- Self- (or team) plagiarism without identification and acknowledgement
- Cutting and pasting of others' work without identification and acknowledgement
- Replication of methods sections (in Biomedical journals) without clear statement of the source
- Reproduction of conference papers with little added value
- Review papers which largely replicate previously published content
- Plagiarism of images/tables/formulae/data without both acknowledgement and copyright permission
- Plagiarism of ideas
- Wholesale plagiarism of previously published text
- Reproduction in translation without acknowledgment, permission and full citation

Anti-Plagiarism Policy

The general rules that we have come up with are as follows:

The following are acceptable, provided always that (a) the quotation (if any) is typographically identified (by quotation marks or, for longer extracts, indentation), (b) the source is acknowledged in the text, and (c) a full citation to the original is given:

(1) Quotation of a modest amount (under 100 words) of the author's own or others' text;
(2) Paraphrase of previously published text in the author's own words;
(3) Repetition of someone else's ideas;
(4) Reproduction of a chart, image, table or key equation from your own or someone else's work (provided copyright permission has been obtained from the original copyright owner, and acknowledgement is included in whatever form they request);
(5) In Biosciences papers it is acceptable to reproduce the description of a standard/homemade method from a previously published source, provided the source is properly acknowledged;
(6) Reproduction of a previously published conference paper is acceptable, if 60% or more of the content is new and substantive (provided copyright permission has been obtained from the original copyright owner, and acknowledgement is included in whatever form they request).
A. Self- (or team) plagiarism without identification and acknowledgement

When an author (or another author from the same research project) repeats text and/or data from his/her (or the team’s) previously published work, either verbatim or with minimal rewording, without clear acknowledgement, this is defined as self- (or team) plagiarism [3].

Remedy—identify the repeated (or reworded) content and provide full citation to the original publication.

B. Cutting and pasting of others’ work without identification and acknowledgement

When an author directly copies text (or other content), either verbatim or with minimal rewording, from others’ work, the quotation must be clearly identified (by quotation marks or—if necessary—indentation) and a full citation must be provided to the original source. Otherwise, it will be considered plagiarism [10].

Remedy—identify the quoted (or reworded) content and provide full citation to the original publication.
C. Replication of methods sections (in Biomedical journals) without clear statement of the source

When a standard method is identical to that described in a previously published article (whether by the same or different authors), it may be repeated verbatim, but a full citation must be provided to the original source; otherwise, the behavior will be considered plagiarism [8, 11].

Remedy—identify the quoted method and provide full citation to the original source. If the description is particularly long or complex, it may either be (a) appended to the paper as supplemental material or (b) provided in the form of a link to the published original, if this is freely available online [12].
D. Republication of conference papers with little added value

If the paper has not been substantially reworked to include additional detail which could not be included in the conference paper, such as detailed proofs or wider comparison with other work in the field, it would be considered self-plagiarism [13]. 已发表的会议论文未获会议论文出版方的版权允许，未加实质新内容，未做任何透明标识，重新作为新论文投向期刊，归为此类，并视为自我抄袭的一种。

Remedy—add 60% or more of substantive new material, which adds value to the original conference paper. Full citation to the original publication must be given, as well as copyright permission from the original publisher [13].

规范指南：已发会议论文如若再投期刊要求：（1）获取会议论文出版方的版权允许；（2）在原会议论文的基础上加约50%以上实质性新内容；（3）重新作为新论文投期刊时要出示版权许可证明，同时在新论文中标识该文部分内容已经发表在会议等信息。

E. Review papers which largely replicate previously published content

If the summaries consist wholly or mainly of the original authors’ words (OSI > 35%), even if they are clearly identified with quotation marks, this would be considered plagiarism [6]. 综述论文重复度高：其文字以粘粘贴贴的形式使整体相似度指数超过35%，即使重复部分有引用、有引号标识，也归为此类。

Remedy—the review author should rewrite the overview in his or her own words.

规范指南：综述论文的相似度（低于35%）可以理解，但要求：（1）对直接引用文字做引号（“”）标识；（2）要求作者对同行的观点和成果尽可能用自己理解的语言去诠释和解释其意，忌讳直接粘粘贴贴他人的文字组合论文。
F. Plagiarism of images/tables/formulae/data without both acknowledgement and copyright permission

Reproducing illustrative content such as tables, diagrams, images or photographs, or indeed formulae, from someone else’s work without both acknowledgement and (in the case of illustrative content) copyright permission from the original publishers, is considered plagiarism, and potentially also copyright infringement [14]. 图/表/公式和数据抄袭：投稿论文中直接复制他人成果中的图/表/公式和数据，未指明出处或缺少版权许可等归为此。

Remedy—provide full citation to the original source, and (in the case of illustrative material) obtain written copyright permission from the original publisher, and include an acknowledgement in whatever form they require.

规范指南：图表及影像等不仅要求进行完整透明标识，并要向原作者获取版权许可，同时据情致谢。

G. Plagiarism of ideas

If an author reuses another author’s ideas (the product of their intellectual effort) without acknowledgment of the original together with a full citation, this is considered plagiarism [10].

思想抄袭：直接将他人的创意（智力劳动产物）以多种形式，未指明出处或缺少完整引用，假做自己的创意来发表论文等归为此。

Remedy—identify the originator of the idea(s), and provide a full citation to the original published source.

规范指南：期刊要建立作者行为伦理准则，要求投稿作者确认论文的原创贡献归属；同时需要同行评议或发表后同行评议来确认此类问题。

* Additional for G, open peer review is a key from JZUS’s experience
H. Wholesale plagiarism of previously published text

If an author submits, as a new publication, large sections (or even complete articles) of his/her own or others’ previously published text, we consider this to be major plagiarism and/or duplicate publication, and will always reject the article. An indicator of what constitutes ‘large sections’ would be if the SMSI is >10\% or the OSI is >35\%\textsuperscript{[6]}.

**Remedy**—there is no remedy in this instance; the paper will always be rejected.

严重的抄袭：抄袭自己或他人已发表论文的大段文字（单篇相似度超过10\%，或者整体相似度指数超过35\%），甚至全文复制，归此类。

I. Republication in translation without acknowledgment, permission and full citation

If an author submits for publication an article which has already been published in another language without acknowledging the fact, this would be considered self-plagiarism. The fact that the article has already been published in another language must be clearly acknowledged and the original publication fully cited; copyright permission must also be obtained from the original publisher.

**Remedy**—make clear that it is a translation, provide full citation to the original publication, and obtain written copyright permission from the original publisher\textsuperscript{[15]}.

规范指南：要调查，据情分析，一般情况都会被拒稿，严重时要与作者单位联系。
JZUS CrossChecking workflow process

Compared with COPE flowchart (since 2006...), JZUS-workflow mainly considered two points in 2009: 1. Large number of submissions per year; and 2. Many contributions from non-English speaking countries. So in order to improve efficiency and save time of reviews & editors, firstly, we posted online the anti-plagiarism policy with JZUS-CrossCheck workflows to raise contributor’s awareness of ethical issues; second, we will run CrossCheck (by excluding bibliography and regardless of table, image and equation that CrossCheck cannot be scanned) to identify similar text for all of submitting papers; third, journal editors analysis stage in light of Anti-plagiarism policy at JZUS.
Fig. 1 CrossCheck Workflow of JZUS-A/B & FITEE

(a) The first CrossCheck during submission

(b) The second CrossCheck before publication

Note: Before run (a), we’ll check all of documents (MS, cover letter, and appendix etc.

For (b), the second Check before publication is due to that considering from accepted by referee to publish on-line or print, there is the database update time lag. On average, we often detect about 2-3 cases of serious plagiarism per year at this late stage.
JZUS - Workflow (a). The first CrossCheck during submission 投稿时的第一次审查

Submission
Run CrossCheck to identify similar text
Analyze similarity report

Exclude bibliography/quotes

No significant overlap

Send for peer review
(NB: Questions for reviewers include possible plagiarism of either text or ideas).

Minor overlap: SMSI <6% and OSI <25%
Middle overlap: SMSI 6%–10% and OSI 25%–35%
Major overlap: SMSI≥10% or OSI≥35%

Investigate similar content:
* Article type: Research article, Review, or Others?
* Section where similarity occurs: Abstract, Introduction, Materials & Methods, Results, Discussion, or Conclusion?
* Is the original source of duplicated content fully acknowledged and cited?

Identify form(s) of plagiarism and make decision

Acceptable:
With attribution/citation of own/others’ work:
- Limited use of own or others’ original work (<100 words) clearly identified as quotation;
- Summarize the overview from the original using author’s own words;
- Paraphrase ideas condensed from the original using different sentence and vocabulary;
- Previously published conference paper that has been extended with more than 60% substantive new content, with citation of the original and copyright permission;
- Duplication of description of standard method in Biosciences papers;
- Reproduction of image/table/formula with citation and copyright permission

Acceptable after revision:
- Missing attribution/citation of own/others’ work (ask author to add) (A, B, C, D, G);
- Original wording (<100 words) directly from other source with citation but without quotation marks or indent (ask author to add) (A, B);
- Excessive amount of original wording (>100 words) directly from source, whether or not identified and cited (ask author to summarize/paraphrase while retaining acknowledgement/citation) (A, B)

Unacceptable:
- Duplicate publication of own or team’s previously published article (A. or I);
- Cutting and pasting of others’ work without identification and acknowledgement (B);
- Republication of conference paper with little added value (published content >40%) (D);
- Review paper of high similarity (OSI>35%) (E);
- Ideas plagiarism without citation and acknowledgment (G);
- Wholesale (major) plagiarism of own or others’ previously published text (H)

Send report to author, point out issue(s) and suggest revisions
Author provides adequate explanation and revises text and adds full citation of source(s)

Send report to author, point out issue(s), and identify reason for rejection
Author has no adequate explanation and/or refuses to revise

Reject without peer review

NB: CrossCheck does not identify images, figures, tables, formulae, translations, or ideas. Editors should view the entire source article to investigate these elements.
JZUS makes it very clear to authors that, besides its high international peer review standards and its strict anti-plagiarism policy, CrossCheck will be used to check their submitted papers in order to identify unduly high levels of similar text, which gives rise to the possibility of plagiarism. Since 2010, JZUS has been developing and using the Workflow.
The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) was established in 1997 by a small group of journal editors in the UK but now has over 10,000 members worldwide from all academic fields. Membership is open to editors of academic journals and others interested in publication ethics.

COPE provides advice to editors and publishers on all aspects of publication ethics and, in particular, how to handle cases of research and publication misconduct. It also provides a forum for its members to discuss individual cases. COPE does not investigate individual cases but encourages editors to ensure that cases are investigated by the appropriate authorities (usually a research institution or employer).

All COPE members are expected to follow the Code of Conduct for Journal Editors.

COPE has produced an eLearning course for new editors. Eleven modules in total, the course currently includes: An Introduction to Publication Ethics, Plagiarism, and Authorship among others. COPE also funds research, organises annual seminars globally and has created an audit tool for members to measure compliance with its Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.

The COPE Strategic Plan for 2016-18 contains more information about COPE’s vision, development and the purpose it serves to publication ethics.

What guidance is available on this website (for members and non-members)?

- COPE Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors
- Flowcharts on how to handle common ethical problems
- Other COPE guidelines (eg on retractions)
- Sample letters (to adapt for use)
- Database of all cases discussed at COPE Forum (including podcasts of the discussion (where available), the advice given
Future plagiarism-- It is time to review our murky thoughts on plagiarism and its related broader concept of “Intellectual Property”

In my book, Prof. Kiang in the Harvard-MIT emphasized “simple copying of words or phrases is easily uncovered by computer programs but appropriation of ideas is impossible to even define, much less expose or punish. So, as a practical matter, plagiarism remains, for the most part, an intellectual offense, usually unpunished except for some damage to one’s reputation.”

My suggestion in this book:

1. The **whole world** should pay attention to **research integrity**;
2. Create a **culture of transparency** in science and publication;
3. Take the **honesty as the best policy** for researchers and authors;
4. Make **responsibility** be the foundation of scientific **publication**;
5. **Sanctions** are necessary in scientific and publishing areas;
This year, 2017, is Chinese New Year of Rooster who is a deep thinker

Last but not least, as journal editors, we can't eradicate plagiarism, but we have to stop it! Don't leave room for plagiarism!
Firstly, journal can post its guidance (policy) on the website for authors and editors who will know what is right or what is wrong--- "Education & Awareness"

Second, create an open peer comment space on your website in order to keep track of the academic value & research integrity of papers published in your journal (JZUS started this way from 2011)--- "Transparency & Evaluation"

Third, ask your authors to register ORCID (open researcher and contributor ID) --- "Self-discipline"

Thank You!

张月红 Helen (Y.H.) ZHANG