



COPE seminar 2007 - March 16

Black Suite, BMA House, Tavistock Square, London 9.30 am – 4.30 pm

Programme

- 9.30 Registration
10.00 Welcome – Harvey Marcovitch
10.05 What's in a picture? The temptation of image manipulation – Mike Rosner (*Journal of Cell Biology*) [45+10min]

11.00 *Tea Break*

11.30 How can editors encourage ethical behaviour and transparency?
— chaired by Elizabeth Wager
11.35 Authorship and transparency – Ana Marusic (*Croatian Medical Journal*) [15+10min]
12.00 Plagiarism detection software – Finton Culwan (South Bank University) [15+10min]
12.25 Application of plagiarism detection software for medical journals – Sunil Moreker
(*Journal of Bombay Ophthalmology Association*) [10+10min]
12.45 Publisher's perspective – Chris Graf (Blackwell) [20+10min]

1.15 *Lunch*

2.15 Update on COPE activities and introduction of website features – Harvey Marcovitch
2.30 Workshop introduction – Harvey Marcovitch/Tim Albert
2.35 Workshop with discussion of cases on
 - duplicate publication
 - authorship disputes
 - fabrication of data
 - plagiarism
 - unethical research3.05 Workshop feedback – chaired by Harvey Marcovitch/Tim Albert

3.30 *Tea Break*

4.00 COPE AGM

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 2007
9.30–16.30 Friday 16 March 2007
Black Suite, BMA House, Tavistock Square, London

Workshop with discussion of hypothetical cases

Case 1 As the Editor-in-Chief of a national European medical journal, you are informed that a review you published was largely copied from another paper. You confirm by your own analysis of both papers that large amounts of text have been directly translated from English into your native language. There was no declaration on submission that the review was a translation. There are 10 authors on the paper, some of which are on your Editorial Board.

What would you do now?

Case 2 As Editor-in-Chief of a renowned specialty journal, you receive notification from an author of a paper you published that it has in fact been published before in another journal. The author who contacted you was last and corresponding author on the earlier paper. The corresponding author on your paper was first author on the earlier paper and first author on the paper you published. There are four authors from three institutions on the first paper. There are five authors from five institutions on the paper you published.

What would you do now?

Case 3 You published a clinical trial 4 years ago. Now you are contacted by the editor of another journal that has a paper under review consisting of further analysis of the trial data. The editor tells you that two of the peer reviewers have questioned the validity of the data (“too evenly distributed”, “some calculations don’t add up”). At the same time you receive a correspondence letter stating that in the context of undertaking a meta-analysis, two researchers detected implausibilities of serious concern in the same trial, such as too much balance in three important covariates. You send this correspondence letter to the author of the original trial, who has incidentally moved to another institution, and ask for a response. The author responds with a superficial justification.

What would you do now?

Case 4 An author contacts you after having seen a presentation at a conference that included a figure from their paper currently under review at your journal. The presenter was a reviewer on the author’s paper. The figure is unique and has not been published elsewhere.

What would you do now?