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Promoting integrity in research publication

COPE is a forum for editors and publishers of peer reviewed journals to discuss all aspects of publication ethics. It also advises editors on how to handle cases of research and publication misconduct. [Read more about COPE.]

---

**FORUM DISCUSSION TOPIC:** Sharing of information among editors-in-chief regarding possible misconduct

The Forum discussion topic on Wednesday 4 September is “Sharing of information among editors-in-chief regarding possible misconduct”. Click below to learn more and leave your comments.

[Learn more]

---

**NEWS & OPINION view all ▶**

**News / COPE's eLearning course relaunched**

27/8/2013 7.50am

COPE is delighted to announce the relaunch of the eLearning programme on the COPE website. COPE members can now access the programme directly on the COPE website [http://publicationethics.org/resources/elearning](http://publicationethics.org/resources/elearning) once they have logged in.

**News / Clarification of COPE advice to editors on Geopolitical intrusions on editorial decisions**

1/8/2013 6.11am

There has been much discussion recently on government, specifically US government, sanctions against Iran, the potential effect on Iranian researchers and some publishers have cautioned editors and reviewers about handling papers from Iran.
Cases database

Updated classification scheme needed

New scheme - 18 main Classifications, up to 2 per case
- 99 Keywords, up to 10 per case
- descriptive, not judgemental

The coding exercise

*Classifications and Keywords indicate the topics discussed, not that a particular form of misconduct had occurred*
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COPE resource development

- *eLearning modules re-launched 2013*: Introduction to publication ethics, Plagiarism, Data falsification, Data fabrication, Conflict of interest, Authorship
- *eLearning modules in development*: Editor misconduct, Reviewer misconduct, Redundant publication, Selective reporting, Unethical research
- *Discussion documents in preparation*: Corrections (expanding on Retraction Guidelines), Authorship, and Text recycling
- New and enhanced *Flowcharts* planned
- New *Guidelines* … on peer review …
‘For his part, Moon acknowledged suggesting his friends and colleagues as reviewers, telling Retraction Watch that the results “can be mistaken for fake reviews.” But he said it wasn’t only his mistake: The editors, Moon said, invited those reviews without confirming the identity of the reviewers.’
COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

Irene Hames on behalf of COPE Council
March 2013, v.1

Peer review in all its forms plays an important role in ensuring the integrity of the scholarly record. The process depends to a large extent on trust, and requires that everyone involved behaves responsibly and ethically. Peer reviewers play a central and critical part in the peer-review process, but too often come to the role without any guidance and may be unaware of their ethical obligations. The COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers set out the basic principles and standards to which all peer reviewers should adhere during the peer-review process. It is hoped they will provide helpful guidance to researchers, be a reference for journals and editors in guiding their reviewers, and act as an educational resource for institutions in training their students and researchers.

Basic principles to which peer reviewers should adhere

Peer reviewers should:

• only agree to review manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner

• respect the confidentiality of peer review and not reveal any details of a manuscript or its review, during or after the peer-review process, beyond those that are released by the journal

‘Promoting integrity in research publication’

- Education as well as guidance and advice
- Making the Forum accessible to more members, more often, in more ways
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