Transparency in the Publishing Process: Ethical use of professional editorial and publishing support services

Trevor Lane
Consultant, Edanz Group; Council Member, COPE

2020 Asia Pacific Virtual Event
September 14-15, 2020
Conflict of Interest

As a Council Member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), part-time Education & Engagement Consultant of Edanz Group (a professional editorial and publishing support service provider), member of the ISMPP GPP4 writing group, and member of some of the mentioned societies (ISMTE, CSE, WAME), Dr Trevor Lane declares affiliations that could be perceived as posing a potential conflict of interest in relation to this presentation.
Learning Outcomes

By the end of this presentation, attendees should be able to:

• Describe how professional editorial and publishing support services (PEPSS) have entered the publishing landscape

• Explain the importance of transparency around provision and use of PEPSS

• Apply current recommendations and best practices to acknowledge use of PEPSS
Office workflow, 20th C

Professional editorial & publishing support service (PEPSS)

Submit & Desk review → Peer review → Revise/resubmit → Reassess → Publish (& Index)

→ Desk reject? → Accept / Reject? → Accept / Reject?

(co-) Publisher

Edit, Artwork

Outsource to PEPSS: freelancer, third party, vendor, publisher…

Will you provide copyediting?
www.ismte.org/resource/resmgr/docs/resources/setting_up_editorial_office.pdf

Submitted version

Page proofs, final version

Empowering editorial offices around the world.
Office workflow, 21st C

Preprint? 
Submit & Desk review 
Peer review 
Revise/resubmit \(\rightarrow\) Reassess 
Post-publication review 
Submit & Desk review

“Author services” (PEPSS)

Submitted version

Author’s Accepted Manuscript (AAM) (postprint)

Early online version

Version of Record (VOR)

Professional editorial & publishing support service (PEPSS)

Screening Submission +/- production Peer reviewed paper

(Co-) Publisher [Edit, Artwork]

Digital archiving, sharing

Edit, Artwork

Edit, Artwork

Edit, Artwork

Submit, Desk review, Peer review, Revise/resubmit, Reassess, Post-publication review

Submitted version

Author’s Accepted Manuscript (AAM) (postprint)

Early online version

Version of Record (VOR)

ISMTE www.ismte.org

Empowering editorial offices around the world.
Office workflow, 21st C

Professional editorial & publishing support service (PEPSS)

Submit & Desk review

Peer review → Reassess

Revise/resubmit → Reassess

Peer reviewed paper

Author's Accepted Manuscript (AAM) (postprint)

Version of Record (VOR)

Potential conflicts of interest (Cols)

Undisclosed financial relationships (service company ownership / deals, employment)

● editor Cols

● compulsory services +/- guarantees, conditions

● misleading article processing charges

● double-dipping…
Publishing transparency

PRINCIPLES OF TRANSPARENCY
& Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA), and the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) are scholarly organizations. All have seen increases in the number and rigor of membership applications. Our organizations have collaborated to identify Principles of Transparency & Best Practice for Scholarly Publications. These principles form the basis of the criteria by which suitability for membership is assessed by COPE, DOAJ, OASPA, and part of the criteria on which membership applications are evaluated by WAME.

In the event that a member organization is found to have violated these best practices, or other specific requirements of the organization, OASPA/DOAJ/COPE/WAME shall in the first instance try to work with them in order to address any concerns that have been raised. In the event that the member organization is unable or unwilling to address these concerns, their membership in the organization may be suspended or terminated. All of the member organizations have procedures for dealing with concerns raised about member journals.

Publishing transparency

**REVENUE SOURCES**

Business models or revenue sources shall be clearly stated or otherwise evident on the journal’s website.

For example:
- author fees
- subscriptions
- advertising
- reprints
- institutional support
- organizational support

Publishing fees or waiver status should not influence editorial decision making.

**AUTHOR FEES**

Any fees or charges that are required for manuscript processing and/or publishing materials in the journal shall be clearly stated.

This must be:
- in a place that is easy for potential authors to find prior to submitting their manuscripts for review.
  - OR
  - explained to authors before they begin preparing their manuscript for submission.
  - if no such fees are charged that should also be stated.

**PUBLICATION ETHICS**

A journal should have policies on publishing ethics. These should be clearly visible on its website, and should refer to:
- journal policies on authorship and contributorship
- how the journal will handle complaints and appeals
- journal policies on conflicts of interest/competing interests
- journal policies on data sharing and reproducibility
- journal’s policy on ethical oversight
- journal’s policy on intellectual property
- journal’s options for post-publication discussions and corrections.

Author workflow

Preprint?
Submit & Desk review
Peer review
Revise/resubmit → Reassess
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Writing platforms, referencing tools, checking tools, ...

Co-authors, research & industry collaborators, technicians, statisticians, colleagues, preprint users, conference peer reviewers/delegates, illustrators, PEPSS (editing, review, finding journal & reviewers)

Chief editor, academic / associate / senior (handling) editor,… peer reviewers

Co-authors, colleagues, PEPSS (editing, checking responses to reviewers)

Manuscript editor, production editor

Chief editor, academic / associate / senior editor, production editor

Co-authors, PEPSS (editing)
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Author support

Commercial, institutional, freelance services

- Light → heavy editing
- Assistance with author-guided drafting
- Translation
- Proofreading, formatting
- Review, peer review
- Checking author responses to reviewers
- Recommending independent reviewers
- Recommending journals
- Plain-language summaries, press releases
- Plagiarism / text-match reports
- Illustrations, posters, graphical abstracts
- ? Literature searches; data/statistical analyses → co-author?
- ??? Actual submissions/uploads

GATE Principles

Guarantee
Are the authors guarantors?

Advice
Was the writer advised by the authors?

Transparency
Is the writer acknowledged?

Expertise
Is the writer knowledgeable of the subject?


Empowering editorial offices around the world.
Author support

- Professional conduct (association standards eg, COPE, ISMTE, CSE, EASE, ISMPP, EMWA, AMWA, WAME)
- Adhere to laws/regulations; conditions of funder, institution, journal
- ASEC: Alliance of Scientific Editing in China (www.asec.org.cn), Best Practice Guidelines on Ethics for Author and Publication Support Service Providers
  - Clear services, prices, trained staff, complaint procedure, code of ethics
  - Acknowledgments, editor CoI policies; no misappropriation
  - Do not recommend predatory journals or help authors in unethical practices
  - Clear business relationships (esp. with publishers); independent from editorial decisions, no promises of publication

× Paper mill, contract cheating; selling custom-written / plagiarized / translated / fraudulent papers
× Selling fake peer review
× Brokerage agency: intermediary between authors and submission platform, paying journals to publish papers
× Selling guest authorship at revision stage
× Promising publication; links to / recommending predatory journals
× ‘Removing’ plagiarism, paraphrasing to avoid plagiarism detection
× Ghost writing/authoring favorable, promotional papers for companies
× Cybercrime: Phishing, ID theft, stealing $/work, pretending to be (or linked to) well-known company/publisher/journal
Unethical practices

Third party company botched student’s doctoral work, says biologist

Pay to play? Three new ways companies are subverting academic publishing

A new record: Major publisher retracting more than 100 studies from cancer journal over fake peer reviews

Author pulls study for duplication, blames editing company

Editors say they missed “fairly obvious clues” of third party tampering, publish fake peer reviews

COPE guidance

COPE guidance

COPE guidance

Clear policies (that allow for transparency around who contributed to the work and in what capacity) should be in place for requirements for authorship and contributorship as well as processes for managing potential disputes.

www.publicationethics.org
9. Websites and editorial management platforms of scholarly journals should contain transparent information on the editorial management, peer review, open access or subscription models, and acceptable editing practices. Commercial editing services, which are offered by publishers and other organizations, may help improve the quality of journal submissions. However, all these services require transparency and acknowledgment in accordance with the recommendations of global editorial associations.
## Acknowledgments

**International Committee of Medical Journal Editors** ([www.icmje.org](http://www.icmje.org))

Contributors who meet fewer than all 4 of the above criteria for authorship should not be listed as authors, but they should be acknowledged. Examples of activities that alone (without other contributions) do not qualify a contributor for authorship are acquisition of funding; general supervision of a research group or general administrative support; and writing assistance, technical editing, language editing, and proofreading… …obtain written permission to be acknowledged from all acknowledged individuals.

**“PNAS”, McNutt et al, 2018** ([https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1715374115](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1715374115))

…To discourage ghost authorship, CAs [corresponding authors] must reveal as appropriate whether the manuscript benefited from the use of editorial services that, if unacknowledged, might constitute an undisclosed conflict of interest. Examples include use of an editor from an organization that may have a vested interest in slanting the results or reliance on a technical writer at a level that would warrant authorship credit.

**International Society of Medical Publication Professionals** ([https://www.ismpp.org/gpp3](https://www.ismpp.org/gpp3))

Medical writers generally do not meet accepted authorship criteria, but there may be exceptions (for example, if they contribute substantially to a review article). If writers qualify for authorship (that is, meet ICMJE or journal-specific criteria), they should be listed as authors and their financial relationship with the sponsor should be disclosed.
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World Association of Medical Editors (www.wame.org)
Ghost authorship would be avoided if corresponding authors listed everyone else who participated in the work, including those who contributed only to the writing, along with their individual contributions and institutional affiliations; stated explicitly how the work was paid for; and fully disclosed any further potential competing interests.

AMWA–EMWA–ISMPP Joint Position Statement on the Role of Professional Medical Writers
…acknowledge the provision of medical writing support, including the nature of the support, and the name, highest relevant qualifications (eg, degree or professional credential), and affiliation of the professional medical writer accountable for the support provided, and acknowledge the funding sources for the provision of medical writing support;… recognize as a co-author all contributors (including a professional medical writer) who meet the ICMJE authorship criteria.

“The authors thank [1. name and qualifications] of [2. company, city, country] for providing medical writing support/editorial support [3. specify and/or expand as appropriate], which was funded by [4. sponsor, city, country] in accordance with Good Publication Practice (GPP3) guidelines (http://www.ismpp.org/gpp3).”
Contributorship?

CRediT items based on credit.niso.org

CONCEPTUALIZATION: RESEARCHERS 1,2,3
DATA CURATION: RESEARCHER 2
FORMAL ANALYSIS: RESEARCHER 1, ANOTHER 2
FUNDING ACQUISITION: ANOTHER 1, ANOTHER 2
INVESTIGATION: RESEARCHERS 2,3
METHODLOGY: ANOTHER 2
PROJECT ADMINISTRATION: RESEARCHER 1
RESOURCES: RESEARCHERS 1,3
SOFTWARE: ANOTHER 2
SUPERVISION: RESEARCHER 3
VALIDATION: RESEARCHERS 1,2,3
VISUALIZATION: ANOTHER 3
WRITING – ORIGINAL DRAFT: RESEARCHER 1
WRITING – REVIEW & EDITING: RESEARCHERS 1,2,3, ANOTHER 3

No animals were harmed during this production.

CRediT items based on credit.niso.org
Authorship 1

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors [www.icmje.org]

1) **Substantial contributions** to the **conception or design** of the work; or the **acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data** for the work; **AND**

2) **Drafting** the work or **revising** it critically for important intellectual content; **AND**

3) Final approval of the version to be published; **AND**

4) Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

---

**CRediTs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptualization</th>
<th>RESEARCHERS 1,2,3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data curation</td>
<td>RESEARCHER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Analysis</td>
<td>RESEARCHER 1, ANOTHER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding acquisition</td>
<td>ANOTHER 1, ANOTHER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>RESEARCHERS 2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>ANOTHER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project administration</td>
<td>RESEARCHER 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>RESEARCHERS 1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>ANOTHER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>RESEARCHER 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>RESEARCHERS 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>ANOTHER 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing – original draft</td>
<td>RESEARCHER 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing – review &amp; editing</td>
<td>RESEARCHERS 1,2,3, ANOTHER 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No animals were harmed during this production.

CRediT items based on [credit.niso.org](http://credit.niso.org)
“PNAS”, McNutt et al, 2018

(https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1715374115)

1) Each author is expected to have made substantial contributions to the **conception** or **design** of the work; or the **acquisition**, **analysis**, or **interpretation of data**; or the **creation of new software** used in the work; **OR** have **drafted** the work or **substantively revised** it;

2) **AND** to have approved the submitted version (and any substantially modified version that involves the author’s contribution to the study);

3) **AND** to have agreed both to be personally accountable for the author’s own contributions and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work, even ones in which the author was not personally involved, are appropriately investigated, resolved, and the resolution documented in the literature.

No animals were harmed during this production.

CRedit items based on credit.niso.org
“Neurology” journals
(American Academy of Neurology; https://www.neurology.org/authorship-and-disclosures)

Neurology defines an author as a person who has made a substantive intellectual contribution to the submitted manuscript. A substantive contribution includes one or more of the following:

- **Design** or **conceptualization** of the study
  OR major role in the **acquisition of data**
  OR **analysis** or **interpretation of the data**
  OR **drafting** or **revising** the manuscript for intellectual content
- All those qualifying for authorship must give final approval of the version to be published and take responsibility for the conduct of the research.

Professional writers employed by pharmaceutical companies or other academic, governmental, or commercial entities who have drafted or revised the intellectual content of the paper must be included as authors.

---

**CRediTs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization</td>
<td>RESEARCHERS 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data curation</td>
<td>RESEARCHER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Analysis</td>
<td>RESEARCHER 1, ANOTHER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding acquisition</td>
<td>A N OTHER 1, ANOTHER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>RESEARCHERS 2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>A N OTHER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project administration</td>
<td>RESEARCHER 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>RESEARCHERS 1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>A N OTHER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>RESEARCHER 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>RESEARCHERS 1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>A N OTHER 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing – original draft</td>
<td>RESEARCHER 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing – review &amp; editing</td>
<td>RESEARCHERS 1,2,3, ANOTHER 3, EDITOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No animals were harmed during this production.

CRediT items based on credit.niso.org
## Transparency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ <strong>Author declarations, disclosures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Clear author guidelines, authorship criteria &amp; policies (any joint places; handling disputes, changes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Clear policies on how to use and acknowledge services; if submission by 3rd parties is allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Ask authors to provide any necessary evidence (inc. Track Change docs, editing certificates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Transparency of any linked or recommended author services &amp; Cols in instructions &amp; in articles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author declarations at submission to include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>⬤ <strong>All authors</strong> fulfill journal’s criteria; approve, responsible for content; agree to journal policies on authorship + affiliations, contributions, Cols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⬤ Who is corresponding author; who is guarantor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⬤ <strong>No omitted</strong> deserving authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⬤ <strong>All non-authors inc. (medical) writers / editors</strong> (paid or unpaid) named in Acknowledgments, with permission + affiliations, contributions, Cols inc. funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Study funder** and any roles + *Declarations of transparency, pre-/post-publication access to (raw) data, originality, ethics, etc*
Transparency in author and nonauthor contributorship
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