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INTRODUCTION TO COPE

Who we are

• Non-profit established in 1997; operated, managed, and governed by small group of paid employees, with volunteers on Trustee Board and Council

• >13,500 members from 97 countries:
  o mostly publishers/editors of scholarly journals
  o universities and research institutes
  o individual and corporate members
    (including editorial and publishing support services)

• COPE brings together all stakeholders worldwide to discuss, develop, and promote best practices in publication ethics
INTRODUCTION TO COPE

Resources

• 100+ Forums (members only) held since 1997
• 648+ Forum cases (open access) with advice on COPE’s website

• Flowcharts: step by step guides

• Guidelines: formal policy documents

• Community discussions and discussion documents on emerging issues

• Webinars and videos of COPE speakers at events

• COPE seminars & workshops (members only) held globally

• Joint founder of Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing

• eLearning (members only)
• Journal Audit (members only)
INTRODUCTION TO COPE

Mission

PROMOTING INTEGRITY IN SCHOLARLY RESEARCH AND ITS PUBLICATION

COPE’s mission is built around three core principles:

**SUPPORT**

Providing practical resources to educate and support our members.

**LEADERSHIP**

Providing leadership in thinking on publication ethics.

**VOICE**

Offering a neutral, professional voice in current debates.
INTRODUCTION TO COPE

Member benefits

- Forum Discussion of Cases
- Contact Council for Advice
- Seminars & Workshops
- Webinars
- Online Learning
- Audit
- Personalised COPE Logo
- Sample Letters
- Stand for Council
INTRODUCTION TO COPE

Toolkit

CONTENTS

How to use this guide

Four key activities for a successful editorial office

1. Develop guidelines for authors
2. Develop guidelines for reviewers
3. Develop processes to help identify ethical concerns
4. Develop guidelines for promptly responding to suspected ethical breaches by authors, reviewers, and editors

How to apply for COPE membership

Applying for journal membership
Applying for publisher membership

COPE Core Practices

Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing

Checklist

https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines/ethics-toolkit-editors
Free introductory e-learning module
Use COPE Ethics Toolkit

New journals just establishing an editorial office

Begin with the COPE Core Practices and guidelines from the publisher

Develop guidelines for authors and reviewers based on COPE Core Practices on ‘Authorship and contributorship’ and ‘Peer review processes’


Develop guidelines for promptly responding to suspected ethical breaches by authors, reviewers, and editors: see COPE Core Practice on ‘Complaints and appeals’

Check journal complies with the Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing before applying for COPE membership

Established journals
Best practice to handle ethical issues

Ethical issues are often complex and the approach will vary depending on the specific problem and the resources of the journal. In general, COPE expects that member journals will adhere to these three basic principles to resolve ethical issues and cases of alleged misconduct:

Journal guidelines and processes must be transparent

Provide links to COPE Guidelines, flowcharts, and other materials (e.g., ICMJE authorship and conflict of interest guidelines)

These items will clearly inform authors, reviewers, and readers of the processes of submission, review, publication, and grievances
Best practice to handle ethical issues

Ethical issues are often complex and the approach will vary depending on the specific problem and the resources of the journal. In general, COPE expects that member journals will adhere to these three basic principles to resolve ethical issues and cases of alleged misconduct:

1. Journal guidelines and processes must be transparent
   - Provide links to COPE Guidelines, flowcharts, and other materials (e.g., ICMJE authorship and conflict of interest guidelines)
   - These items will clearly inform authors, reviewers, and readers of the processes of submission, review, publication, and grievances

2. Systems must be in place to promptly attend to and resolve all complaints related to publication ethics
   - Clearly identify contact information for the person responsible for handling allegations of misconduct
   - Establish editorial office guidelines about who responds to complaints (e.g., in what manner, within what timeframe, and what parameters require involvement of legal staff and the publisher). Some journals have an ethics committee; others rely on a sole editor to handle these issues
   - Know when and how to liaise with other editors and institutions

For more information, visit publicationethics.org
Best practice to handle ethical issues

Ethical issues are often complex and the approach will vary depending on the specific problem and the resources of the journal. In general, COPE expects that member journals will adhere to these three basic principles to resolve ethical issues and cases of alleged misconduct:

1. Journal guidelines and processes must be transparent
   - Provide links to COPE Guidelines, flowcharts, and other materials (eg, ICME authorship and conflict of interest guidelines)
   - These items will clearly inform authors, reviewers, and readers of the processes of submission, review, publication, and grievances

2. Systems must be in place to promptly attend to and resolve all complaints related to publication ethics
   - Clearly identify contact information for the person responsible for handling allegations of misconduct
   - Establish editorial office guidelines about who responds to complaints (eg, in what manner, within what time frame, and what parameters require involvement of legal staff and the publisher). Some journals have an ethics committee; others rely on a sole editor to handle these issues
   - Know when and how to liaise with other editors and institutions\textsuperscript{1,2}

3. Editorial staff must be committed to correcting the literature when needed and following through on requests from institutional investigations
   - Assure that resources such as COPE Retraction guidelines, flowcharts, and access to legal advice, if needed, are available to those tasked with resolving ethics issues

---

\textsuperscript{1} Guidelines for the identification, classification, and reporting of clinical research and clinical trial data

\textsuperscript{2} Recommendations for the handling of suspected cases of scientific misconduct in clinical trials

---

Publicationethics.org
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COPE CORE PRACTICES

Core Practices are required to reach the highest standards in publication ethics:

- Allegations of misconduct
- Authorship and contributorship
- Complaints and appeals
- Conflicts of interest/Competing interests
- Data and reproducibility
- Ethical oversight
- Intellectual property
- Journal management
- Peer review processes
- Post-publication discussions and corrections
COPE CORE PRACTICES

1. Allegations of misconduct
Journals should have a clearly described process for handling allegations, however they are brought to the journal's or publisher’s attention. Journals must take seriously allegations of misconduct pre-publication and post-publication. Policies should include how to handle allegations from whistleblowers.

2. Authorship and contributorship
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.
COPE CORE PRACTICES

3. Complaints and appeals
Journals should have a clearly described process for handling complaints against the journal, its staff, editorial board or publisher.

4. Conflicts of interest / Competing interests
There must be clear definitions of conflicts of interest and processes for handling conflicts of interest of authors, reviewers, editors, journals and publishers, whether identified before or after publication.
COPE CORE PRACTICES

5. Data and reproducibility
Journals should include policies on data availability and encourage the use of reporting
guidelines and registration of clinical trials and other study designs according to standard
practice in their discipline.

6. Ethical oversight
Ethical oversight should include, but is not limited to, policies on consent to publication,
publication on vulnerable populations, ethical conduct of research using animals, ethical
conduct of research using human subjects, handling confidential data and ethical
business/marketing practices.
COPE CORE PRACTICES

7. Intellectual property
All policies on intellectual property, including copyright and publishing licenses, should be clearly described. In addition, any costs associated with publishing should be obvious to authors and readers. Policies should be clear on what counts as prepublication that will preclude consideration. What constitutes plagiarism and redundant/overlapping publication should be specified.

8. Journal management
A well-described and implemented infrastructure is essential, including the business model, policies, processes and software for efficient running of an editorially independent journal, as well as the efficient management and training of editorial boards and editorial and publishing staff.
COPE CORE PRACTICES

9. Peer review processes
All peer review processes must be transparently described and well managed. Journals should provide training for editors and reviewers and have policies on diverse aspects of peer review, especially with respect to adoption of appropriate models of review and processes for handling conflicts of interest, appeals and disputes that may arise in peer review.

10. Post-publication discussions and corrections
Journals must allow debate post publication either on their site, through letters to the editor, or on an external moderated site, such as PubPeer. They must have mechanisms for correcting, revising or retracting articles after publication.
The Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing should apply to all published content, including special issues and conference proceedings.

PRINCIPLES OF TRANSPARENCY
AND BEST PRACTICE IN SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), the Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association (OASPA), and the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) are scholarly organisations that have collaborated to identify principles of transparency and best practice for scholarly publications. This is the fourth version of a work in progress (published September 15 2022). We encourage its wide dissemination.
PRINCIPLES OF TRANSPARENCY AND BEST PRACTICE IN SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING
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The Committee on Publication Ethics of Open Access Journals (COPE), the Directory (DOAJ), the Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association Medical Editors (OASPA), and the World Association of (WAME) are scholarly organisations that have collaborated to identify principles of transparency and best practice for scholarly publications. This is the fourth version of a work in progress (published September 15, 2022). We encourage its wide dissemination.

The Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing should apply to all published content, including special issues and conference proceedings. Where practices deviate from the standards outlined, editors must transparently communicate the procedures that the journal follows.

These principles also acknowledge that publishers and editors are responsible for promoting accessibility, diversity, equity, and inclusivity in all aspects of the publication. Editorial decisions should be based on scholarly merit. They should not be affected by the origins of the manuscript, including the nationality, ethnicity, political beliefs, race, or religion of the authors. Journals should ensure no policies create an exclusionary environment for anyone wanting to engage with the journal and should regularly assess their policies for inclusivity.
1. Name of journal
The journal's name should:
• Be unique and not be one that is easily confused with another journal.
• Not mislead potential authors and readers about the journal's origin, scope, or association with other journals and organisations.

Note: Inclusion of examples and links does not imply endorsement
2. Website

- Websites should be properly supported and maintained, with particular attention given to security aspects that help protect users from viruses and malware. As a minimum, websites should use https and not http, and all traffic should be redirected through https.
- Those responsible for the website should apply web standards and best ethical practices to the website's content, presentation, and application.
- The website should not contain information that might mislead readers or authors.
- The website should not copy another journal/publisher’s site, design, or logo.
- If any text is copied from another website, an acknowledgement to the source website should be declared.
2. Website /cont…
In addition to the requirements outlined below, the following items should be clearly displayed:
• Aims and scope.
• The target readership of the journal.
• The types of manuscripts the journal will consider for publication (for example, that multiple or redundant publication is not allowed).
• Authorship criteria.
• ISSN (separate for print and electronic versions).
3. Publishing schedule
A journal’s publishing frequency should be clearly described, and the journal must keep to its publishing schedule unless there are exceptional circumstances.

4. Archiving
A journal’s plan for electronic backup and long term digital preservation of the journal content, in the event that the journal and/or publisher stops operating, should be clearly indicated. Examples include PMC and those listed in the Keepers Registry.
5. Copyright

- The copyright terms for published content should be clearly stated on the website and in the content.
- **The copyright terms should be separate and distinct from the copyright of the website.**
- The copyright holder should be named on the full text of all published articles (HTML and PDF).
- If the copyright terms are described in a separate form, this should be easy to find on the website and available to all.
6. Licensing

- Licensing information should be clearly described on the website.
- Licensing terms should be indicated on the full text of all published articles (HTML and PDF).
- Content designated as Open Access must use an open license.
- Licensing policies about the posting of author manuscripts and published articles in third party repositories should be clearly stated.

If Creative Commons licences are used, then the terms of that licence should also link to the correct licence on the Creative Commons website.
7. Publication ethics and related editorial policies

A journal should have policies on publication ethics (for example, COPE's Core Practice guidance). These should be visible on its website, and should refer to:

- Journal's policies on authorship and contributorship.
- How the journal will handle complaints and appeals.
- How the journal will handle allegations of research misconduct.
- Journal's policies on conflicts of interest.
- Journal's 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.
- Journal's policies on corrections and retractions.

https://www.wisdomperiodical.com

COPE CORE PRACTICES

EG

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

The Journal WISDOM and its Publisher, Khachatur Aboyun Armenian State Pedagogical University, are members of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). The journal follows the

https://www.wisdomperiodical.com
Editors and publishers are responsible for ensuring the integrity of the scholarly literature in their journals and should ensure they outline their policies and procedures for handling such issues when they arise. These issues include plagiarism, citation manipulation, and data falsification/fabrication, among others. Neither the journal’s policies nor the statements of its editors should encourage such misconduct, or knowingly allow such misconduct to take place.

In the event that a journal’s editors or publisher are made aware of any allegation of research misconduct relating to a submitted or published article in their journal, the editor or publisher should follow COPE’s guidance (or equivalent) in dealing with allegations.
8. Peer review
Peer review is defined as obtaining advice on manuscripts from reviewers/experts in the manuscript’s subject area. Those individuals should not be part of the journal’s editorial team. However, the specific elements of peer review may differ by journal and discipline, so the following should be clearly stated on the website:

• Whether or not the content is peer reviewed.

• Who conducts the peer review, for example, external experts or editorial board members.

• The type of peer review process(es) used

• Any policies related to the peer review procedures, for example:
  - Use of author recommended reviewers.
  - Any masking of identities, and if so who is masked and to whom.
  - Whether or not supplementary material is subjected to peer review.
  - Whether or not reviews are posted with articles.
  - Whether or not reviews are signed or anonymous.
PRINCIPLES OF TRANSPARENCY AND BEST PRACTICE IN SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

JOURNAL PRACTICES

8. Peer review /cont...

• How a decision about a manuscript is ultimately made and who is involved.
• Any exceptions to the peer review process, such as specific article types that do not undergo peer review.

If an article’s peer review is an exception to the usual policy, the article should state what review it received.

Journals should not guarantee acceptance of initial manuscript submissions. Statements of peer review times should be supported by published timeframes on accepted papers. In the event of delays, authors should be informed of the reason for the delay and given the opportunity to withdraw their manuscript if they wish.

The date of publication should be published with all published research. Dates of submission and acceptance are preferred as well.
9. Access

If any of the online content is not freely accessible to everyone, the method of gaining access (for example, registration, subscription, or pay-per-view fees) should be clearly described. If offline versions (for example, print) are available, this should be clearly described along with any associated charges.
10. Ownership and management

- Information about the ownership and management of a journal should be clearly indicated on the journal's website.
- Organisational names should not be used in a way that could mislead potential authors and editors about the nature of the journal's owner.
- If a journal is affiliated with a society, institution, or sponsor, links to their website(s) should be provided where available.
PRINCIPLES OF TRANSPARENCY AND BEST PRACTICE IN SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

11. Advisory body
Journals should have editorial boards or other advisory bodies whose members are recognised experts in the subject areas stated in the journal's aims and scope.
- The full names and affiliations of the members should be provided on the journal's website.
- The list should be up to date, and members must agree to serve.
- To avoid being associated with predatory or deceptive journals, journals should periodically review their board to ensure it is still relevant and appropriate.

12. Editorial team/contact information
Journals should provide the full names and affiliations of their editors as well as contact information for the editorial office, including a full mailing address, on the journal’s website.
13. Author fees

- If author fees are charged (such as article processing charges, page charges, editorial processing charges, language editing fees, colour charges, submission fees, membership fees, or other supplementary charges), then the fees should be clearly stated on the website.
- If there are no such fees, this should be clearly stated.
- Author fee information should be easy to find and presented as early in the submission process as possible.
- If the journal is likely to implement author charges in the future, this should be stated.
- If waivers are available for author fees, this information should be stated clearly.
- Waiver information should include:
  - Who is eligible for a waiver
  - Which author(s) of the group must be eligible for the waiver to apply
  - When and how to apply for a waiver
- Author fees or waiver status should not influence editorial decision making, and this should be clearly stated.
14. Other revenue

Business models or revenue sources should be clearly stated on the journal’s website.

Examples include author fees (see section 13), subscriptions, sponsorships and subsidies, advertising (see section 15), reprints, supplements, or special issues.

Business models or revenue sources (for example, reprint income, supplements, special issues, sponsorships) should not influence editorial decision making.

Supplements from BMJ are willing to consider publishing supplements to regular issues. Supplement proposals may be made at the request of:

- The journal editor, an editorial board member or a learned society may wish to organise a meeting and publish the proceedings as a supplement. Sponsorship may be sought.
- The journal editor, editorial board member or learned society may wish to commission a supplement on a particular theme or topic. Again, sponsorship may be sought.
- BMJ itself may have proposals for supplements where sponsorship may be necessary.
- A sponsoring organisation, often a pharmaceutical company or a charitable foundation, may wish to organise a meeting and publish the proceedings as a supplement.

In all cases, it is vital that the journal’s integrity, independence and academic reputation are not compromised in any way.

Funding

Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL. FGS and KK were funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany (BMBF) under the project NEED (Grant No. 01KI2022).

https://parasitesandvectors.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.186/s13071-023-05974-z#Fun
15. Advertising

Journals should state whether they accept advertising. If they do, they should state their advertising policy, including:

- Which types of advertisements will be considered.
- Who makes decisions regarding accepting advertisements.
- Whether they are linked to content or reader behaviour or are displayed at random.

Advertisements should not be related in any way to editorial decision making and should be kept separate from the published content.

16. Direct marketing

Any direct marketing activities, including solicitation of manuscripts, that are conducted on behalf of the journal should be appropriate, well targeted, and unobtrusive. Information provided about the publisher or journal should be truthful and not misleading for readers or authors.
COPE CORE PRACTICES & PRINCIPLES OF TRANSPARENCY AND BEST PRACTICE IN SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING (PTBPSP)

1. Allegations of misconduct
2. Authorship and contributorship
3. Complaints and appeals
4. Conflicts of interest/Competing interests
5. Data and reproducibility
6. Ethical oversight
7. Intellectual property
8. Journal management
9. Peer review processes
10. Post-publication discussions and corrections
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APPLYING FOR COPE MEMBERSHIP

How do COPE Core Practices relate to a successful editorial office?

1. Develop guidelines for authors

2. Develop guidelines for reviewers

3. Develop processes to help identify ethical concerns

4. Develop guidelines for promptly responding to suspected ethical breaches by authors, reviewers, and editors
APPLYING FOR COPE MEMBERSHIP
How to develop guidelines, policies, and processes?

2. Develop guidelines for reviewers

COPE Core Practice 9
All peer review processes must be transparently described and well managed. Journals should provide training for editors and reviewers and have policies on diverse aspects of peer review, especially with respect to adoption of appropriate models of review and processes for handling conflicts of interest, appeals and disputes that may arise in peer review.
2. Develop guidelines for reviewers

State on your website what is peer reviewed, what model of peer review you use, and how the peer review process is managed and by whom. Consider including the following in your guidelines for reviewers:

- how peer reviewers are selected and trained
- how many peer reviewers review each manuscript
- responsibilities of reviewers
- ethics of reviewing, including conflicts of interest, policies on confidentiality of the process and author materials, and the procedure when a reviewer wishes to nominate a co-reviewer
- how to perform a review and time allowed
- what reviewers should do if they suspect research or publication misconduct
- how to prepare the review report, who owns the review, and transferability of reviews
- how decisions on acceptance, revision, and rejection are made
- procedures for review of submitted revisions and handling appeals
APPLYING FOR COPE MEMBERSHIP
How to develop guidelines, policies, and processes?

2. Develop guidelines for reviewers

Resources to help you develop policies and guidelines for reviewers
- COPE discussion document: Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers (https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.9)
- COPE discussion document: Who ‘owns’ peer reviews? (https://doi.org/10.24318/rouP8ld4)
- COPE guideline: Editing peer reviews (https://doi.org/10.24318/AoZQlusn)
- COPE focus: Peer review (https://cope.onl/digest-peer)
- COPE flowcharts (https://cope.onl/flowcharts-3)
- Cases on peer review from COPE's cases database (https://cope.onl/cases-peer)
- COPE statement on inappropriate manipulation of peer review processes (https://cope.onl/news-peer)
APPLYING FOR COPE MEMBERSHIP
 Which category to apply for?

Journal Members
Peer reviewed academic journals.
Individual journal applications for 1 to 4 journals by the same publisher.

Apply using the application form at:
https://cope.onl/journal-app
See page 18

Publisher Members
Companies that publish 5 or more peer reviewed academic journals.

Apply using the application form at:
https://cope.onl/publisher-app
See page 20

All journals must have been publishing for at least 1 year.
APPLYING FOR COPE MEMBERSHIP

How to apply?

Journal membership application form | COPE: Committee on Publication Ethics

https://publicationethics.org/membership/apply/journal-application

Form requires website links to key policies and guidelines.
APPLYING FOR COPE MEMBERSHIP
How to apply?

Submit spreadsheet of journal details, including website links to key policies and guidelines

Publisher membership application form | COPE: Committee on Publication Ethics

https://publicationethics.org/publisher-membership-application-form-1
APPLYING FOR COPE MEMBERSHIP
How to apply?

https://publicationethics.org/membership-application-faq
APPLYING FOR COPE MEMBERSHIP

What are the membership fees?

https://publicationethics.org/cope-membership-subscription-fees
APPLYING FOR COPE MEMBERSHIP
What happens next?

- Only complete forms will be assessed.
- The Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing (https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.12) form part of the criteria we use to evaluate publishers and journals, expecting applicants to adhere to and follow the spirit of the principles in all aspects of their publishing operation.
- The membership administrator will evaluate the application by:
  - using the information and supporting documentation supplied on the application form
  - reviewing the publisher and journal websites to research the application
  - consulting other sources, if deemed relevant (eg, feedback from editorial board members and publicly available information).
- COPE will research reports of practices that do not apply our principles of publication ethics outlined in the COPE Core Practices (https://cope.onl/core-4).
- The membership administrator will supply the Membership subcommittee with the relevant documentation based on review and research of the application. The Membership subcommittee will make the final decision on membership, based on the application, the information reviewed, and more subtle forms of assessment using the Membership subcommittee’s experience.
APPLYING FOR COPE MEMBERSHIP

Tips for applying

DOS AND DON’TS

• Do: Follow the instructions on page 16 for the correct category
• Do: Ensure your application is complete and all the required information is supplied
• Do: Provide discrete URLs corresponding to webpages showing your journal guidelines and policies
• Do: Check all URL links are correct and functional

• Don’t: Copy and paste COPE or other resources as if they are your own guidelines
• Don’t: Use the same URL or homepage URL for each required guideline or policy in the application form
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INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
1. Editor as author in own journal (Case 05-22)

- The editor of a specialist journal is a leading researcher in a certain topic
- The editor wants to publish their work, and their own journal is the only suitable one worldwide
- The editor would have a conflict of interest submitting to their own journal and personally selecting 2 external peer reviewers
- Can editors publish in their own journal?

A. No. Peer review will be biased because of a conflict of interest.
B. Yes. But an associate editor should independently handle the peer review process.
C. Yes. But remove author names before peer review.

https://publicationethics.org/case/editor-author-own-journal
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INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
1. Editor as author in own journal

8. …If an article's peer review is an exception to the usual policy, the article should state what review it received.

9. Can editors publish in their own journal?
While you should not be denied the ability to publish in your own journal, you must take extra precautions not to exploit your position or to create an impression of impropriety. Your journal must have a procedure for handling submissions from editors or members of the editorial board that will ensure that the peer review is handled independently of the author/editor. We also recommend that you describe the process in a commentary or similar note once the paper is published, see: (https://bit.ly/2OGsPk3).

A short guide to ethical editing for new editors | COPE: Committee on Publication Ethics
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
1. Editor as author in own journal

Journal editorial management
...Abstain from the peer review process and editorial decisions for any papers authored by the editor, or where they have a competing interest. In such instances, the editor must delegate responsibility of the peer review, and editorial decision process of any of their own work submitted to the journal (excluding editorials), to another suitable editor on the journal (e.g. deputy Editor, advisory or editorial board member), or nominate a suitable guest editor who will be given the responsibility for assessment, peer review and for making the final editorial decision.

Journal editor code of conduct - Editor Resources (taylorandfrancis.com)


The effect of blood usage protocol on the age of packed red blood cell transfusions administered at 2 veterinary teaching hospitals

Marie K. Holowaychuk DVM, DACVECC  Sarah E. Musulin DVM, DACVECC

First published: 15 June 2015
https://doi.org/10.1111/vec.12339
Citations: 4

Dr. Holowaychuk’s current address is: Critical Care Vet Consulting, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Dr. Holowaychuk is an Assistant Editor for the Journal but did not participate in the peer review process other than as an author. The authors declare no other conflict of interest.
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY

2. Possible duplicate publication (Case 03-08)

- Article A, about a medical treatment, is published by 4 authors in Journal A but is found to be similar to Article B, published 2 years earlier in Journal B by 2 of the 4 authors plus another

- Most of the abstract, methods, and discussion are identical; Article B has 4 more patients in the sample

- Article A has the same references as Article B plus 6 extra references, including 1 to Article B

- Is it duplicate publication when the first article is referenced in the second article?

A. No. The author groups of the 2 articles are different.

B. No. Referencing is enough for transparency.

C. Yes. This is republishing a major part of the same study.

INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
2. Possible duplicate publication (Case 03-08)

• Article A, about a medical treatment, is published by 4 authors in Journal A but is found to be similar to Article B, published 2 years earlier in Journal B by 2 of the 4 authors plus another

• Most of the abstract, methods, and discussion are identical; Article B has 4 more patients in the sample

• Article A has the same references as Article B plus 6 extra references, including 1 to Article B

• Is it duplicate publication when the first article is referenced in the second article?

A. No. The author groups of the 2 articles are different.

B. No. Referencing is enough for transparency.

C. Yes. This is republishing a major part of the same study.

INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
2. Possible duplicate publication

Suspected redundant publication in a published article: COPE guidance (publicationethics.org)
COPE Core Practice 7
All policies on intellectual property, including copyright and publishing licenses, should be clearly described. In addition, any costs associated with publishing should be obvious to authors and readers. Policies should be clear on what counts as prepublication that will preclude consideration. What constitutes plagiarism and redundant/overlapping publication should be specified.

If redundant publication occurs, the journal that published first may issue a notice of redundant publication but should not retract the article unless there are other concerns, such as the reliability of the data. Any journals that subsequently publish a redundant article should retract it and state the reason for the retraction. If an article is published in more than one journal (either online or in print) around the same time, precedence may be determined by the publication dates or the dates on which a licence to publish or copyright transfer agreement was signed by the authors.
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY

2. Possible duplicate publication

Editorial process

Initial submission

Manuscripts should be submitted via the online submission system. The corresponding author should indicate whether the work described in the manuscript has been discussed with a specific Nature Communications editor before submission. Copies of any papers containing related work that are under consideration or in-press at other journals should be included with the submission as additional supplementary information.

Each new submission is assigned to a primary editor, who reads the paper, consults with the other editors, and then evaluates the novelty and potential impact of the work, the appropriateness for the journal’s editorial scope, the conceptual or methodological advances described in the paper, and its potential interest to Nature Communications’ readership. Manuscripts that meet these editorial criteria are sent out to external referees for further assessment.

The novelty of a submitted paper is considered to be compromised if it has significant conceptual overlap with a published paper or one accepted for publication by Nature Communications. Preprint archives do not compromise novelty. Papers that are published independently while your manuscript is under review or under revision at Nature Communications are also not considered to compromise novelty, even in cases where there is conceptual overlap.

https://www.nature.com/ncomms/submit/editorial-process
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
3. Lack of participant consent (Case 04-12)

- A journal receives a submitted manuscript reporting on a volunteer receiving experimental hospital treatment

- Treatment was given under supervision in an intensive care unit, in case of serious side effects

- The journal submission does not mention participant giving informed consent or researchers obtaining ethics committee approval

- What should the editor do next?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A. Proceed with peer review because this was emergency care.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Ask the authors about informed consent and ethics committee approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Suspend review and ask the author’s institution to follow up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://publicationethics.org/case/research-volunteers-without-informed-consent-or-ethics-committee-approval
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
3. Lack of participant consent (Case 04-12)

A journal receives a submitted manuscript reporting on a volunteer receiving experimental hospital treatment.

Treatment was given under supervision in an intensive care unit, in case of serious side effects.

The journal submission does not mention participant giving informed consent or researchers obtaining ethics committee approval.

What should the editor do next?

A. Proceed with peer review because this was emergency care.
B. Ask the authors about informed consent and ethics committee approval.
C. Suspend review and ask the author’s institution to follow up.

https://publicationethics.org/case/research-volunteers-without-informed-consent-or-ethics-committee-approval
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
3. Lack of participant consent

Dealing with suspected ethics issues in a submitted manuscript (publicationethics.org)
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
3. Lack of participant consent

3. Develop processes to help identify ethical concerns

- Allegations of misconduct
- Conflicts of interest/Competing interests
- Data and reproducibility
- Ethical oversight
- Intellectual property
- Journal management
- Post-publication discussions and corrections

COPE Core Practice 6
Ethical oversight should include, but is not limited to, policies on consent to publication, publication on vulnerable populations, ethical conduct of research using animals, ethical conduct of research using human subjects, handling confidential data and ethical business/marketing practices.
3. Develop processes to help identify ethical concerns

Journals must adopt and publish clear guidelines regarding ethical conduct of research. Regulations and norms of the journal’s discipline should be consulted to ensure that the journal policies reflect those standards. Journals must diligently review submitted work to ensure that it conforms with research ethics guidelines. Consider implementing processes on the following, documenting the processes in the website, and linking to relevant COPE resources:

- recommended practices for handling issues such as informed consent, institutional oversight, prior ethics approval, and compliance with international research guidelines
- investigating concerns raised about the ethics of any study that has been published
- preventing potential cases of misconduct—for example, routines for checking for:
  - plagiarism
  - falsification
  - fabrication
  - peer review manipulation
  - citation manipulation
  - authorship misconduct
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
3. Lack of participant consent

ICMJE (International Committee of Medical Journal Editors) Guidelines

Protection of Research Participants

All investigators should ensure that the planning, conduct, and reporting of human research are in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration as revised in 2013. All authors should seek approval to conduct research from an independent local, regional or national review body (e.g., ethics committee, institutional review board). If doubt exists whether the research was conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration, the authors must explain the rationale for their approach and demonstrate that the local, regional or national review body explicitly approved the doubtful aspects of the study. Approval by a responsible review body does not preclude editors from forming their own judgment whether the conduct of the research was appropriate.

Patients have a right to privacy that should not be violated without informed consent. Identifying information, including names, initials, or hospital numbers, should not be published in written descriptions, photographs, or pedigrees unless the information is essential for scientific purposes and the patient (or parent or guardian) gives written informed consent for publication. Informed consent for this purpose requires that an identifiable patient be shown the manuscript to be published. Authors should disclose to these patients whether any potential identifiable material might be available via the Internet as well as in print after publication. Patient consent should be written and archived with the journal, the authors, or both, as dictated by local regulations or laws. Applicable laws vary from locale to locale, and journals should establish their own policies with legal guidance. Since a journal that archives the consent will be aware of patient identity, some journals may decide that patient confidentiality is better guarded by having the author archive the consent and instead providing the journal with a written statement that attests that they have received and archived written patient consent.

Nonessential identifying details should be omitted. Informed consent should be obtained if there is any doubt that anonymity can be maintained. For example, masking the eye region in photographs of patients is inadequate protection of anonymity. If identifying characteristics are deidentified, authors should provide assurance, and editors should so note, that such changes do not distort scientific meaning.

The requirement for informed consent should be included in the journal’s instructions for authors. When informed consent has been obtained, it should be indicated in the published article.

https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/protection-of-research-participants.html
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
3. Lack of participant consent

Ethics

All manuscripts and journal activities are expected to adhere to Ethics in publishing and Ethical guidelines for journal publication. Studies on human subjects require documentation of a policy that exempts the project from ethical committee approval, an ethics committee letter determining the project is exempt from review, or ethics committee approval. Appropriate consents, permissions, and releases must be obtained where an author wishes to include the use of images or personal information of patients and any other individuals. Written consents but copies for the patients are not required. Only if specifically requested by the medical journal, a legal issue arises must the author include such consents have been obtained. The Use of Images or Personal Information or Images and the Ethical Statement.

Ethical Statement

For research manuscripts, an electronic copy of the Ethical Statement (also called the Institutional Review Board (IRB) permission letter) from the institution that granted permission to conduct the research study must accompany the first submission. An English translation must also be submitted if the IRB letter is not in English. For Quality Improvement (QI) or Evidenced-Based Practice (EBP) projects, reports of projects involving human participants must include a statement explaining what type of ethical oversight was required, or describing the ethical standards followed at the author's organization to conduct the QI or EBP project. This should include a copy of a policy exempting single-site QI projects from IRB oversight, IRB exemption from review letters, or IRB approval. The Ethical Statement is to be uploaded to the "Ethical Statement" section of the manuscript in the EM submission system at https://www.editorialmanager.com/jen/.

Author Disclosures

Conflicts of interest: none to report. This research was supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Fee-Offset Scholarship through Federation University Australia. No other grants or funding have been received for this project. Ethical approval for this project was granted by the Federation University Human Research Ethics Committee, approval number: A20-095.

https://www.jenonline.org/article/S0099-1767(23)00116-2/fulltext
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
4. Authorship dispute (Case 10-27)

• A retired professor claims they should have been included as an author on two published articles in a journal

• The editor discovered that the professor was involved in the early stage of both studies and was named as an author but removed from the final draft by the same co-author

• After much effort (and involvement of the institution), the editor decided to correct both articles by adding the author, but both authors were still unhappy

• How can the editor handle future author disputes?

A. Ask authors to declare contributions so editor can decide.

B. Retract affected articles.

C. Require authors or their institution to decide.

https://publicationethics.org/case/professoreditor
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
4. Authorship dispute (Case 10-27)

• A retired professor claims they should have been included as an author on two published articles in a journal

• The editor discovered that the professor was involved in the early stage of both studies and was named as an author but removed from the final draft by the same co-author

• After much effort (and involvement of the institution), the editor decided to correct both articles by adding the author, but both authors were still unhappy

• How can the editor handle future author disputes?

https://publicationethics.org/case/professoreditor

A. Ask authors to declare contributions so editor can decide.

B. Retract affected articles.

C. Require authors or their institution to decide.

? Needs clear authorship criteria; could require article declarations

? Only if legal reason or article is questionable

✔ Follow COPE flowcharts
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
4. Authorship dispute

A request to add an author after publication: COPE guidance (publicationethics.org)
COPE Core Practice 2

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.
1. Develop guidelines for authors

In your guidelines for authors, consider including the following, in addition to providing information about the journal, submission criteria, manuscript preparation, and the submission process:

- a clear definition of authorship
- responsibilities of authors and corresponding author
- how author contributions should be declared on submission (and in the publication)
- how to acknowledge non-authors
- how potential authorship disputes are managed
- any author fee
- data and intellectual property policies, including copyright and licence arrangements
- research and publication ethics, including conflicts of interest
- peer review process, including if authors can nominate or exclude reviewers, and procedure for appeals
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
4. Authorship dispute

Authorship Qualification:

To qualify: each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for the content. Authorship credit should be based on substantial contribution to conception and design, execution, or analysis and interpretation of data. All authors should be involved in drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content and must have read and approved the final version of the manuscript. Authors should adhere to the practices of their research field and the guidelines of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). According to the ICMJE guidelines, all of the following 4 criteria must be met to be considered an author:

- Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- 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.

Individuals who participated only in acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of a research group (i.e. institution leaders who were not actively involved in specific projects), does not justify authorship. These individuals should be included in the Acknowledgements.

Authorship declaration in article, traditional

Authors’ Contributions

Study concept and design: S.H., B.C.L., G.G.P., S.W., H.S., S.B.E., and K.R.P. Data collection and processing: G.G.P. for the ADHD data. Data analysis and interpretation: all authors. Drafting of the manuscript: S.H. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content and final approval: all authors. Supervision: B.C.L., S.B.E., and K.R.P.

# Interactive Case Study

4. Authorship dispute

**Conceptualization**

**Data curation**

**Formal Analysis**

**Funding acquisition**

**Investigation**

**Methodology**

**Project administration**

**Resources**

**Software**

**Supervision**

**Validation**

---

**CRediT and authorship criteria**

*For all journals adopting CRediT, all parties who have made a substantive contribution to the article should be listed as authors. Any contributors with roles that do not amount to a substantive contribution (e.g. if Supervision, Funding Acquisition or Data Curation was the sole role) should be listed in the Acknowledgements.*

*For technical or medical journals adopting CRediT, to qualify for authorship each individual must have been responsible for:*

1. **At least one** of the following:
   - Conceptualization
   - Methodology
   - Formal Analysis
   - Investigation

2. **AND**

   2. **At least one** of the following:
      - Writing – Original Draft Preparation
      - Writing – Review & Editing

---

[https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/credit](https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/credit)
INTERACTIVE CASE STUDY
4. Authorship dispute

Authorship declaration in article, CRediT style

Author contribution(s)
Shannon Whittaker: Conceptualization; Formal analysis; Methodology; Visualization; Writing—original draft; Writing—review & editing.
Isabel Martinez: Conceptualization; Formal analysis; Methodology; Supervision; Validation; Writing—review & editing.
Trace Kershaw: Data curation; Formal analysis; Methodology; Funding acquisition; Investigation; Project administration; Supervision; Visualization; Writing—review & editing.

Authors

Authors should ensure that:

• their work is original and written by them
• their work has not been previously published and has been submitted only to the journal
• where material is taken from other sources (including their own published writing) the source is clearly cited and that where appropriate permission is obtained
• their work does not infringe on any rights of others, including privacy rights and intellectual property rights
• their data is true and not manipulated
• their data is their own or that they have permission to use data reproduced in their paper
• any real or apparent conflicting or competing interest is clearly stated on submission of their paper (this would include funding assistance)
• they adhere to all research ethics guidelines of their discipline, particularly where human or animal subjects are involved
• they contact the Editor to identify and rectify any material errors upon discovery, whether prior or subsequent to publication of their work
• authorship of the paper is accurately represented, including ensuring that all individuals credited as authors participated in the actual authorship of the work and that all who participated are credited and have given consent for publication

Above all, authors should be transparent. For example, if an author is not sure whether her paper is original (for instance, whether it might constitute duplicate publication), she should inform the journal’s editor. If the editor decides it is appropriate to publish, the paper itself should state clearly any potential overlap.
Authorship and AI tools

COPE position statement

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools such as ChatGPT or Large Language Models in research publications is expanding rapidly. COPE joins organisations, such as WAME and the JAMA Network among others, to state that AI tools cannot be listed as an author of a paper.

AI tools cannot meet the requirements for authorship as they cannot take responsibility for the submitted work. As non-legal entities, they cannot assert the presence or absence of conflicts of interest nor manage copyright and license agreements.

Authors who use AI tools in the writing of a manuscript, production of images or graphical elements of the paper, or in the collection and analysis of data, must be transparent in disclosing in the Materials and Methods (or similar section) of the paper how the AI tool was used and which tool was used. Authors are fully responsible for the content of their manuscript, even those parts produced by an AI tool, and are thus liable for any breach of publication ethics.
THANK YOU