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WHAT IS COPE?


- To provide a forum for editors on how best to deal with possible breaches in publication ethics

- **1999:** Published the first guidelines on Good Publication Practice

- **2000:** COPE matured to elect a Chair, Vice-Chair, Treasurer, and Council, and write a constitution
WHAT IS COPE?

- 2004: Website launched

- 2005: Published Code of Conduct for Editors

- 2007: Published 14 flowcharts on how to deal with misconduct: plagiarism, fabricated data, redundant publication, changes in authorship, lack of ethics, reviewer misconduct, ghost, guest, or gift authorship, and conflicts of interest
What to do if a reviewer suspects undisclosed conflict of interest (COI) in a submitted manuscript

- Reviewer informs editor of author's undisclosed COI
- Thank reviewer and say you plan to investigate
- Contact author(s) and express concern
  - Author(s) supplies relevant details
  - Author(s) denies COI

To avoid future problems:
Always get signed statement of COIs from all authors before publication (or get them to tick a box if they declare no conflict)
Ensure journal guidelines include clear definition of COI
Committee on Publication Ethics Flowchart
www.publicationethics.org.uk

What to do if a reader suspects undisclosed conflict of interest (Col) in a published article:

- Reader informs editor of author's undisclosed Col
- Thank reader and say you plan to investigate
- Contact author(s) and express concern
  - Author(s) supplies relevant details
  - Author(s) denies Col

It may be helpful to provide a copy of the journal's policy/definition of Col.
Flujograma para el Comité de Ética en Publicaciones

1. ¿Qué hacer si sospecha que una publicación es redundante o duplicada
(a) Sospecha de publicación redundante en un manuscrito recibido

- El revisor informa al editor sobre la publicación redundante
- Agradecer al revisor e informarle que planea investigar. Conseguir todos los indicios documentales, si aún no estuvieran disponibles
- Comprobar el grado de superposición o redundancia

1. Superposición o redundancia importante (p. ej., basada en los mismos datos, con resultados idénticos o muy similares, y/o indicios que los autores intentaron ocultar la redundancia, p. ej., cambiando el título o el orden de los autores, o no citando los artículos publicados previamente)
- Contactar por escrito al autor responsable del artículo, siendo recomendable adjuntar la declaración de autoría (o carta de presentación) donde establezca que el trabajo remitido no había sido publicado en otro lugar, y los indicios documentales de la duplicación
- Contactar al autor en términos neutrales, expresando decepción, explicando la postura de la revista

2. Superposición de menor importancia con algunos elementos de redundancia o reanálisis justified (p. ej., subgrupo, segmento similar a la secuencia que dio lugar a una audiencia diferente)
- Comentar con el revisor, Proseguir con la revisión

3. Ninguna superposición
- Sin respuesta
- El autor responde
- Explicación no satisfactoria

4. Intentar contactar a todos los otros autores (consultar)
- Informar al revisor del resultado o la acción tomada.

Nota: Las instrucciones a los autores deben establecer la política de la revista sobre publicación redundante
La firma del autor en una declaración o una lista de comprobación puede ser de utilidad para investigaciones subsecuentes.

Nota: El CIERM (Comité Internacional de Editores de Revistas Médicas, ICAJE en inglés) publicó una serie de recomendaciones sobre lo que los editores deben hacer si sospechan que una publicación es redundante o duplicada.
WHAT IS COPE?

• 2004: Website launched

• 2005: Published Code of Conduct for Editors

• 2007: Published 14 flowcharts on how to deal with misconduct: plagiarism, fabricated data, redundant publication, changes in authorship, lack of ethics, reviewer misconduct, ghost, guest, or gift authorship, and conflicts of interest

• 2008: COPE incorporates as a company with limited liability for legal protection and is registered as a charity
WHAT IS COPE?

- Four meetings a year of discussion of about 40 anonymised cases of suspected misconduct
- Advice to editors on how to proceed
- Database of research misconduct cases and outcomes, all of which are published on the website
- Annual conferences and reports
- Funds a research grant of £10,000 p.a.
COPE MEMBERS

- As of this year, COPE has some 3500 scientific, technical, and medical journal members, including

  - All of Elsevier (Lancet, Cell Press)

  - All of Wiley–Blackwell


- A growing number of individual Associate members and our first corporate Associate member in CrossRef
COPE FUTURE

- Completely redesigned and rebuilt website with Members’ area: blog, sample letters, reference database, presentations, and searchable database of cases & advice
- Collaboration with CrossCheck, anti-plagiarism screening programme
- Quarterly newsletter
- Online distance-learning course on publication misconduct
- Audit and COPE Marque of Good Publication Practice
CODES OF CONDUCT, GUIDELINES, AND CONTEXT

- Instructions for Authors
- 1979: Vancouver Group (later ICMJE) publish Uniform Requirements
- 1999: COPE’s Guidelines on Good Publication Practice
- 2005: COPE’s Code of Conduct
- 2006: CSE White Paper
- 2006: Blackwell Best Practice Guidelines on Publication Ethics
- 2007: Elsevier and Informa followed suit
CODES OF CONDUCT, GUIDELINES, AND CONTEXT

Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Writing and Editing for Biomedical Publication
Updated October 2004
International Committee of Medical Journal Editors

I. Statement of Purpose
   A. About the Uniform Requirements
   B. Potential Users of the Uniform Requirements
   C. How to Use the Uniform Requirements

II. Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research
   A. Authorship and Contributorship
      1. Byline Authors
      2. Contributors Listed in Acknowledgements
   B. Editorship

IV. Manuscript Preparation and Submission
   A. Preparing a Manuscript for Submission to Biomedical Journals
      1. General Principles and Reporting Guidelines
         a. General Principles
         b. Reporting Guidelines for Specific Study Designs
   2. Title page
   3. Conflict of Interest Notification Page
   4. Abstract and Key Words
Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

GUIDELINES ON GOOD PUBLICATION PRACTICE

Why the guidelines were developed

COPE was founded in 1997 to address breaches of research and publication ethics. A voluntary body providing a discussion forum and advice for scientific editors, it aims to find practical ways of dealing with the issues, and to develop good practice.

We thought it essential to attempt to define best practice in the ethics of scientific publishing. These guidelines should be useful for authors, editors, editorial board members, readers, owners of journals, and publishers.

Intellectual honesty should be actively encouraged in all medical and scientific courses of study, and used to inform publication ethics and prevent misconduct. It is with that in mind that these guidelines have been produced.

(3) Protocols must be carefully agreed by all contributors and collaborators, including, if appropriate, the participants.

(4) The final protocol should form part of the research record.

(5) Early agreement on the precise roles of the contributors and collaborators, and on matters of authorship and publication, is advised.

(6) Statistical issues should be considered early in study design, including power calculations, to ensure there are neither too few nor too many participants.

(7) Formal and documented ethical approval from an appropriately constituted research ethics committee is required for all studies involving people, medical records, and anonymised human tissues.

(8) Use of human tissues in research should conform...
A code of conduct for editors of biomedical journals

A suggested code of conduct for editors to guide them towards being fair to authors, researchers, and readers

Preamble

Editors of biomedical journals should be responsible for everything published in their journals. They should strive to meet the needs of readers and authors, constantly improve the journal; ensure the quality of the material they publish; champion freedom of expression in science and health care; maintain the integrity of the scientific record; preclude business needs from compromising intellectual standards; and always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies when needed.

Any deviation from this code of conduct could be misconduct and should be pursued in the first instance through the journal’s complaints procedure. If the matter is unresolved, a complaint may be referred to COPE. (The process for dealing with complaints against editors referred to COPE is described below.)

Quality and correcting the record

Editors should take all reasonable steps to ensure the quality of the material they publish, recognising that journals and sections within journals will have different aims and standards.

Descriptions of peer review processes should be published, and editors should be ready to justify any important deviation from the described processes. Journals should have a declared mechanism for authors to appeal against editorial decisions.

Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.

An apology must be published whenever appropriate.

If after an appropriate investigation articles prove to be fraudulent or contain major errors that are not apparent from the text, the articles should be retracted. The word retraction should be used in the title of the retraction to ensure that it is picked up by indexing systems.
CODES OF CONDUCT, GUIDELINES, AND CONTEXT

CSE’s White Paper on Promoting Integrity in Scientific Journal Publications

www.publicationethics.org
CODES OF CONDUCT, GUIDELINES, AND CONTEXT

Publication Ethics

Best Practice Guidelines on Publication Ethics: A Publisher's Perspective

These Best Practice Guidelines on Publication Ethics describe Blackwell Publishing's position on the major ethical principles of academic publishing and consider factors that may foster ethical behavior or create problems. The aims are to encourage discussion, to initiate changes where they are needed, and to provide practical guidance, in the form of Best Practice Statements, to inform these changes.

"This is an excellent document. It addresses both broad ethical issues and practical points that we have all come against throughout editorial work"
Penos Vostanis, Editor, Child & Adolescent Mental Health

"It is impressive. I particularly like the 'Best Practice' sections. I think it will be a valuable resource"
Bruce Baum, Senior Editor, Oral Diseases

"Covers most of the issues that we normally address and has raised some ideas for improving some of our codes of practice".
Carol Huxley, Managing Editor, The Journal of Physiology

Best Practice Guidelines on Publication Ethics: A Publisher's Perspective is reproduced with permission from International Journal of Clinical Practice
You can read the abstract and download the PDF from Blackwell Synergy by clicking here.

www.publicationethics.org
CODES OF CONDUCT, GUIDELINES, AND CONTEXT

PUBLISHING ETHICS

The publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal is an essential building block in the development of a coherent and respected network of knowledge. It is a direct reflection of the quality of the work of the authors and the institutions that support them. Peer-reviewed articles support and embody the scientific method. It is therefore important to agree upon standards of expected ethical behavior for all parties involved in the act of publishing: the author, the journal editor, the peer reviewer, the publisher and the society of society-owned or sponsored journals. More about Publishing Ethics can be found in the Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK).

Duties of Editors

- Publication decision
- Fair play
- Confidentiality
- Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest
- Vigilance over published record
- Involvement and cooperation in investigations

Duties of Reviewers

- Contribution to Editorial Decision
- Promptness
- Confidentiality
- Standards of Objectivity
- Acknowledgement of Source
- Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

Duties of Authors

- Reporting standards
- Data Access and Retention
- Originality and Plagiarism
- Multiple, Redundant or Concurrent Publication
- Acknowledgement of Sources
- Authorship of the Paper
- Hazards and Human or Animal Subjects
- Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest
- Fundamental errors in published works

Duties of the Publisher

We are committed to ensuring that advertising, reprint or other commercial revenue has no impact or influence on editorial decisions. In addition, Elsevier will assist in communications with other journals and/or publishers where this is useful to editors. Finally, we are working closely with other publishers and industry associations to set standards for best practices on ethical matters, errors and retractions—and are prepared to provide specialized legal review and counsel if necessary.
DO GUIDELINES WORK?

Yes
DO GUIDELINES WORK?

No
WILL THIS GUIDELINE WORK?

- Not discussed at COPE Council
- Neither the view of my employer nor of COPE
- Personal opinion
WILL THIS GUIDELINE WORK?

- Editors have to be free of conflicts of interest

‘Journals should require that all senior editorial personnel (editors in chief, managing editors, full-time assistant editors) avoid all financial relationships that might constitute a conflict of interest. Editorial managers should also avoid personal, political, or intellectual entanglements, organizational or otherwise, that could be construed as establishing a particular bias that might influence one’s judgments.’
WILL THIS GUIDELINE WORK?

- Ban authors

‘In those rare cases where editors uncover a willful desire to hide financial conflicts of interest, the editors will consider appropriate penalties, such as refusing to allow that author to publish in the journal for a specified period of time.’
WILL THIS GUIDELINE WORK?

- Conflicts of Interest of reviewers

  ‘Whatever the journal’s policy, peer reviewers... should follow the same rules as authors for disclosing conflicts of interest.’
WHAT NEXT?

- Research
- Publish
- Educate
- Collaborate
Welcome to the Emerging Health Threats Forum (previously Forum for Global Health Protection). Register today to view our news the way you want.

**Top News Stories**

- **Borders and shortages hinder pandemic plans**
  Preparedness policy must become more street-wise to cope with a flu pandemic, US analysis suggests.

- **Chemical cues for mosquito control**
  Specific chemicals attract *Aedes Aegypti* to breeding sites and could be used to prevent vector-borne disease.

**Breaking News**

- **ECDC publishes chikungunya communications toolkit**
- **Coxsackie virus suspected in Spain’s nail-shedding epidemic**
- **Update: Crimean-Congo haemorrhagic fever death toll rises in Turkey**
- **Crimean-Congo haemorrhagic fever: second case suspected in Greece**
- **A dollar more for climate change adaptation, a**

**Emerging Health Threats Journal**

- **Syphilis in China: the great comeback**
  Hesketh et al. review the history of the syphilis epidemic in China, its elimination in the 1960s, and its resurgence in the past two decades.

- **Development of a national burn network: the AUSBURNPLAN**
  Wood et al. review the process and development of the Australian National Burn network designed to manage a mass burn casualty disaster.

- **Knowledge base black holes: the next (small) big thing?**
  Ken Dunn comments on the utility of making policy reviews part of the permanent

www.eht-forum.org