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Overview

1. Research–publishing landscape
2. What are the issues?
3. How can COPE help?
4. How can stakeholders help?
5. What are the challenges…and solutions?
1. Research–publishing landscape

- Literature review, research Q
- Design, ethics approval
- Funding application
- Manuscript preparation
- Conference presentation
- Research, analysis
- Journal submission, peer review
- Acceptance, editing/artwork
- Publication
New publishing trends

- Literature review, research Q
- Design, ethics approval
- Funding application
- Collaborations / agreements

- Manuscript preparation
- Conference presentation
- Research, analysis

- Journal submission, peer review
- Acceptance, editing/artwork
- Publication

- Funding mandates* (Open Research, Data management)
- Trial registration, Preregistered reports, Upload/publish protocols
- Metadata, Social/mass media reports, Stakeholder engagement/feedback, Impact, Technology transfer

- Upload preprint, Avoid predatory journals, Reporting guidelines, ORCiD, CRediT
- Megajournals, Supplementary files, Graphical abstract, Highlights, Lay summary
- Different peer review models,
  *Open access online journals,
  *Archive accepted version (postprint),
  *Archive/share data
New publishing trends

- Collaborations / agreements: European Guidelines on Intellectual Property Management; World IP Organization framework guidelines on university-industry technology transfer
- Open Research, Data management: UK Concordat on Open Research Data
- Trial registration: Japan Primary Registries Network; Peer-reviewed protocols: Preregistered reports
- Upload / publish protocols: eg, protocols.io; Upload public preprint (may be funder-approved)
- Avoid predatory / questionable journals: ThinkCheckSubmit.org
- International reporting guidelines: EQUATOR Network
- Researcher identifiers: ORCiD; Contributor roles taxonomy: CRediT
- Different peer review models: COPE guidelines on peer review ethics and peer review reports
- Open access online (mega)journals: Directory of Open Access Journals; Creative Commons
- Archive accepted version (postprint): SHERPA/RoMEO list of publisher © & self-archive policies
- Archive/share data: TOP guidelines; data journals; data repositories
- Metadata: eg, Crossref, CHORUS
- Social / mass media reports (public engagement / research communication): eg, Kudos
- Impact, stakeholder engagement, technology transfer: World IP Organization website; Patent grace periods; San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)
STM Tech Trends: Outlook 2020
THE TECHNOLOGY FLOODGATES ARE OPEN


Key performance indicators
Institutions, publishers/editors/journals, researchers, sponsors…

1. Reputation of journal, editors, reviewers, authors, institutions
2. Number of authors / readers, publications, hits, downloads
3. Countries of editors / reviewers / (co)authors / readers
4. Number of research outputs submitted, reviewed, accepted
5. Time for desk review, first peer-review decision, acceptance / publication
6. On-time / rapid publication [research projects finished on time]
7. Revenue [grants, return on investment, technology transfer]
8. Journal citations, ranking, bibliometrics (eg, JIF, CiteScore, Eigenfactor, h-index)
9. Social / mass media attention, altmetrics, engagement / partnerships
10. Production / content quality, societal impact of research

• Make sure all your processes are ethical and transparent!
2. What are the issues?

- **error**
- **misconduct**
- **fraud**

### Non-intentional
- not easily detected

### Intentional
- easily detected

#### 1. wrong observation
#### 2. wrong analysis
#### 3. inadequate record keeping
#### 4. withholding method details
#### 5. double and sliced publications
#### 6. biased or post-hoc revision of study design
#### 7. ignoring previous work of others
#### 8. suppressing own data, dropping data points
#### 9. undeclared conflicts of interest, corruption
#### 10. undeserved authorship
#### 11. unfair review, wrong testimony
#### 12. espionage, giving away secrets
#### 13. misuse of public funds
#### 14. bullying, nepotism
#### 15. overlooking others' use of flawed data
#### 16. suppressing fraud allegation
#### 17. no informed consent
#### 18. plagiarism
#### 19. falsification
#### 20. fabrication
#### 21. illegal human experiments
“Specific research misconduct” (…FFP)  
*Japan Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT)*

- **Fabrication**—Making up data or research results, etc

- **Falsification**—Manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes to change data or results obtained from research activities

- **Plagiarism**—Appropriating the ideas, analysis, analytical methods, data, research results, research paper(s), or words of other researchers without obtaining the permission of the researchers or giving appropriate credit
“Questionable research practices” (QRPs)

*US National Academy of Sciences, 1992*

- Inappropriate management of research records and data analysis; not storing data for a certain period
- Dishonest authorship and research presentation / media publicity
- Lack of access to research materials and/or data
- Insufficient research training; exploiting students
MEXT: Consequences of research misconduct

- Violates true nature of research / publication
- Undermines faith in science; hinders progress
- Researchers “negate the significance of their own existence”
- Affects researcher, scientific community, institutions, funder
MEXT: Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR)

- “Voluntary self-discipline” by researchers
- Checking/training…in lab, unit, department / faculty
- Institutional culture, management, investigations, sanctions
- Responsibility to funders: prevent misuse of funding
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Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, 2010

- Honesty in all aspects of research
- Accountability in the conduct of research
- Professional courtesy and fairness in working with others
- Good stewardship of research on behalf of others

3. How can COPE help?

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

- >12,000 members are primarily editors and owners/publishers of scholarly journals of all disciplines; we are exploring expanding membership, eg editorial and publishing support services, funders, preprint providers, institutions

- Provides support, leadership, and professional voice to help promote integrity in research and its publication through policies and practices that reflect current best principles of transparency and integrity
Importance of COPE

…Is the publisher a member of a recognized industry initiative?
– Do they belong to COPE,…DOAJ,…OASPA?…

Statement on Article Publication Resulting from NIH Funded Research

The National Library of Medicine, the NIH entity that maintains PubMed and PubMed Central, encourages publishers to follow established industry best practices including:
…COPE,…DOAJ,…OASPA,…WAME

Scopus Journal FAQs: Helping to improve the submission & success process for Editors & Publishers

Is there an online publication ethics and publication malpractice statement available for the journal? For more information…, see, for example,…COPE…
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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 memos in the number, and range in quality of membership applications. Our organizations have collaborated to identify Principles of Transparency & Best Practice for Scholarly Publications. These principles form a basis for the criteria for which suitability for membership is assessed by COPE, DOAJ, OASPA, and part of the criteria on which membership applications are evaluated by WAME.

A journal's website, including the text that it contains, must demonstrate that it has been developed to meet high ethical and professional standards:
- a clear statement of editorial policy;
- the name(s) and contact details of the editor(s);
- criteria for selection of articles;
- guidelines for authors;
- guidelines for reviewers;
- author fees (if any).

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, its membership in the organization may be suspended or terminated. All of the member organizations have procedures for dealing with concerns raised about member journals.

https://publicationethics.org/join-cope

publicationethics.org
### Website

A Journal’s website, including the text that it contains, shall demonstrate that care has been taken to ensure high ethical and professional standards.

It should:
- contain an ‘Aims & Scope’ statement and the readership clearly defined.
- include a statement on what a journal will consider for publication including authorship criteria (e.g. not multiple submissions, redundant publications)
- ISSN displayed clearly (separate for print and electronic).

It must not:
- contain information that might mislead readers or authors.
- attempt to mimic another journal/publisher’s site.

### Name of Journal

The Journal name shall be unique. It must not:
- be one that is easily confused with another journal.
- mislead potential authors and readers about the Journal’s origin or association with other journals.
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**PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

Journal content must be clearly marked as whether peer reviewed or not. Peer review is defined as obtaining advice on individual manuscripts from reviewers expert in the field who are not part of the journal’s editorial staff.

The journal’s website should:
- clearly describe this process, as well as any policies related to the journal’s peer review procedures including the method of peer review used.

The journal’s website should not:
- guarantee manuscript acceptance or very short peer review times.

**OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT**

Information about the ownership and/or management of a journal shall be clearly indicated on the journal’s website.

Publishers should not:
- use organizational or journal names that would mislead potential authors and editors about the nature of the journal’s owner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNING BODY</th>
<th>EDITORIAL TEAM/CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journals shall have editorial boards or other governing bodies whose members are recognized experts in the subject areas included within the journal’s scope.</td>
<td>Journals shall provide the full names and affiliations of the journal’s editors on the journal website as well as contact information for the editorial office, including a full address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The journal’s website should:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– show full names and affiliations of the journal’s editorial board or other governing body.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPYRIGHT AND LICENSING

The policy for copyright shall be clearly stated in the author guidelines and the copyright holder named on all published articles.

The journal’s website should:
– show licensing information clearly described in guidelines.

Licensing terms shall be indicated on all published articles, both HTML and PDFs.
If authors are allowed to publish under a Creative Commons license then any specific license requirements shall be noted. Any policies on posting of final accepted versions or published articles on third party repositories shall be clearly stated.

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.
ALLEGATIONS OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

Publishers and editors shall take reasonable steps to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred.

This includes but not limited to:
- plagiarism
- citation manipulation
- data falsification/fabrication

In no case shall a journal or its editors encourage such misconduct, or knowingly allow such misconduct to take place. In the event that a journal's publisher or editors are made aware of any allegation of research misconduct relating to a published article in their journal, the publisher or editor shall follow COPE's guidelines (or equivalent).

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.
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**PUBLISHING SCHEDULE**

The periodicity at which a journal publishes shall be clearly indicated.

**ACCESS**

The way(s) in which the journal and individual articles are available to readers and whether there are associated subscription or pay per view fees shall be stated.
**ARCHIVING**

A journal’s plan for electronic backup and preservation of access to the journal content shall be clearly indicated (for example, access to main articles via CLOCKSS or PubMedCentral).

This is in the event that a journal is no longer published.

---

**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.
ADVERTISING

Journals shall state their advertising policy if relevant including:
- what types of adverts will be considered
- who makes decisions regarding accepting adverts
- (online only) whether they are linked to content or reader behavior or are displayed at random.

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

DIRECT MARKETING

Any direct marketing activities, including solicitation of manuscripts that are conducted on behalf of the journal, shall be appropriate, well targeted, and unobtrusive.

Information provided about the publisher or journal is expected to be truthful and not misleading for readers or authors.
COPE’s Core Practices

OUR CORE PRACTICES

Policies and practices required to reach the highest standards in publication ethics

View all core practices ▶
COPE’s Core Practices

Editors/Publishers should have robust and well-described publicly-documented practices in all the following areas for their journals (to be considered alongside specific national and international codes of conduct for research):

- 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

https://publicationethics.org/core-practices
COPE Core Practices replaced “Codes of Conduct” in 2017

- Core Practices: expectations of all professionals involved in publishing scholarly literature: editors, publishers, institutions… (and not just COPE members)
- Framework for detailed COPE documents and resources
- “Codes of Conduct” have been archived

https://publicationethics.org/files/Code%20of%20Conduct%20for%20Journals%20FINAL_1_0_0.pdf
https://publicationethics.org/files/Code%20of%20Conduct%20for%20Editors%20FINAL_1_0_0.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Publication Ethics: Best Practices for All Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLAINTS &amp; APPEALS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA &amp; REPRODUCIBILITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEER REVIEW PROCESSES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTHORSHIP &amp; CONTRIBUTORSHIP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONFLICTS OF INTEREST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHICAL OVERSIGHT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOURNAL MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST-PUBLICATION DISCUSSIONS &amp; CORRECTIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[publicationethics.org]
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.
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

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.
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 of business/marketing 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.
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, 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.
COPE’s resources, [https://publicationethics.org/resources](https://publicationethics.org/resources)

- **10 core practices**
  - Flowcharts for handling cases of alleged misconduct
  - Infographics
  - Best practice guidelines
  - Discussion documents
  - Newsletter, presentation archives
  - COPE Forum cases

- **For members** (Editors/Publishers & Associate Members):
  - E-Learning modules
  - Letter templates, Self-audit tool for journals
  - Seminars/workshops and webinars
  - COPE Forum
  - Use of COPE logo in journal/website
  - Fee waivers/reductions possible

Join at [https://publicationethics.org/join-cope](https://publicationethics.org/join-cope)
What to do if you suspect redundant (duplicate) publication

(a) Suspected redundant publication in a submitted manuscript

Reviewer informs editor about redundant publication

Redundancy detected by text-matching software (e.g., CrossCheck screening)

Thank reviewer and say you plan to investigate. Get full documentary evidence if not already provided

Check extent and nature of overlap/redundancy

- Major overlap/redundancy (i.e., based on same data with identical or very similar findings and/or evidence that authors have sought to hide redundancy e.g., by changing title or author order or not citing previous papers)

- Minor overlap with some element of redundancy or legitimate overlap (e.g., methods) or re-analysis (e.g., sub-group/extended follow-up/discussion aimed at different audience)

- No significant overlap

https://publicationethics.org/files/redundant%20publication%20A_0.pdf
How to recognise potential manipulation of the peer review process

The features or patterns of activity shown are suggested to help recognise potential signs of peer review manipulation.

Often it is the occurrence of these features in combination that may indicate a potential issue.

Summary

Journal editors should consider retracting a publication if:

- they have clear evidence that the findings are unreliable, either as a result of misconduct (e.g., data fabrication) or honest error (e.g., miscalculation or experimental error)
- the findings have previously been published elsewhere without proper crossreferencing, permission or justification (i.e., cases of redundant publication)
- it constitutes plagiarism

https://publicationethics.org/files/retraction%20guidelines_0.pdf
Cooperation between research institutions and journals on research integrity cases: guidance from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

Summary

Institutions and journals both have important duties relating to research and publication misconduct. Institutions are responsible for the conduct of their researchers and for encouraging a healthy research environment. Journals are responsible for the conduct of their editors, for safeguarding the research record, and for ensuring the reliability of everything they publish. It is therefore important for institutions and journals to communicate and collaborate effectively on cases relating to research integrity. To achieve this, we make the following recommendations.

https://publicationethics.org/files/Research_institutions_guidelines_final_0_0.pdf
Introduction

This guidance has been drafted following a COPE Discussion Forum (4 September 2013, http://tinyurl.com/pn43bxk) and Discussion Document (February 2014, http://tinyurl.com/lqag4uh) on the subject, and it was initiated in the wake of a number of high-profile cases of research misconduct in which the sharing of information between the relevant editors-in-chief (EiCs) was crucial to the final settlement of the cases."
A preprint is a scholarly manuscript posted by the author(s) in an openly accessible platform, usually before or in parallel with the peer review process. While the sharing of manuscripts via preprint platforms has been common in some disciplines (such as physics and mathematics) for many years, uptake in other disciplines traditionally had been low, possibly influenced by differences in research culture and strong opposition by some journal publishers [1]. The landscape has evolved rapidly in other fields in recent years, however, thanks...
Example COPE Forum cases

• Employee of medical communications company says authors submitted paper to journal declaring only assistance with language editing, not developmental editing

• Student and supervisor demand retraction of published methods-testing paper that plagiarised their blogged method

• A few published papers show possibly manipulated illustrations; institution clears authors of misconduct but notes no originals exist

What should the journal do in each case?

Based on https://publicationethics.org/case/authors%E2%80%99-contributions-and-involvement-medical-communications-company
4. How can stakeholders help?

• Promote research integrity, responsible conduct of research, best practices

• Promote culture of honesty and transparency, reproducibility, accountability; participate in global ethical culture, dialogue, policy-making; collaboration among stakeholders and COPE

• Undergraduate, postgraduate, and continuing education in ethics, research design / conduct / analysis / reporting

• Strengthen policies (including institutional review boards / ethics committees and training); Code of Ethics (institution and lab/group-level); whistleblowing policy

• Research integrity office/r to prevent and confidentially respond to alleged misconduct

• Incentives, career development: research assessment, peer review recognition, mentoring for supervisors and students, research/data sharing

Based on: The Culture of Scientific Research in the UK.
http://nuffieldbioethics.org/project/research-culture
http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/jinzai/fusei/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2015/07/13/1359618_01.pdf
# Ethics training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Ethics board approval/waiver; hazard warnings; for humans: informed consent, permission to publish, data privacy, trial registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Full and transparent methods, honest data reporting / interpretation (no “fishing”; use report checklist), appropriate citation, data sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No plagiarism</td>
<td>Quote, paraphrase / synthesize, cite sources, © permission &amp; note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data manipulation</td>
<td>Maintain data integrity: data storage, availability, sharing; do not fabricate or falsify data (eg, do not manipulate parts of images)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorship</td>
<td>(1) Design or data acquisition / analysis / interpretation &amp; (2) Writing / revising &amp; (3) Approval &amp; (4) Accountability. Decide early, including author order and corresponding author; acknowledgements with permission, personal communications with permission; +/- CRediT contributions, ORCIDs, © awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of interest (COIs)</td>
<td>Funding source, potential (non-)financial / personal COIs; had access to data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Submit to only one journal, do not republish, state if previous presentation or similar papers/preprints, do not manipulate peer review; learn how to identify trustworthy journals ➔ ThinkCheckSubmit.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal details, ability</strong></td>
<td>Give correct name, contacts, qualifications, affiliations, CV, areas of expertise; understands publishing and review processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong></td>
<td>Will perform the review within the given deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectivity, honesty</strong></td>
<td>Will be professional; will not slow down process or be unfair; will nominate any alternative reviewers neutrally and truthfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution</strong></td>
<td>Will perform the review without help (or will seek prior permission); no coerced authorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidentiality</strong></td>
<td>Will not use/share any of the author information or confidential peer review report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflicts of interest (COIs)</strong></td>
<td>Will state any potential (non-)financial / personal COIs, public viewpoints, expert witness; self-recusal if needed; no coerced citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editor-only report</strong></td>
<td>Recommendation of accept / revise / reject; any ethical concerns about research/reporting; which sections were (not) reviewed; COIs during review; identity of author became known during double-blind review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. What are the challenges…?

- Pressure to publish
- Over-reliance on journals and metrics
  - Publication bias, “cherry picking”
  - Multidisciplinary work discouraged
  - Authorship pressure
- Perverse incentives
- Compromise on standards
- Verification not encouraged

“58% of survey respondents are aware of scientists feeling tempted or under pressure to compromise on research integrity and standards”
5. …and solutions?

Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS)
www.jsps.go.jp/j-kousei

RePAIR Guidelines in Protecting the Integrity of the Research Record
5. …and solutions?

**All stages; all stakeholders:**
- Technology
- Training
- Unbiased reporting
- Transparency, including conflicts of interest
- Open research
- Data sharing
- Reproducibility
- Clear guidelines
- Emphasis on correction
- Cooperation (COPE)
- ORCiD, CRediT
- Service, peer review
- Assessment (DORA)
- Incentives, support

http://nuffieldbioethics.org/project/research-culture/
COPE membership application  https://publicationethics.org/join-cope

1. Study requirements for membership at COPE website; journals must have published for at least 1 year

2. Choose membership category (i, Publisher; ii, Editor)  
   [Associate Members directly email COPE]

3. i. Identify applicant and senior ethics person; prepare journals spreadsheet  
   ii. Identify applicant; prepare CV of chief editor

4. Check you fulfil all 16 Principles of Transparency & Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing and 10 COPE Core Practices, and have read necessary documents

5. Complete online form (eg, URLs for each item) and submit with supporting documents; be prepared to give password access to articles
## Some Don’ts

### XXX Medical Journal Principles of Transparency
- **Website**: Yes
- **Journal name**: XXX Medical Journal
- **Peer Review**:
  - Yes, 1 week, blinded

### Our ethics
See COPE Codes of Conduct

- No specific policies; Codes have now been archived; Use of logo

### XXX Medical Journal Principles of Transparency
- **Website**: www.xxx.org
- **Journal name**: www.xxx.org
- **Peer Review**: www.xxx.org & Publisher website
- **APC**: Pay USD88 at submission for open access

### Box ticking for 16 principles / addressing them in one webpage only; Vague and short peer review

### Giving same URL for every item in application form; Just referring to publisher; APC due at submission

### We indexing in followings:
- CiteFactor
- ICV 500
- Global IF 10
- Mega IF 50

### Questionable metrics / indexes; Poor grammar
Some Dos

• Plan carefully
  o Show stable infrastructure, production
  o Peer review, content, language/presentation quality
  o Clear ethics policies & procedures are in place (Not just box-ticking)
  o Professional website; relevant links to COPE, ICMJE, GPP3, CSE, WAME,...
  o Complete application correctly, respond to emails

• International standards
  o ISSN, DOIs, ©, CC licence, ORCiDs, full bibliographic data
  o Digital archiving (CLOCKSS, Portico, PubMed Central)
  o EQUATOR Network checklists, Trial registration, TOP data sharing policies
  o Check for -ve journal signs (Shamseer et al, BMC Medicine 2017;15:28)

• Standard statements
  o Clear journal info; fully address Fabrication / Falsification / Plagiarism & questionable practices
  o Authors, Acknowledgements, COIs, Funding, Ethics approval, Consent, Trial No., ©, CC licence, © permissions, prior presentation, data sharing, ‘transparency statement’
Wiley Research Seminar Japan 2018
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Thank you!

Trevor Lane, DPhil, Education & Engagement Consultant, Edanz Group, and COPE Council Member (Chair, Member Services), tlane@edanzgroup.com
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