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An art gallery curator acquires displays, cares for, organises, develops and oversees collections of works of art.
Close Examination: Fakes, Mistakes and Discoveries

Date and time
30 June – 12 September 2010
Sainsbury Wing Exhibition
Admission free

This exhibition explores the vital contributions of applied science to the understanding of Old Master paintings in the National Gallery. A world leader in its field, the Gallery employs advanced techniques in scientific examination, conservation and art historical research to investigate a painting’s physical properties.

The exhibition will showcase some of the most intriguing stories behind paintings in the Gallery, as it explores the ways in which advances in...
Editors as Leaders for Research Integrity (and Good Publication Practice)

Leading =

• To have a goal and vision – full and honest reporting
• To set a path for this goal – best practices and policies
• To motivate others to follow
Editors and suspected misconduct
3 main challenges:

- Raising awareness among editors (in all disciplines)
- Common agreed principles and approach (where possible)
- Improved collaboration between editors and research leaders/institutions
Raising awareness and help for Editors

Helping journals to get their houses in order

COPE is a forum for publishers and editors of peer-reviewed journals to discuss issues related to the integrity of work submitted to or published in their journals. It supports and encourages editors to report, catalogue and instigate investigations into ethical problems in the publication process...

Membership benefits of COPE

- Fully searchable archive of 10 years of cases and advice

Latest News & Events

GROWING PARTNERSHIPS WITH PUBLISHERS ENABLES COPE TO EXPAND
October 24, 2008

www.publicationethics.org.uk
COPE – cases

- 4 meetings a year (Forum) – about 40 editors and other COPE members
Cases

Listed here are all the cases COPE has discussed since its inception in 1997. You can search by keyword using either the search field top left or by filtering your inquiry using the years and keywords listed in the cloud below.

Years


Keywords
author mistakes authorship changes in authorship consent for publication data fabrication data manipulation / falsification data ownership disputed authorship editorial decisions gift authorship journal mistakes lack of ethical review/approval multiple submissions overlapping publications participant confidentiality participant consent plagiarism protection of subjects (human) quality of research redundant publication retractions reviewer misconduct role of publisher role of sponsor sanctions for misconduct selective reporting undeclared CoI (authors) undeclared CoI (reviewers) unethical research whistleblowers

Lack Of Acknowledgement Of Contributor
Case Number: 10-23
✓ authorship ✓ sanctions for misconduct

A Claim Of Stolen Data And A Demand For Retractions
Case Number: 10-22
✓ data ownership ✓ disputed authorship ✓ rejections
### Discussed cases at COPE 1997-2010 (n=408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unethical research/consent issues</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redundant submission/publication</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorship issues</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plagiarism</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>editorial misconduct</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fabrication/falsification</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflicts of interest</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewer misconduct</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common agreed Principles and Approach

International Guidelines/Best Practices and Policies

• For authors
• For editors

?To be agreed in Singapore 2010
Concurrent session Track 4
Best Practices for Authors

10 Principles

- Ethical research
- Originality
- Accuracy
- Completeness
- Honesty
- Balance
- Authorship/acknowledgement
- Peer review and publication convention
- Responsibility and responsiveness
Best Practices for Editors – the 3 Ps
Policies, Processes, and Principles

• General policies
  ➢ Transparency and honest reporting (authorship, CoI and role of funding source, full and honest reporting)
  ➢ Responding to criticisms and concerns (scientific debate, correction, investigating misconduct, screening for misconduct)

• Policies only relevant for biomedical journals
  ➢ Ethical conduct (ethics approval, consent, data protection, adherence to specific guidelines legal requirements

www.publicationethics.org.uk
Best Practices for Editors – the 3 Ps

• Processes
  ➢ Fair and appropriate peer review (interaction with peer reviewers and authors, dealing with reviewer misconduct)
  ➢ Fair editorial decision-making (journal processes, editorial conflict of interest policies)

• Principles
  ➢ Editorial independence and integrity (separating decision-making from commercial consideration, editors’ relationship to owner or publisher, journal metrics)
  ➢ Editorial confidentiality (authors’ material, reviewers’ identity)
Collaboration with Research Leaders/Institutions

Difficulties for Editors

Not clear whom to contact
Not always responsive
Some forms of misconduct not taken seriously enough
Investigation not done, or not thoroughly or fairly done
Investigation takes a long time
Editors are not always informed
Findings are not publicly available
Peer review misconduct not taken seriously
"For me, integrity is not a fixed state of mind, it is something I have to work for every day”

Richard Smith