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COPE’s Core Practices

COPE assists editors of scholarly journals and publishers - as well as other parties, such as institutions - in their work to preserve and promote the integrity of the scholarly record through policies and practices. COPE describes these in 10 “Core Practices”. COPE's Core Practices should be considered alongside specific national and international codes of conduct for research.

Core practices are the policies and practices journals and publishers need, to reach the highest standards in publication ethics. We include cases with advice, guidance for day-to-day practice, education modules and events on topical issues, to support journals and publishers fulfil their policies.

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
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.

Cases

Victim of article theft wants correction to list their name, not retraction

Peer reviewer contacted by author

Authorship conflict

Guidelines

How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers

Flowcharts

How to recognise potential authorship problems

Systematic manipulation of the publication process

General approach to publication ethics for the Editorial Office
Analysis of Authorship Cases

COPE database of cases (N=597) presented to Forum for discussion includes 134 (23%) cases related to authorship and contributorship through December 2018

(https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Case)

Qualitative content analysis of written case presentation
Cases brought to COPE Forum by members (1997-2018)

29 specific categories assigned to reflect major issues
Cases are complex and multiple categories apply
Overarching Question about Behaviors

• Unintentional
  • Legitimate confusion
  • Naiveté
  • Cultural misunderstandings
  • Vulnerable authors
  • Honest disagreement about the science

• Intentional
  • Protection of reputation
  • Territorial disputes
  • Deliberate plagiarism
  • Bullying or threatening
  • Conflicts of interest
  • Forging documents
Top 5 most common problems

Claims that data, methods, intellectual content stolen

Institutional investigation was incomplete, inconclusive, suspicious

Undeclared conflicts of interest

Misconduct in conducting, analyzing, or reporting findings

Duplicate publication or salami slicing
Author activities involved in disputes

Changes to author list: removal, omission, or addition after submission

Manuscripts submitted without knowledge of one or more listed authors

Claims of authorship after submission or publication

Ghost, guest, gift authors

Disputed order of authors

Forged signatures on submission and/or copyright transfer forms
Institutional investigations of complex cases

Often involved large studies or clinical trials

Frequently involved patents or proprietary intellectual property

Legal issues complicated proceedings

Cases were extremely complex
Cases of Claims of Theft (N=47)

- Stolen data, methods, materials, verbal content = 23
- Student work submitted by supervisors, others = 7
- Translated article fails to acknowledge original = 2
- Legitimate authors removed or omitted, inappropriate addition of other authors = 15
Cases of Authors Fighting (N=35)

• Differences of opinion or interpretation of data = 11
• Legal threats or disputes = 10
• Authorship order disputes = 4
• Submission delayed by supervisor = 3
• Bullying by one author = 7
Cases of Shadowy/Mystery Authors (N=35)

- Ghost authors = 3
- Guest/gift authors = 8
- Unaware of submission = 11
- Disappearing authors = 5
- Forging authors = 4
- Implausible productivity = 1
- Anonymous authors = 1
- Questionable personal integrity = 2
Disbanded author consortium

Corresponding author (CA)

15 Authors

9 Institutions

Journal editor

Outside legal counsel

Institutional investigators

Disbanded author consortium

Refused to add authors from one institution
Denied permission for removal request from 3 authors

3 Researchers requested removal for disputes with CA

3 Additional junior researchers claimed authorship but CA refused to agree

Unresolved investigation by institution

Requested investigation and delayed publication awaiting findings

Submitted case to COPE

Lawyers threatened journal editor with "legal action and full media coverage for alleged censorship and unethical behavior"

Hired lawyers

Please save your questions until all the presenters have finished
Thank You
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