



Declaring the Publication Ethics (Scopus Comments)

**Razieh Moghadam,
Kowsar Corporation,**



Open to accelerate science

SciVerse Scopus

- **Scopus**, officially named **SciVerse Scopus**, is a bibliographic database containing abstracts and citations for academic journal articles. It covers nearly 18,000 titles from over 5,000 international publishers, including coverage of 16,500 peer-reviewed journals in the scientific, technical, medical, and social sciences (including arts and humanities). It is owned by Elsevier and is available online by subscription. Searches in **Scopus** incorporate searches of scientific web pages through Scirus, another Elsevier product, as well as patent databases.

Better to be as the main link in EIC/Authors/Reviewers' Area

ELSEVIER

Type here to search on Elsevier.com



Advanced search

Follow us ▼

Help & Contact

Journals & books

Online tools

Authors, editors & reviewers

About Elsevier

Store

For Editors

[Home](#)

[Peer review](#)

[Elsevier Editorial System](#)

[Publishing Ethics Resource Kit](#)

[Publishing ethics:](#)

[Duties of editors and other parties](#)

[Additional organizations or resources](#)

[About PERK](#)

[About COPE](#)

[How this Publishing Ethics Resource Kit works](#)

[Why this Publishing Ethics Resource Kit?](#)

[What is Elsevier's position on publishing ethics?](#)

[Questions and](#)

PERK

Introduction

The Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK) is an online resource to support journal editors in handling publishing ethics issues. It is a single point of access for information and guidelines on publishing ethics. PERK provides flowcharts to guide editors through processes required to deal with different forms of publishing ethics abuse. Furthermore, it includes form letters to adapt and use for various situations, Q & A information and much more. For more information on this resource kit and how it works, please see [Why PERK?](#) and [How PERK works](#).

More resources for editors are available from COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics), including an eLearning program on how to handle and prevent misconduct. [Read more](#) about Elsevier & COPE.

NEW!

[Ethics in Research & Publication](#) offers young researchers advice on how to avoid misconduct and recommended reading about research and publication ethics. The program is a collaboration of an independent panel of experts in research and publishing ethics and Elsevier.



Decision trees

[General guidelines \(all decision trees\)](#)

- [1. Authorship complaints](#)
- [2. Plagiarism complaints](#)
- [3. Multiple duplicate concurrent publication/Simultaneous submission](#)

<http://www.elsevier.com/editors/home>

Razieh Moghadam

Kowsar Corp.



A publication ethics and malpractice statement has to contain the subjects below:

- Publication and authorship
 - ✓ *no plagiarism, no fraudulent data;*
 - ✓ *forbidden to publish same research in more than one journal.*
 - ✓ *list of references, financial support;*

- Author's responsibilities
 - ❖ *Authors obliged to participate in peer review process*
 - ✓ *All authors have significantly contributed to the research*
 - ✓ *Statement that all data in article are real and authentic*
 - ❖ *All authors are obliged to provide retractions or corrections of mistakes*
(<http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk/general-guidelines-all-decision-trees>)

- Peer review / responsibility for the reviewers
- ❖ *Judgments should be objective*
- ❖ *Reviewers should have no conflict of interest with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders*
- ❖ *Reviewers should point out relevant published work which is not yet cited*
- ❖ *Reviewed articles should be treated confidentially*

(<http://www.elsevier.com/about/publishing-guidelines/publishing-ethics>)

Publishing guidelines ▾

- Industry standards
- Peer review
- Publishing ethics**
- Policies
- Corporate responsibility ▶
- Open access ▶
- Universal access ▶
- Company history ▶
- Annual reports
- Press releases ▶
- Conferences
- Exhibitions
- Content innovation ▶
- Careers
- Social Media

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
- 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

- Editorial responsibilities

- ✓ *Editors have complete responsibility and authority to reject/accept an article*

- ❖ *Editors should have no conflict of interest with respect to articles they reject/accept*

- ❖ *Only accept a paper when reasonably certain*

- ❖ *When errors are found, promote publication of correction or retraction*

- ❖ *Preserve anonymity of reviewers*

<http://www.elsevier.com/about/publishing-guidelines/publishing-ethics>)

- Publishing ethics issues

- ❖ *Monitoring/safeguarding publishing ethics by editorial board*

- ❖ *Guidelines for retracting articles*

- (<http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/corrections.html>)*

- ❖ *Maintain the integrity of the academic record*

- ❖ *Preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards*

- ❖ *Always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed*

- ✓ *no plagiarism, no fraudulent data*

- <http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk>*

Other Subjects Which Can be Declared

• Plagiarism Detection

For Editors

[Home](#)
[Peer review](#)
[Elsevier Editorial System](#)

[Publishing Ethics Resource Kit](#) ▼

[Publishing ethics: Duties of editors and other parties](#)

[Additional organizations or resources](#)

[About PERK](#)

[About COPE](#)

[How this Publishing Ethics Resource Kit works](#)

[Why this Publishing Ethics Resource Kit?](#)

[What is Elsevier's position on publishing ethics?](#)

[Questions and answers](#)

[Note regarding COPE charts](#)

[All decision trees](#)

Plagiarism detection

The peer-review process is at the heart of scientific publishing. As part of Elsevier's commitment to the protecting the integrity of the scholarly record, Elsevier has an obligation to assist the scientific community in all aspects of publishing ethics, including cases of (suspected) duplicate submission and plagiarism.



Investing in plagiarism-detection software

Cases of suspected plagiarism are rarely limited to the same journal or publisher. More often than not, multiple journals and publishers are involved. Software solutions, therefore, ideally require cooperation between (all) publishing houses. In 2008, Crossref and the STM publishing community came together to develop CrossCheck, a service that allows publishers to verify the originality of published works. CrossCheck is powered by the iThenticate software from iParadigms, known as providers of Turnitin. CrossRef members collaborate to maintain a single database of published articles against which checking can take place.

About CrossCheck

iThenticate is standalone web-based software, separate from the Elsevier Editorial System (EES), developed and owned by iParadigms. It can be accessed with a username/password combination.

CrossCheck uses originality detection software to compare manuscripts against a unique database of 30+ million articles from 200+ publishers including Elsevier, IOP, Nature, Springer and Oxford University Press amongst others. Elsevier's contribution consists of 9 million articles and 7000 books and is continually increasing.

For a searchable list of all participating publishers, please visit: http://www.crossref.org/crosscheck_members.html

For a searchable list of all journals in the CrossCheck database, please visit: <http://www.ithenticate.com/search/>

Editors: to request a CrossCheck account, please discuss with your Publisher.

How the software works

The iThenticate system can be used to generate a similarity report at any point during the review process. Running a similarity check is very straightforward. After logging in to the iThenticate account you can simply upload the manuscript(s) and a similarity report will be generated within minutes.

The default similarity report view gives the percentage of the text of the manuscript which has overlap with one or more published articles.

<http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk/plagiarism-detection>

Razieh Moghadam

Kowsar Corp.



• All Decision Trees

For Editors

All decision trees

Decision trees provide flow charts for dealing with different forms of publishing ethics abuse. When an editor is confronted with a case (or suspected case) of ethics abuse, he/she should first identify the type of unethical behaviour, using the definitions provided in each of the decision trees. Then the decision trees, and their recommended action, can be followed. Flow charts from COPE, in this kit named 'COPE charts', are available for a second opinion. This is often the time for the editor to discuss the case with his/her publishing contact within Elsevier and agree what action, if any, needs to be taken. Within the decision trees, reference is made to the relevant form letters and Elsevier policies.



Home
Peer review
Elsevier Editorial System

Publishing Ethics Resource Kit

Publishing ethics:
Duties of editors and other parties

Additional organizations or resources

About PERK

About COPE

How this Publishing Ethics Resource Kit works

Why this Publishing Ethics Resource Kit?

What is Elsevier's position on publishing ethics?

Questions and answers

Note regarding COPE charts

All decision trees

Types of decision trees

General guidelines (all decision trees)

1. Authorship complaints
2. Plagiarism complaints
3. Multiple, duplicate, concurrent publication/Simultaneous submission
4. Research results misappropriation
5. Allegations of research errors and fraud
6. Research standards violations
7. Undisclosed conflicts of interest
8. Reviewer bias or competitive harmful acts by reviewers

<http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk/all-decision-trees>

Razieh Moghadam

Kowsar Corp.



Form Letters

For Editors

Home

Peer review

Elsevier Editorial System

Publishing Ethics
Resource Kit

Publishing ethics:
Duties of editors and
other parties

Additional organizations
or resources

About PERK

About COPE

How this Publishing
Ethics Resource Kit
works

Why this Publishing
Ethics Resource Kit?

What is Elsevier's
position on publishing
ethics?

Questions and
answers

Form letters

Form letters are examples of appropriate letters for various situations. Please consult the decision trees to find out which letter is appropriate for which type of ethics complaint. You can copy the text of the letter and adjust it to your needs. The template is also available in Word or PDF format.

Types of letters

- A. To author
- B. To complainant re: Author
- C. To institution
- D. To other journal (double publication)
- E. To funding agency
- F. To reviewer
- G. To complainant re: Reviewer
- H. To reviewer's institution

<http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk/form-letters>

[Home](#)

[Peer review](#)

[Elsevier Editorial System](#)

[Publishing Ethics Resource Kit](#)

[Publishing ethics: Duties of editors and other parties](#)

[Additional organizations or resources](#)

[About PERK](#)

[About COPE](#)

[How this Publishing Ethics Resource Kit works](#)

[Why this Publishing Ethics Resource Kit?](#)

[What is Elsevier's position on publishing ethics?](#)

[Questions and answers](#)

[Note regarding COPE charts](#)

Reviewer bias or competitive harmful acts by reviewers

How it works

To find out if a case, or suspected case of ethics abuse, falls within the category of this tree, please consult the definitions provided under 'What identifies a case in this area?' If it does, the recommended action of this tree can be followed. This tree furthermore provides:

- Case studies.
- References to the relevant form letters (examples of appropriate letters for various situations).
- Flow charts from COPE, here named 'COPE charts'. These are available for a second opinion. This is often the time for the editor to discuss the case with his/her publishing contact within Elsevier and agree what action, if any, needs to be taken.
- References to relevant Elsevier policies/links.

[< Back to all decision trees](#)



[What identifies a case in this area?](#)



[Recommended action](#)

Case studies

- 1: Submission of a paper by a reviewer
- 2: Reviewer/author conflict of interest
- 3: Referee with a conflict of interest

COPE charts

NOTE

[What to do if you suspect a reviewer has appropriated an author's ideas or data?](#)

Relevant Elsevier policies/links

[Duties of reviewers](#)

[Elsevier policy on article withdrawal](#)

<http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk/reviewer-bias-or-competitive-harmful-acts-by-reviewers>

• Additional Organizations or Resources

For Editors

[Home](#)

[Peer review](#)

[Elsevier Editorial System](#)

[Publishing Ethics
Resource Kit](#)

[Publishing ethics:
Duties of editors and
other parties](#)

[Additional
organizations or
resources](#)

[About PERK](#)

[About COPE](#)

[How this Publishing
Ethics Resource Kit
works](#)

[Why this Publishing
Ethics Resource Kit?](#)

[What is Elsevier's
position on publishing
ethics?](#)

[Questions and
answers](#)

[Note regarding COPE
charts](#)

Additional organizations or resources

This page provides an overview of useful links to additional organizations or resources that operate/are available in the field of publishing and research ethics.

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

[COPE](#) is a forum for editors of peer-reviewed journals to discuss issues related to the integrity of the scientific record. It supports and encourages editors to report, catalogue and instigate investigations into ethical problems in the publication process. COPE aims to define best practice in the ethics of scientific publishing and to assist authors, editors, editorial board members, readers, owners of journals and publishers. One of the ways in which it fulfils this mission is by the publication of its [Code of Conduct](#) and [Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors](#). COPE first published a set of guidelines in its third year of existence. These guidelines were published as [Guidelines on Good Publication Practice](#). See also [About COPE](#).

Council of Science Editors (CSE)

[CSE](#)'s mission is to promote excellence in the communication of scientific information. [CSE's White paper on promoting integrity in scientific journal publications](#) covers the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in publishing and identifies research misconduct and guidelines for action.

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE)

The [ICMJE](#) is a group of general medical journal editors whose participants meet annually and fund their work on the [Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts \(URM\) submitted to biomedical journals](#).

World Association of Medical Editors (WAME)

Established in 1995, [WAME](#) (pronounced "whammy") is a nonprofit voluntary association of editors of peer-reviewed medical journals from countries around the world who seek to foster international cooperation among and education of medical journal editors.

Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT)

[CONSORT](#) encompasses various initiatives developed by the CONSORT Group to alleviate the problems arising from inadequate reporting of randomized controlled trials (RCTs). CONSORT provides standards for randomized trials.

Sense about science

[Sense about science](#) is an independent charitable trust promoting good science and evidence in public debates.



<http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk/additional-organizations-or-resources>