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Small journals lack visibility

• U.S. National Library of Medicine indexes 5,515 in MEDLINE, of >18,000 journals received

• 90% of relevant information is published in 10% of biomedical journals

• Science Citation Index: <2% of journals from small and developing countries

• Small journals are often ‘not seen’, even when the information is important
Indexing + access = visibility

Indexing
Is your journal indexed? Where?

Online publication
Is your journal published online?

Access to articles
Is a journal subscription required to access your articles?
Indexing

• A systematic organization of the literature to facilitate information retrieval

• **VISIBILITY**: provide a simple way to gain global visibility for little/no cost

• **ACCESS**: can serve as a portal to online content

• **QUALITY**: often have criteria for technical, editorial, and research quality and a stable publication record
Major indexers of scientific journals
Types of indexes

• **Open indexes**
  – Google Scholar
  – Index Copernicus

• **Quality-controlled indexes**
  – MEDLINE/PubMed
  – CAB International

• **Citation indexes** (also quality-controlled)
  – Scopus
  – Web of Science

Each index includes a slightly different database of journals
Indexes and journal selection

- "Bradford’s Law": a small number of journals in a discipline publish the majority of significant scholarly work
- Thus, most indexes use criteria to select journals for inclusion
  - Must meet basic publishing standards, publish regularly
  - Relevant scope
  - Original, peer-reviewed content
  - Editorial and ethics policies
- Indexes may periodically reassess journals
http://scholar.google.com

- Indexes websites with “scholarly articles”
- Websites must provide full abstracts or articles
- Retrieval system based on page ranking, citation data
- Citation rates higher than other indexes, as wide range of publication types
http://www.indexcopernicus.com

- Indexes bibliographic data and databases
- All journals can register
- A subset of journals meets basic standards
- Emphasize inclusiveness, the global scientific community
- Can be set up in various countries, using local languages
CAB International

• “the leading English-language bibliographic information service providing access to the world’s applied life sciences literature”

• Strength in agriculture, veterinary medicine

• Selective indexing of articles from wide range of journals
MEDLINE/PubMed


- National Library of Medicine bibliographic database of journal articles in life sciences and biomedicine
- **MEDLINE**: the database: titles, authors, abstracts; indexed using MeSH terminology
- **PubMed**: interface to retrieve article info from MEDLINE, PubMed Central, NCBI bookshelf
- **PubMed Central**: open access article repository
MEDLINE journal selection

- Literature Selection Technical Review Committee
  - A National Institutes of Health (NIH) advisory committee of external experts (analogous to a grant review panel)
  - Oversight by the Director of the National Library of Medicine
  - Meets 3X yearly, evaluates ~180 titles/meeting
  - Priority score between 0 (low) and 5 (high)
  - Acceptance rate 15% or lower
MEDLINE journal selection criteria

• **Scope and coverage**: core, unique biomedical content
• **Quality of content**: scientific merit, validity, importance
• **Quality of editorial work**
  – Objectivity, credibility, quality
  – Peer review process, adherence to ethical guidelines, disclosure of financial conflicts of interest, correction of errata, opportunity for dissent and opinion
• **Production quality**
  – Layout, printing, graphics, archival acid-free paper, online archive, website navigation
MEDLINE journal selection criteria

• Audience
  – Researchers, clinicians, educators, administrators, students
  – Physicians, nurses, dentists, veterinarians, scientists

• Types of content (prioritized)
  – Original research, original clinical observations, critical reviews, statistical compilations, descriptions or evaluations of methods or procedures, case reports with discussions

• Geographic coverage
  – Foreign language journals held to same criteria; English abstracts preferred; does the content fill a unique geographic niche?
ICMJE
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF MEDICAL JOURNAL EDITORS

Recommendations

Conflicts of Interest

Read the Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals.

Use the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest to generate a disclosure statement for your manuscript.
PubMed Central

- Launched in 2000 as a free archive for full text articles; a repository
- **Goal: comprehensive, broad coverage**
  - Must be in-scope for MEDLINE (biomedical, life sciences)
  - Unlike MEDLINE, need not provide unique content, but...
    - Must meet basic publishing standards
    - Review of scientific and editorial quality (librarians, scientists)
    - Review of ethical policies and practices
- A good “first step” to getting indexed in PubMed
SCOPUS

• “The largest abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed literature: scientific journals, books and conference proceedings”
• Basic publishing standards; regular, stable publication
• Scientific quality
  – Peer reviewed, diverse authors, citations, internationally relevant
  – Conformity with stated aims and scope
• Editorial quality
  – Diversity of editorial board
  – Convincing editorial and peer-review policies
• Technical quality
  – Readability of articles, English language abstracts
  – References in Roman script
Science Citation Index

• Journals in this index are used to calculate a journal’s impact factor:
  
  \[ IF_{2017} = \frac{\text{# citations in 2016 to articles published in 2015 and 2014}}{\text{# articles published in 2015 and 2014}} \]

An average of how often articles in a journal are cited by others
Science Citation Index

• Journal selection is a 2-step process
  – Step 1: Emerging Sources Citation Index
    • Citations tracked, but an impact factor is not calculated
    • Must be peer reviewed, follow ethical publishing practices, meet technical requirements, have English bibliographic info, be recommended or requested by Web of Science users
  – Step 2: Science Citation Expanded Index
    • Emphasis on citation impact; inclusion not guaranteed
Science Citation Index

• Basic publishing standards
  – Peer review, ethics, format, timeliness, informative titles and abstracts, complete bibliographic and author information
  – Prioritize journals publishing full-text articles in English
• Scientific content: will the articles enrich the database?
• International focus
  – Diversity in authors, editors, board (as appropriate for target audience)
  – Excellent regional journals that target local audiences
• Citation analysis
  – How important and influential is the journal in its discipline?
  – Is the journal integrated with the surrounding literature?
  – How cited are the authors and editorial board?
Indexing

• Indexing your journal as widely as possible increases its visibility

• Indexing is a benchmark of publishing standards and quality

• Develop strategic goals based on your target audience
Open-access journals

- Articles freely available online
- Strong trend in publishing (>11,000 journals)
- “Gold” model: author pays
  - $1500-$5000 on average
- “Green” model: free repository
  - e.g., PubMed Central
- Authors usually retain copyright
Hybrid journals

- Subscription journals with some open-access content
  - Selected articles or issues
  - Authors can opt to pay for open access for their article
  - Content freely available after a specified embargo period (usually 6-12 mos)
Open access • Open data • Open science

- Library subscription costs not sustainable
- Paywalls stifle learning and innovation, slow scientific progress
- Publicly-funded research should be available to the public
- Access to information is a right, not a privilege
Open access: visibility and innovation

- Enhanced “discoverability” — open indexes and search engines find authors and articles
- Novel publishing platforms
- Shorter time to publication
- Links with social networking
- New models of peer review
- Preprint publication
- Scalable: no “page limits”
VISIBILITY MATTERS
Predatory Journals

Journals that present a legitimate face for an illegitimate publication process

Accompanied by a rise in predatory publishers and journals
Predatory Journals – Criteria to Examine

**Editor and Staff**
- Are editors named?
- What are their academic credentials?
- Diversity – geographic, scientific, gender?
- Are listed editors aware of their listing?

**Business Management**
- Lack of transparency
- Undisclosed fees
- No practice for digital preservation
Predatory Journals – Criteria to Examine

Poor Journal Standards/Practices
Bona fide peer reviews not conducted
Author guidelines copied verbatim from other publishers

Integrity
Name of journal doesn’t reflect its mission or origin
(Canadian Journal of...)
Advertises fake impact factor
False indexing claims
Republishes articles without credit
Beware the Predatory Journal

Who’s Afraid of Peer Review?
Bohannon J, Science 2013;343:60-65

A spoof paper concocted by Science reveals little or no scrutiny at many open-access journals

Accepted by > 157 of the 300 journals
The journals that **accepted** the article were mostly:
- **On** Beall’s list of predatory journals
- **Not** in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)
- Peer review: little to none

The journals that **rejected** the article were mostly:
- In the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)

There was **overlap** between Beall’s list and the DOAJ
Tangled web

Follow the money
- Accepted
- Bank
- Rejected
- Editor
- Publisher

John Bohannon Science 2013;342:60-65

Published by AAAS
Call for Paper

International Journal of Innovative Research in Medical Science (IJIRMS) is a registered independent Organization, delivering quality education and services to education professionals and researchers around the world, especially those from the developing countries, and publishing high quality original research papers.

IJIRMS is owned and managed by Glare International Journal of Innovative Research in Medical Science (IJIRMS) also provides authoritative insight and new innovations affecting Research in Medical Science and the whole public.

The scope of articles for this journal includes case studies, theoretical and empirically based research. All manuscript should be reviewed and selection shall be based on the strength of quality, originality and contribution to knowledge.

Acceptance Notification: within 3-4 days after submission

Publication (Online): within 1-2 days after Payment Approval

Publication Charges:

For Indian Authors- 2000 Rs/-

For International Authors- 100 USD
Awareness of “predatory” open-access journals among prospective veterinary and medical authors attending scientific writing workshops

Mary M. Christopher* and Karen M. Young

Department of Pathology, Microbiology, and Immunology, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of California–Davis, Davis, CA, USA
Department of Pathobiological Sciences, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, WI, USA

Authors face many choices when selecting a journal for publication. Prospective authors, especially trainees, may be unaware of “predatory” online journals or how to differentiate them from legitimate journals. In this study, we assessed awareness of open-access and predatory journals among prospective authors attending scientific writing workshops; our long-term goal was to inform educational goals for the workshops. We surveyed participants of writing workshops at veterinary and medical schools and an international conference over a 1-year period. The survey included 14 statements for respondents to indicate agreement level on a Likert-like scale and four questions on awareness of resources about
Awareness of Predatory Journals

23% aware of term “predatory journal”

~5% aware of Beall’s list

~65% defined predatory journals based on some poor but not predatory practices; some misunderstood the term completely

On the rise

Mentors: Help novice writers to –

distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate journals

select the best journal for their work
Beware the Predatory Journal

Be sure the publisher is reputable

• Full verifiable contact information, including address?
• Peer review process: described?
• Member of the Directory of Open Access Journals or similar association?
• Are articles assigned a DOI?
Beware the Predatory Journal

Investigate the journal

- Assess quality of published articles
- Where is journal indexed?
- Is journal associated with a scholarly society?
- Who is the Editor?
- Editorial Board: recognized experts/affiliations?
Beware the Predatory Journal

Beall’s list:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>publishers</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journals</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However:

One person’s crusade, not without controversy, has disappeared from the Web
“Beall will be criminally prosecuted for fraud, extortion, bribery and money laundering.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>ISSN:</th>
<th>Online Access</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date Added to DOAJ</th>
<th>APC:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frontiers in Veterinary Science</td>
<td>2297-1769 (Online)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.frontiersin.org/Veterinary_Science">http://www.frontiersin.org/Veterinary_Science</a></td>
<td>Agriculture: Animal culture: Veterinary medicine</td>
<td>25 Mar 2015</td>
<td>1900USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medwave</td>
<td>0717-6384 (Online)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.medwave.cl">http://www.medwave.cl</a></td>
<td>Medicine: Medicine (General)</td>
<td>15 Jan 2013</td>
<td>600USD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Veterinarski Glasnik
ISSN: 0350-2457 (Print); 2406-0771 (Online)
Double blind peer review
Subject: Agriculture: Animal culture: Veterinary medicine
Date added to DOAJ: 21 Dec 2012

Acta Veterinaria
ISSN: 1820-7448 (Online)
http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/acve
Double blind peer review
Subject: Agriculture: Animal culture: Veterinary medicine
Date added to DOAJ: 11 Nov 2010

https://doaj.org/
Choose the right journal for your research

http://thinkchecksubmit.org/

Sharing research results with the world is key to the progress of your discipline and career. But with so many publications, how can you be sure you can trust a particular journal? Follow this check list to make sure you choose trusted journals for your research.
ONLY if you answer ‘yes’ to the questions on our checklist

Are you submitting your research to a trusted journal? Is it the right journal for your work?

Use our checklist to assess the journal

SUBMIT
Addressing Faculty Publishing Concerns with Open Access Journal Quality Indicators

Sarah Beaubien, Max Eckard


© 2014 by the author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution License, which allows unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, providing the original author and source are credited.

JLSC is a quarterly journal sponsored and published by Pacific University Library | ISSN 2162-3309 | http://jlscc-pub.org
Positive Indicators

- Scope of the journal stated
- Journal’s primary audience
- Researchers/practitioners
- Editor, editorial board membership
- Journal is affiliated with established scholarly organizations
Positive Indicators

Journal is registered in U Directory

Journal is listed in the Directory

Journal is included in sub indexes
Negative Indicators

difficult to locate or identify
information is absent on the
Negative Indicators

- No information is provided about the publisher, or the information provided does not clearly indicate a relationship to a mission to disseminate research content
- Repeat lead authors in same issue
- Publisher has a negative reputation (e.g., documented examples in Chronicle of Higher Education, list-servs, etc.)
Potential predatory and legitimate biomedical journals: can you tell the difference? A cross-sectional comparison

Larissa Shamseer¹,²*, David Moher¹,², Onyi Maduekwe³, Lucy Turner⁴, Virginia Barbour⁵, Rebecca Burch⁶, Jocelyn Clark⁷, James Galipeau¹, Jason Roberts⁸ and Beverley J. Shea⁹
Table 10 Salient characteristics of potential predatory journals

1. The scope of interest includes non-biomedical subjects alongside biomedical topics
2. The website contains spelling and grammar errors
3. Images are distorted/fuzzy, intended to look like something they are not, or which are unauthorized
4. The homepage language targets authors
5. The Index Copernicus Value is promoted on the website
6. Description of the manuscript handling process is lacking
7. Manuscripts are requested to be submitted via email
8. Rapid publication is promised
9. There is no retraction policy
10. Information on whether and how journal content will be digitally preserved is absent
11. The Article processing/publication charge is very low (e.g., < $150 USD)
12. Journals claiming to be open access either retain copyright of published research or fail to mention copyright
13. The contact email address is non-professional and non-journal affiliated (e.g., @gmail.com or @yahoo.com)
Fake Impact Factors and Metrics

- > 50 fake impact factor companies and misleading metrics
  - 2012 The Global Impact Factor (GIF)
  - 2013 CiteFactor
  - Universal Impact Factor (UIF)

- Logos sometimes appear on website of legitimate journals

Mehrdad Jalalian, The story of fake impact factor companies and how we detected them, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4477767/
Fake/Misleading Metrics

Metrics are judged to be misleading if they meet the following criteria:

• Website nontransparent, little information about location, team
• Charges journals for inclusion
• Scores for most or all journals increase each year
• Uses Google Scholar as its database for calculating metrics (no screening for quality and indexes predatory journals)
• Uses the term “impact factor”
The Journal Blacklist

Specialists analyze over 60 behavioral indicators to keep the community aware of the growing threats and to keep academia protected from exploitative operations.

Everything you need to know about a journal

Access to our 11,000+ journal database includes journal details, contact information, citation metrics, submission and review guidelines, and more.

Check below for subscription details
Cabell’s New Predatory Journal Blacklist: A Review

By RICK ANDERSON | JUL 25, 2017 | 60 COMMENTS

Rick Anderson

@LOOPTOPPER

Rick Anderson is Associate Dean for Collections and Scholarly Communication in the J. Willard Marriott Library at the University of Utah. He speaks and writes regularly on issues related to libraries, scholarly communication, and higher education, and has served as president of NASIG and of the Society for Scholarly Publishing.

View All Posts by Rick Anderson
“welcome development that it still needs quite a bit of work. The positives:

• The criteria for inclusion in the blacklist are clearly set out and publicly available.
• For each entry, date of last review is indicated, and an email hyperlink is provided that allows readers to contribute information about a journal.
• Each entry includes a link to Cabell’s appeal policy. Appeals are allowed once per journal per year, and instructions are included in the policy text.
• Wisely, ratings are given at the journal level, not the publisher level; thus, for example, the Open Science journal Advances in Biomedical Sciences is listed as having 5 violations of Cabell’s criteria, while the same publisher’s International Journal of Public Health Research has 6.
• For each entry, specifics of the violations are conveniently listed under criterion categories: thus, Acta Rheumatologica is dinged for violations in the categories of “Integrity” ( “The publisher hides or obscures relationships with for-profit partner companies”), “Website” (“Does not identify a physical address for the publisher or gives a fake address”) and “Business Practices” (“Emails from journals received by researchers who are clearly not in the field the journal covers”).”

Rick Anderson
“So what are the problems?

The most serious is that, as currently configured, Cabell’s Blacklist perpetuates the common problem of conflation low-quality journal publishing with deceptive or predatory publishing. In this case, the conflation happens because many of the blacklisting criteria Cabell’s applies are really quality criteria (“poor grammar and/or spelling,” “does not have a clearly stated peer review policy,” “no policy for digital preservation,” etc.) that can easily end up gathering fundamentally honest but less-competently-run journals into the same net as those journals that are actively trying to perpetrate a scam. Predatory and incompetent journals do often evince some of the same traits, but these traits don’t always indicate predatory intent. (However, the Cabell’s staff assures me that there is a behind-the-scenes scoring rubric that assigns different weights to different violations, and is designed to prevent merely new or low-quality journals from being tagged as predators and included in the blacklist.)”

Rick Anderson
Beall's list: Gone but not lost

24 JANUARY 2017 on Predatory publishers, Beall's list, Think check submit, research, Where to publish

Struggling to spot Predatory Publishers?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>T/F?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The publisher is a <a href="https://www.cope.org">COPE member</a> (ICMJE membership as well if medical titles), or of the STM Association, DOAJ, OASPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority/all of the publisher’s journals (or the journal in question) are indexed on services such as Web of Knowledge, Pubmed, PubmedCentral, Scopus etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The publisher has policies or practices for digital preservation, meaning that if the journal ceases operations, all of the content disappears from the internet” e.g. CLOCKSS, LOCKSS, PORTICO, (ArKiv, Rosetta, Arkivum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The publisher has published content to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is publicly available information on the publisher’s review procedures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When searching for the publisher name online - there are no concerning author or reviewer comments on online forums or similar about the publisher’s procedures and practices?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the journal/publisher on QOAM and do their journals have a high quality score <a href="http://www.qoam.eu">http://www.qoam.eu</a>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The publisher provides sufficient information about author fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The publisher provides comprehensive copyediting and proofreading services to published submissions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The publisher lists sufficient contact information, including contact information that clearly states the headquarter location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identifying Predatory or Pseudo-Journals

4 TABLES

1. Beall’s criteria for identification of predatory journals and publishers (inaccessible)

2. Criteria for receipt of the DOAJ seal

3. Checklist from Think. Check. Submit. initiative

4. “Warning sign” features that should increase suspicion that a journal is predatory (although features may be absent even in a predatory journal)
How can you let authors know your journal is not predatory?

• Does your journal adhere to the positive indicators?

• Does your journal avoid the negative indicators?

• Use these indicators of legitimacy and illegitimacy to create the vision, mission, and characteristics of your journal.
MedCrave strives to bring online scientific journals that cover almost every aspect of distinct science topics. Our advancements are strictly oriented to the research material of Biotechnology, Pharmaceuticals, Microbiology, Genetics, Clinical & Medical Research, Nutritional Sciences, and many more.

Agriculture, Aquaculture & Food Science

MOJ Food Processing & Technology (MOJFPT) - ISSN: 2381-182X
Journal of Aquaculture & Marine Biology (JAMB) - ISSN: 2378-3184
Advances in Plants & Agriculture Research (APAR) - ISSN: 2373-6402
Horticulture International Journal (HIJ)
Plant Science Open Access Journal (PSOAJ)
Journal of Agricultural Economics: Open Access (JAEOA)

NIH Funded & Indexed Articles

Translational Collaboration Platforms.
PubMed ID: 26798945

The Use of Low Level Laser Therapy (LLLT) For Musculoskeletal Pain
PubMed ID: 26859986

Clinical Trial Laboratory Data Nested With in Subject: Components of Variance, Sample Size and Cost.
PubMed ID: 26457336

Why is Preterm Birth Stubbornly Higher in African-Americans?
PubMed ID: 25905109

Association of Masseter Muscle Activities during Awake and Sleep Periods with Self-Reported Anxiety, Depression, and Somatic Symptoms
PubMed ID: 26709387

XGlycScan: An Open-source Software For N-linked Glycosite Assignment....
PubMed ID: 25346946
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Endocrinology &amp; Metabolism International Journal (EMIJ)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MOJ Anatomy &amp; Physiology (MOJAP)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hematology &amp; Transfusion International Journal (HTIJ)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MOJ Clinical &amp; Medical Case Reports (MOJCR)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Otolaryngology-ENT Research (JOENTR)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MOJ Surgery (MOJS)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urology &amp; Nephrology Open Access Journal (UNOA)</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Dairy, Veterinary &amp; Animal Research (JDVAR)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Obstetrics &amp; Gynecology International Journal (OCIJ)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Advances in Ophthalmology &amp; Visual System (AOVS)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Lung, Pulmonary &amp; Respiratory Research (JLPRR)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Diabetes, Metabolic Disorders &amp; Control (JDMDC)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MOJ Orthopedics &amp; Rheumatology (MOJOR)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Neurology &amp; Stroke (JNSK)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gastroenterology &amp; Hepatology: Open Access (GHOA)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Cancer Prevention &amp; Current Research (JCPCR)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Pediatrics &amp; Neonatal Care (JPNC)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Cardiology &amp; Current Research (JCCR)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Dental Health, Oral Disorders &amp; Therapy (JDHODT)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Dermatology &amp; Cosmetology (JDC)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MOJ Gerontology &amp; Geriatrics (MOJGG)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MOJ Lymphology &amp; Phlebology (MOJLP)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Pancreatic Research, Disorders &amp; Therapy (JPRDT)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Reproductive System &amp; Sexual Disorders International Journal (RSSDI)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urology & Nephrology Open Access Journal (UNOAJ) is an Internationally Peer-reviewed, Open Access Journal with a strong **motto** to promote information regarding the improvements and advances in the fields of Urology, Nephrology and research. The Journal covers the arena of kidneys, adrenal glands, ureters, urinary bladder, urethra, genitourinary disorders, urinary tract infections, urinary tract system and several other research areas. The innate theme of the Journal is to spread the advanced research technologies in Urology and Nephrology. All manuscripts published in this Journal are **subjected to rigorous Peer review.** The Journal **delightfully** welcomes Research Papers, Review Articles, Case Reports, Short Communications, Mini-Reviews, Opinions, Letter to Editors etc.

Email: urology@medcraveonline.org, urology@medcraveonline.us
Case presentation

A 37-year-old white male was in a large suburban mall parking garage and was unable to locate his car. After more than an hour of walking up and down flights of stairs and through row after row of cars, searching fruitlessly for his own car, he felt a powerful urge to urinate. With no restroom available in the garage, and knowing that he suffers from uromycitis, he feared that if he did not urinate immediately he would develop uromycitis poisoning. Because of his medically diagnosed condition, and because of the progressive policies of the city in which he resided (New York City), he had been issued a public urination pass, which shielded him from legal prosecution under public sanitation ordinances if, by medical necessity, he urinated in public and was caught and detained and issued a citation by civil authorities.

That day, though, he was not carrying his pass on his person; his younger male sibling had absconded with it. Nor, in fact, was
Predatory Journals and Publishers

Uromycitis Poisoning Results in Lower Urinary Tract Infection and Acute Renal Failure: Case Report

Abstract

Uromycitis is a rare but serious condition that affects over 2,000 mostly adult men and women in the United States each year. Described simply, it is caused by prolonged failure to evacuate the contents of the bladder and can result in a serious infection of the lower urinary tract known as “uromycitis poisoning.” which, if untreated, can cause acute renal failure and has an associated high mortality. Because people with uromycitis often cannot hold in their urine and feel they must-and, at times, actually must-urinate in inappropriate places, sometimes running afoul of local public sanitation ordinances, they can feel great personal shame and place themselves in legal jeopardy, through no fault of their own. We report the case of a 37-year-old male who suffers from uromycitis, was prevented from urinating in public, was admitted to the emergency room with uromycitis poisoning, was misdiagnosed, and was referred to our institution for treatment.

Martin van Nostrand¹*, Jay Riemenschnieder² and Leonard Nicodemo²

¹Department of Interventional Urology, Arthur Vandelay Urological Research Institute, USA
²Department of Psychology, Weill Cornell Medical College, USA

*Corresponding author: Martin van Nostrand, Arthur Vandelay Urological Research Institute, 129 W 81st Street, New York, NY 10024, USA, Email: martinvanonnostrand1949@gmail.com

Received: March 22, 2017 | Published: March 31, 2017
Beware the Predatory Journal

Mentors: Help novice writers to –

distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate journals
select the best journal for their work
Metrics

• What are metrics?
• What metrics should I use for my journal?
• Using metrics appropriately
Drowning in metrics

- Increasingly used to govern science
- Widely misused in hiring, funding, promotion
- Universities obsessed with global rankings
- Evaluation now “led by the data rather than by judgment”
Everyone loves numbers....
...but remember...
Numbers don’t tell you...

...the quality of the paper
...the quality of the journal
...the quality of the researchers
...the whole story
San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment

*Putting science into the assessment of research*

There is a pressing need to improve the ways in which the output of scientific research is evaluated by funding agencies, academic institutions, and other parties.

To address this issue, a group of editors and publishers of scholarly journals met during the Annual Meeting of The American Society for Cell Biology (ASCB) in San Francisco, CA, on December 16, 2012. The group developed a set of recommendations, referred to as the *San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment*. We invite interested parties across all scientific disciplines to indicate their support by adding their names to this Declaration.

The outputs from scientific research are many and varied, including: research articles reporting new knowledge, data, reagents, and software; intellectual property; and highly trained young scientists. Funding agencies, institutions that employ scientists, and scientists themselves, all have a desire, and need, to assess the quality and impact of scientific outputs. It is thus imperative that scientific output is measured accurately and evaluated wisely.

The Journal Impact Factor is frequently used as the primary parameter with which to compare the scientific output of individuals and institutions. The Journal Impact Factor, as calculated by Thomson Reuters,* was originally created as a tool to help librarians identify journals to purchase, not as a measure of the scientific quality of research in an article. With that in mind, it is critical to understand that the Journal Impact Factor has a number of well-documented deficiencies as a tool for research assessment. These limitations include: A) citation distributions within journals are highly skewed [1–3]; B) the properties of the Journal Impact Factor are field-specific: it is a composite of multiple, highly diverse article types, including primary research papers and reviews [1, 4]; C) Journal Impact Factors can be manipulated (or “gamed”) by editorial policy [5]; and D) data used to calculate the Journal Impact Factors are neither transparent nor openly available to the public [4, 6, 7].

Below we make a number of recommendations for improving the way in which the quality of research output is evaluated. Outputs other than research articles will grow in importance in assessing research effectiveness in the future, but the peer-reviewed research paper will remain a central research output that informs research assessment. Our recommendations therefore focus primarily on practices relating to research articles published in peer-reviewed journals but can and should be extended by recognizing additional products, such as datasets, as important research outputs. These recommendations are aimed at funding agencies, academic institutions, journals, organizations that supply metrics, and individual researchers.

A number of themes run through these recommendations:

Signed by 12,788 editors as of Oct 4, 2017
Metrics

• What metrics should I use for my journal?
  – Journal manuscript activity
  – Journal citation metrics
  – Article level metrics
Journal manuscript activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Indicator</th>
<th>Vet Clin Pathol</th>
<th>JAMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submissions/year</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Peer-reviewed</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: submission to 1st decision</td>
<td>1.5 mo</td>
<td>1.0 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: submission to acceptance</td>
<td>3.0 mo</td>
<td>2.5 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: acceptance to publication</td>
<td>9.0 mo</td>
<td>1.5 mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Journal rejection rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Type</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Rejection Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General science</td>
<td><em>Nature, British Medical Journal</em></td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty science</td>
<td><em>Circulation, Heart</em></td>
<td>75-85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subspecialty science</td>
<td><em>J Interventional Cardiology</em></td>
<td>50-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super specialist</td>
<td><em>Journal of Vascular Access</em></td>
<td>&lt;60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias to publish</td>
<td><em>Current Medical Research &amp; Opinion</em></td>
<td>10-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Large open access journals often have relatively high rejection rates because of impact-neutral peer review process

Data from Liz Wager, COPE
The journal impact factor (IF)
The journal impact factor (IF)
Journal Citation Report

• Annual publication of journal impact factor:

  \[ \text{IF}_{2017} = \frac{\text{# citations in 2016 to articles published in 2015 and 2014}}{\text{# articles published in 2015 and 2014}} \]

An average of how often articles in a journal are cited by others

Originally developed for librarians, to guide journal collections
Range of impact factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>8.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gut</td>
<td>16.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Clin Oncol</td>
<td>24.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>30.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>47.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Eng J Med</td>
<td>72.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca-Cancer</td>
<td>187.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>40.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Reviews Drug Discovery</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science (n = 138)</td>
<td>0.000 – 4.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59% &lt;1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The journal impact factor

• A general indicator of journal prestige

• Statistical issues
  – A mean of highly skewed data
    • High-impact journals get most citations from few articles
    • Doesn’t correlate with quality of individual articles or authors
  – Statistical noise 15–40%, depending on journal size
  – Precision to one decimal place

• Affected by discipline, article type, citation practices

• Open to abuse and manipulation
Citation rates differ by discipline

VIROLOGY
n = 30
median IF = 2.516
total cites = 223,580
total articles = 5,875

AGRICULTURE
n = 50
median IF = 0.676
total cites = 107,988
total articles = 5,922
Veterinary and medical journals

VETERINARY MEDICINE
n = 141
median IF = 0.705
total cites = 202,410
total articles = 13,639

MEDICINE
n = 133
median IF = 1.275
total cites = 913,720
total articles = 16,599

Journal IF

NEJM 47.050
ACTA MED MEDIT 0.000
VET RES 3.579
IRAN J VET RES 0.016
Citation rates differ by audience size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General science</td>
<td><em>Nature</em></td>
<td>36.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General neuroscience</td>
<td><em>Nature Neuroscience</em></td>
<td>15.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental neuroscience</td>
<td><em>J Neuropath Exp Neuro</em></td>
<td>4.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty neuroscience</td>
<td><em>Brain Pathol</em></td>
<td>3.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subspecialty neuroscience</td>
<td><em>Neuropeptides</em></td>
<td>1.553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citation practices affect citation rates

• Self-citation
  – Most journals have self-citation rates ≤15%
  – Major deviation: journals suspended from IF for 1 year
• Journal restrictions on the number of references
• Citing articles without reading them
• Tendency to cite English-language articles
• Citing poor-quality studies to make a point
Other factors affecting citation rates

• Scientific collaboration
  – “A correlation exists between the number of authors and the number of times an article is cited ....” (Flgg et al, 2006)

• Open access
  – 27 of 31 studies found more citations of open access articles (Swan A. [http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/18516](http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/18516))
    – Effect varies by discipline

• Early online publication: articles available longer
Comment from a journal editor to the authors of an accepted manuscript:

“Please review the past three years of our journal, and, where appropriate and relevant, cite all articles that would be relevant to your paper's subject. We appreciate your efforts in citing relevant previous studies from our journal. Thank you.”

Posting on WAME Listserv 3/11/2004
“We recently received an offer to pay money to authors who cite articles from our journal to increase the Impact Factor of the journal...”

Posting on WAME Listserv, 12/1/2010
“We have debated whether we should eliminate our ‘Notes’ section…”, because they are cited much less frequently than full articles. “But we are not prepared to sacrifice valid scientific content just to improve a metric…”

Fitzsimmons JM, Skevington JH, Canadian Field-Naturalist, 2010
ASM Journals Eliminate Impact Factor Information from Journal Websites

“Our goal is to avoid contributing further to the inappropriate focus on journal IFs...
Keep the impact factor in perspective

• Focus on article quality and your target audience
• Provide translations into English
• Expand indexing and access
• Educate and inform
  – Impact factor doesn’t measure article or author quality
  – Impact factor doesn’t measure educational benefit
  – Impact factor doesn’t measure clinical impact
• Avoid treating the number vs the patient
Other citation metrics and tools

• **h-index**: an author-level metric based on the number of articles (h) that have received at least h citations
  – h=6: an author has at least 6 publications that have each received at least 6 citations
  – Quantifies both scientific productivity and impact
  – Can be applied to journals and countries
• SCIImago Journal Rankings ([www.scimagojr.com](http://www.scimagojr.com))
SCImago: compare disciplines
### SCImago: Journal rank

![SCImago Journal & Country Rank](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>SJR</th>
<th>H Index</th>
<th>Total Docs. (2016)</th>
<th>Total Docs. (3years)</th>
<th>Total Cites (3years)</th>
<th>Citable Docs. (3years)</th>
<th>Cites / Doc. (2years)</th>
<th>Ref. / Doc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acta Veterinaria</td>
<td>journal</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>29.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annals of Animal Science</td>
<td>journal</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>2889</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>44.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCImago: compare countries in a region
SCImago: country-specific data

Serbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H index</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Citations per document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>62428</td>
<td>391776</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [Graph showing Citable documents and External cites]
  - Citable documents
  - Non-citable documents
  - Output: % of the region, % of the world
SCImago: country-specific data
Article-level metrics

A measure of the “attention” an article is receiving by readers

Compare with other articles in that journal or in similar journals

Most attention occurs shortly after publication
How can editors use article-level metrics?

- Encourage authors to promote their articles
- Help authors make their articles ‘discoverable’
- Help authors build networks, respond to comments
- Engage in social media
- Push popular articles toward new readers
- Track the performance of articles in your journal
- Compare journal performance over time
Metrics in academic evaluation

- Editors can inform and advise academic evaluators
- Quantitative evaluation should support qualitative, expert assessment
- Protect excellence locally relevant research
- Account for variations by field
- Avoid misplaced concreteness and false precision

_Nature_ 23 Apr 2015
Publication Ethics

“Encourage research that is praiseworthy rather than simply discourage research that is blameworthy.”

Center for Ethics at the University of Montana

The scientific enterprise is built on a foundation of trust

Published research influences other researchers and changes practice.
Public Trust in Research

MEDLINE retractions:
- 500 in 2014
- 684 in 2015
  (664 in 2016) Increased by 37%

MEDLINE citations:
- about 806,000 in 2015
  (870,000 in 2016) increased by 5%

Many retracted articles continue to be cited
(or are included in systematic reviews) after retraction
Have they plateaued? Too soon to know
MEDLINE Retractions

Retractions per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Retracted articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEDLINE Errata

Errata per year

| FY 2016 | 8,992 |
| FY 2015 | 12,344 |
| FY 2014 | 9,602 |
| FY 2013 | 9,178 |

Percent change
Promoting integrity in research publication

COPE is a forum for editors and publishers of peer-reviewed journals to discuss all aspects of publication ethics. It also advises editors on how to handle cases of research and publication misconduct. Read more About COPE...

**Code of Conduct**
COPE aims to define best practice in the ethics of scholarly publishing and to assist editors, editorial board members, owners of journals and publishers to achieve this.

**Flowcharts**
Our flowcharts are designed to help editors follow COPE's Code of Conduct and implement its advice when faced with cases of suspected misconduct.

**Guidelines**
Access COPE’s official guidance, including the Retraction Guidelines.

**COPE Research Grant**
COPE offers a grant of up to £5000 to a member for a research project into publication ethics. The next deadline for applications is 1st June 2011.

**NEWS & OPINION**

*News / NEW guide! A Short Guide to Ethical Editing for New Editors*
21/4/2011 2.28pm

*Opinion / COPE retraction study published*
21/4/2011 1.59pm by Natalie Ridgeway

*News / New Website goes live!*
21/4/2011 12.32pm
The redesigned COPE website has now been
Welcome to the Office of Research Integrity

The Office of Research Integrity (ORI) promotes integrity in biomedical and behavioral research supported by the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS) at about 4,000 institutions worldwide. ORI monitors institutional investigations of research misconduct and facilitates the responsible conduct of research (RCR) through educational, preventive, and regulatory activities.

ORI is organized under the following departments:
2. Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services (OS)
3. Office of the Assistant Secretary of Health (ASH)

ORI Update  Misconduct  RCR  Related Organizations

RSS News Feeds is an easy way for our latest news to come to you. Simply add http://ori.hhs.gov/feed.xml to your aggregate news reader.

ORI to Release Interactive Movie on Research Integrity.
A video simulation on research integrity will be released soon on the ORI web site and as a DVD. In the simulation, research...
Ethical Reporting of Data

- Image manipulation
- Misrepresentation of data
- Fabrication of data
- Honest errors
- Errors through negligence
- Purposeful deception

The pressure to publish...
Image manipulation

• No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced

• Adjustments of brightness, contrast, or color acceptable if applied to the whole image and do not obscure or eliminate any information present in the original

• How do you know? Software programs to detect manipulation

• As an editor, never manipulate images outside guidelines
Criteria for Authorship

- Substantial contributions to conception or design; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data; AND
- Drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

About CREDIT and ACCOUNTABILITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical editorial decisions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorship</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication/ Falsification</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical research</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Variation in nine most common case categories 1997-2016
Authorship Cases

• Unusually frequent submission of articles by a single author
• Editor as author of paper
• Paper submitted for publication without consent or knowledge of co-authors
• Request to withdraw as an author on an accepted but unpublished paper
• Suspected contact between reviewer and an author led to co-authorship of the reviewer
Misattribution

**Ghost authorship**
Failing to list as an author someone who meets accepted criteria for authorship

**Guest or gift authorship**
Listing as an author someone who fails to meet accepted criteria for authorship

*Cultural differences*......
Ghost Authorship

Malignant ghosts

Vioxx® case; Ross et al. JAMA 299:1800-1812, 2008

Rofecoxib (Merck)
Introduced as a safe and effective alternative to other NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis

Academic authors changed/softened manuscript at Merck’s request from: “systemic biosynthesis of prostacyclin...was decreased by [rofecoxib]” to “Cox-2 may play a role in the systemic biosynthesis of prostacyclin.”
Ghost Authorship

Thus, rofecoxib (Merck) might increase thrombus formation – but not presented in the publications

Other cardiovascular risks obscured

>80 million people took the drug
  80,000-140,000 cases of serious cardiovascular complications (stroke, heart attack) with estimated 30-40% fatalities

In litigation, company fined $320 million
What can editors do about ghost and guest authors?

Ghosts
Journal editors usually will not add an author (or publish a correction) without written agreement from the other authors.

Guests
After publication, if author listed without journal editor might publish a correction.

All research institutions, journals, and scientific societies should have formal authorship policies.
What now?

• Letters of submission of manuscripts to journals should include an “authorship verification statement” signed by all authors and indicating each author’s contribution
• The specific roles of the authors (“contributorship”) should be listed in the published article
• Conflict of interest disclosure
• Schemes to determine authorship and arrange order
Origin of the human malaria parasite Plasmodium falciparum in gorillas

Weimin Liu, Yingying Li, Gerald H. Learn, Rebecca S. Rudicell, Joel D. Robertson, Brandon F. Keele, Jean-Bosco N. Ndjango, Crickette M. Sanz, David B. Morgan, Sabrina Locatelli, Mary K. Gonder, Philip J. Kranzusch, Peter D. Walsh, Eric Delaporte, Eitel Mpoudi-Ngole, Alexander V. Georgiev, Martin N. Muller, George M. Shaw, Martine Peeters, Paul M. Sharp, Julian C. Rayner & Beatrice H. Hahn

Affiliations  Contributions  Corresponding author

Nature 467, 420–425 (23 September 2010)  doi:10.1038/nature09442
Received 25 May 2010  Accepted 20 August 2010
Contributions
All authors contributed to the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of the data; W.L., M.P., J.C.R., P.M.S. and B.H.H. initiated and designed the study; W.L., Y.L. and J.D.R. performed non-invasive Plasmodium testing and SGA analyses; B.F.K, R.S.R and J.D.R. performed microsatellite analyses; P.M.S. calculated Plasmodium prevalence rates; G.H.L. and P.M.S performed phylogenetic analyses; J.-B.N.N., C.M.S., D.B.M., S.L., M.K.G., P.J.K., P.D.W., E.D., E.M.-N., A.V.G. and M.N.M. conducted and supervised all fieldwork; and W.L., G.M.S., M.P., P.M.S., J.C.R. and B.H.H. coordinated the contributions of all authors and wrote the paper.

Competing financial interests
The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Corresponding author
Correspondence to: Beatrice H. Hahn

SGA-derived Plasmodium nucleotide sequences have been deposited in GenBank under accession numbers HM234976–HM235117 and HM237301 (cytb), HM235118–HM235143 (ldh), HM235144–HM235170 (clpC), HM235171–HM235268 (mtDNA-3.3 kb) and HM235269–HM235404 (mtDNA-3.4 kb) (also see Supplementary Table 6).
PUBLICATION
new knowledge....for the first time!

• Plagiarism
• Duplicate publication
Plagiarism

• Using or copying someone else’s words or data as though they were your own
  o All or part of a paper
  o Paragraphs, sentences, figures, data, etc.
  o Print or online
  o Inadequate attribution
Duplicate publication

• Using your own work in more than one publication
• Partial or full overlap
  o Text, figures, tables, data, samples, cases
• In print or electronic media
• Not acknowledged or disclosed
• Also called “text recycling”
Duplicate publication

• Some journals limit previous publication to a 250-word abstract
• Some journals consider conference proceedings as previous publication unless the distribution is limited
• Does your journal have a policy? Is it clearly stated on your website?
What would you do?

An author contact you about submitting her manuscript to your journal. She realized she had submitted the article to a predatory journal when the article was accepted in 2 days and a fee was requested. She never paid the fee and withdrew the manuscript, but the predatory journal nevertheless published it online.

Can she submit the paper to your journal?
iThenticate
Professional Plagiarism Prevention

VERIFY ORIGINALITY
Plagiarism Detection & Prevention Technology
- Check written work for plagiarism and attribution
- World's largest comparison database of professional & scholarly work
- Easy to use, results in minutes

Authors & Researchers
BUY CREDITS

Organizations
GET A QUOTE

Researchers, Editors & Companies
TRUST iThenticate
Protect your reputation
Avoid costly retractions
Prevent copyright infringement

How to Avoid Plagiarism
FREE PAPERS & REPORTS
Self-Plagiarism »
Pressure to Publish »
Costs of Research Misconduct »
More Papers & Resources »
What to do if you suspect plagiarism
(b) Suspected plagiarism in a published article

Reader informs editor about suspected plagiarism

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

Check degree of copying

Clear plagiarism (unattributed use of large portions of text and/or data, presented as if they were by the plagiarist)

Contact corresponding author in writing, ideally enclosing signed authorship statement (or cover letter) stating that work is original/the author’s own and documentary evidence of plagiarism

Minor copying of short phrases only (e.g., in discussion of research paper)
No misattribution of data

Contact author in neutral terms/expressing disappointment/explaining journal’s position
Discuss publishing correction giving reference to original paper(s) if this has been omitted

Note: The instructions to authors should include a definition of plagiarism and state the journal’s policy on it.
Journal policies on originality of work

• The submitted work must be original
• The manuscript is not under consideration by another journal
• Information in the manuscript has not been previously published except in abstract form (proceedings might be acceptable)
• Reprinted translations are acceptable if both editors agree and the original version is cited/attributed in the translated version
Conflicts of Interest

Disclose relationships, funding sources, revenue sources, consultantships, board memberships

Disclosure doesn’t imply bias, but lets reader interpret findings with full knowledge of possible biases
Privacy and confidentiality

• Manuscripts are “privileged communication”
• Editors must not disclose information, reviews, or decisions about manuscripts to anyone except authors and reviewers

• Reviewers:
  o Must not publicly discuss the author’s work before publication
  o Must not make copies or share with others
  o Must not contact authors
Ethical dilemma par excellence!

An article and 34 others by the same author published in another journal have been retracted.

One editor in the wake of these rejections.

Data were falsified and the author was reviewing his own papers!

He had suggested false reviewers with gmail and yahoo email addresses – and all the emails tracked back to him. He then submitted glowing reviews.
The tip-off?

The reviews were returned within 24 hours!
Committee on Publication Ethics

Recognised Features or Patterns of Reviewer Activity

- Similarity to other peer reviewer reports
  (purportedly from different individuals)
- Third party agency involvement
- Non-institutional email address
  (including, but not limited to: gmail, yahoo, or hotmail accounts)
- Suspicious email address
  (atypical for that reviewer)
- A review that is vague in style
  (language not typical of apparent seniority, experience, or educational background of reviewer)(Ref 6)
- Positive review in strong contrast to other reviewers
  (with mainly grammatical changes)
- Complimentary review but points out minor technical issues
  (appearing credible)
- Never recommends rejection
- Reviews frequently returned well ahead of the deadline
- Agreeing to review many manuscripts
  (and particularly ‘active’ in a journal’s peer review database)
- Fictitious name
- Work in an unrelated subject to the manuscript
- Atypical features of the IP address
- Extremely quick to agree to peer review
When reporting experiments on animals, authors should indicate whether institutional and national standards for the care and use of laboratory animals were followed. Further guidance on animal research ethics is available from the

International Association of Veterinary Editors’ Consensus Author Guidelines on Animal Ethics and Welfare.
Animal Care and Use

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF VETERINARY EDITORS

CONSENSUS AUTHOR GUIDELINES FOR ANIMAL USE

ARRIVE guidelines

Our ARRIVE (Animal Research: Reporting of In Vivo Experiments) guidelines are intended to improve the reporting of research using animals – maximising information published and minimising unnecessary studies.

The ARRIVE guidelines, originally published in PLOS Biology, were developed in consultation with the scientific community as part of an NC3Rs initiative to improve the standard of reporting of research using animals.
Corrections and Retractions

RETRACTION GUIDELINES

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
- it reports unethical research
Corrections and Retractions

Journal editors should consider issuing an expression of concern if:

- they receive inconclusive evidence of research or publication misconduct by the authors
- there is evidence that the findings are unreliable but the authors’ institution will not investigate the case
- they believe that an investigation into alleged misconduct related to the publication either has not been, or would not be, fair and impartial or conclusive
- an investigation is underway but a judgement will not be available for a considerable time

Journal editors should consider issuing a correction if:

- a small portion of an otherwise reliable publication proves to be misleading (especially because of honest error)
- the author / contributor list is incorrect (i.e. a deserving author has been omitted or somebody who does not meet authorship criteria has been included)

Retractions are not usually appropriate if:

- a change of authorship is required but there is no reason to doubt the validity of the findings
Resources and training

EQUATOR Reporting Guidelines and Toolkits
http://www.equator-network.org/

COPE E-Learning Modules
https://publicationethics.org/resources/e-learning

Pippa Smart Editor Training Course
https://www.pspconsulting.org/training/online-editor-s-course/
Organizations for Medical/Science Editors

International Association of Veterinary Editors (IAVE)  
www.veteditors.org

World Association of Medical Editors (WAME)  www.wame.org

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE)  
www.icmje.org

European Association of Science Editors (EASE)  www.ease.org.uk

Council of Science Editors (CSE)  www.councilscienceeditors.org

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)  http://publicationethics.org
Webinars and Upcoming Meetings

COPE Webinars

EASE and IAVE, Bucharest, Romania 8-10 June 2018
*Balancing Innovation and Tradition in Science Editing*

Sixth World Conference on Research Integrity, Hong Kong, 2019

Ninth International Congress on Peer Review and Scientific Publication, 2021
(see [http://www.peerreviewcongress.org](http://www.peerreviewcongress.org) for Eighth Congress, September 2017)