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Publication ethics
What is publication ethics?

“A set of common rules among authors, editors, reviewers and publishers to protect the integrity of the scientific record.”

Charlotte Haug, previous Vice Chair, COPE
What are the big issues?

Publication Ethics: 16 years of COPE — Irene Hames, Charon A Pierson, Natalie E Ridgeway and Virginia Barbour
7th International Congress on Peer Review and Biomedical Publication
http://www.peerreviewcongress.org/abstracts_2013.html
What is COPE?

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...
Who are COPE members?

General members
- 11,000+ members (editors, publishers, associates)
- International and fully inclusive (100+ countries)
- Broad range of subject areas

Constitutional members
- 40 council members elected by general members or co-opted
- Trustee Board: officers/committee chairs, elected by Council members
- All volunteers, supported by 6 or so paid staff

publicationethics.org
COPE resources and services

- A neutral place (forum) to discuss issues
- Searchable database of ‘cases’
- A website of freely available resources
- Flowcharts
- Best practice guidelines
- Discussion documents
- Seminars/workshops and now webinars
- eLearning modules
- Code of Conduct
What help can you get?

- **Code of Conduct**
  Through the 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.
  [View Code](#)

- **Guidelines**
  Access COPE's official guidance, including the Retraction Guidelines.
  [View Guidelines](#)

- **International standards for editors and authors**
  Position statements setting out international standards for responsible research publication for editors and authors.
  [View more](#)

- **Flowcharts**
  Flowcharts are designed to help editors follow COPE's Code of Conduct and implement its advice when faced with cases of suspected misconduct.
  [View Flowcharts](#)

- **Sample Letters**
  Sample letters for editors covering a range of scenarios e.g. suspected plagiarism, change of authorship, undisclosed COIs
  [View more](#)

- **eLearning**
  COPE's eLearning course is designed to give editors a deeper understanding about publication ethics and practical guidance about how to detect, prevent and handle misconduct.
  [View eLearning](#)

- **Audit**
  Tool to help editors think about ethical issues and decide what is best for their journals.
  [View more](#)

- **Discussion Documents**
  Discussion documents aim to stimulate discussion and debate within the academic publishing community. Comments on the documents will be used to inform future guidelines and policies.
  [View Documents](#)

- **COPE Digest**
  COPE's monthly newsletter, providing up to date news on COPE and publication ethics issues elsewhere.
  [View Digest](#)

- **Seminars**
  Programmes and presentations from previous seminars.
  [View seminars](#)
Anonymous description of real issues (cases)
Discussion
Advice, follow up, resolution
Searchable resource
Challenges but no easy solutions

Nuffield Council report

- Pressure to publish
- Reliance on metrics
- Perverse incentives
- Compromise on standards
- Verification

“58% of survey respondents are aware of scientists feeling tempted or under pressure to compromise on research integrity and standards”
Publication ethics – a wicked problem?

“Could we aim to move the culture of publishing towards one where ethical practices become the norm, part of the culture itself, not something imposed from outside?”

Ginny Barbour, Chair COPE
Reporting guidelines
Scientific manuscripts should present sufficient data so that the reader can fully evaluate the information and reach his or her own conclusions about results.

Doug Altman, University of Oxford
The ethics of waste in research

*The need for reports of new research begins with up-to-date analyses of what is already known*

Iain Chalmers, James Lind Initiative
“...there is a relative scarcity of systematic reviews...”
“...it would therefore be desirable to undertake further systematic reviews and meta-analyses to evaluate more fully the predictability and transferability of animal models.”
A protocol format for the preparation, registration and publication of systematic reviews of animal intervention studies

Rob B. M. de Vries, Carlijn R. Hooijmans, Miranda W. Langendam, Judith van Luijk, Marlies Leenaars, Merel Ritskes-Hoitinga, Kimberley E. Wever

First published: 24 February 2015

DOI: 10.1002/ebm2.7

This work was partially funded by The Netherlands Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport (VWS), grant number 321200.
Why animal research needs to improve

Many of the studies that use animals to model human diseases are too small and too prone to bias to be trusted, says Malcolm Macleod.

Malcolm Macleod

*Nature 477, 511 (2011) | doi:10.1038/477511a*

Dopamine agonists in animal models of Parkinson’s disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Evelien D.M. Rooke ¹, Hanna M. Vesterinen ¹, Emily S. Sena, Kieren. J. Egan, Malcolm R. Macleod*
Guidelines for veterinary medicine?

1. Methods and processes of developing the strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology – veterinary (STROBE-Vet) statement

2. Completeness of reporting of radiation therapy planning, dose, and delivery in veterinary radiation oncology manuscripts from 2005 to 2010


4. Proposed definitions and criteria for reporting time frame, outcome, and complications for clinical orthopedic studies in veterinary medicine

5. Recommended guidelines for the conduct and evaluation of prognostic studies in veterinary oncology
Proposed Definitions and Criteria for Reporting Time Frame, Outcome, and Complications For Clinical Orthopedic Studies in Veterinary Medicine
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Recommended Guidelines for the Conduct and Evaluation of Prognostic Studies in Veterinary Oncology

J. D. Webster, M. M. Dennis, N. Dervisis, more...

First Published July 27, 2010 | Review Article

Abstract

There is an increasing need for more accurate prognostic and predictive markers in veterinary oncology because of an increasing number of treatment options, the increased financial costs associated with treatment, and the emotional stress experienced by owners in association with the disease and its treatment. Numerous studies have evaluated potential prognostic and predictive markers for veterinary neoplastic diseases, but there are no established guidelines or standards for the conduct and reporting of prognostic studies in veterinary medicine. This lack of standardization has made the evaluation and comparison of studies difficult. Most important, translating these results to clinical applications is problematic. To address this issue, the American College of Veterinary Pathologists’ Oncology Committee organized an initiative to establish guidelines for the conduct and reporting of prognostic studies in veterinary oncology. The goal of this initiative is to increase the quality and standardization of veterinary prognostic studies to facilitate independent evaluation, validation, comparison, and implementation of study...
COMPLETENESS OF REPORTING OF RADIATION THERAPY PLANNING, DOSE, AND DELIVERY IN VETERINARY RADIATION ONCOLOGY MANUSCRIPTS FROM 2005 TO 2010

Michele A. Keyerleber, Margaret C. McEntee, John Farrelly, Matthew Podgorsak
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Abstract

Surrounding a shift toward evidence-based medicine and widespread adoption of reporting guidelines such as the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) statement, there has been a growing body of literature evaluating the quality of reporting in human and veterinary medicine. These reviews have consistently demonstrated the presence of...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting guideline provided for? (i.e. exactly what the authors state in the paper)</th>
<th>Writing for publication in veterinary medicine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant URLs (full-text if available)</td>
<td>The full-text of this guide is freely available from: <a href="#">Practical Guide</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies to the whole report or to individual sections of the report?</td>
<td>Whole report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record last updated on</td>
<td>February 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods and processes of developing the strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology – veterinary (STROBE-Vet) statement

J.M. Sargeant a, b, g, A.M O'Connor c, I.R. Dohoo d, H.N. Erb e, M. Cevallos f, M. Egger f, A.K. Ersbøll g, S.W. Martin b, L.R. Nielsen h, D.L. Pearl b, D.U. Pfeiffer i, J. Sanchez i, M.E. Torrence k, H. Vigre l, C. Waldner m, M.P. Ward n
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