“Ethical issues aren’t just a concern on Wall Street. Publications deal with ethical issues constantly and practices vary widely.”

Retractions: Guidance from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

Ethical issues aren’t just a concern on Wall Street. Publications deal with ethical issues constantly and practices vary widely. Here we provide the COPE guidelines on retraction originally published December 1, 2009.

What is COPE?
The Committee On Publication Ethics (COPE) aims to increase the integrity of academic journals by advising editors on publication ethics. COPE has more than 5,000 members worldwide across a wide range of disciplines embracing sciences and humanities.

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 cross-referencing, permission, or justification (i.e. cases of redundant publication).
• It constitutes plagiarism.
• It reports unethical research.

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.
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Scores of us in the publishing industry have a mentor who has helped form our personal approach on ethics and perhaps they are still more influential than we realize. In my case I’ve had several mentors throughout the years and have found myself asking more than once “What would they do?” But decisions aren’t always about doing only what is right, but also how to make things right. From time to time all of us come across controversial topics or situations in our work. In this issue we’ve focused on both guidelines and websites that help you in times when you need an objective opinion.

Our feature article reprints the Council On Publication Ethics (COPE) retraction guidelines. COPE states that 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); if the findings have previously been published elsewhere without proper cross-referencing, permission, or justification (i.e. cases of redundant publication); if the material constitutes plagiarism; or if it reports unethical research. But from time to time, perhaps you just need to publish a correction. If you do retract an article, the digital world in which we now live allows for something print can’t promise: a link to the retracted article wherever possible.

The Publishers Association (PA) recently made available the Copyright Infringement Portal, covered in this issue’s Technovations article, and members of the PA are entitled to use the Copyright Infringement Portal at no cost. This is truly a captivating development for publishers who are concerned that their works are being plagiarized.

This issue of FrontMatter is accompanied by the 2009 Study of Subscription Prices for Scholarly Society Journals. Given the current economic climate and the changing nature of the scholarly publishing industry, reviewing historical price trends can serve as a starting point for establishing new, or revising existing, subscriptions prices. ★
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• 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 judgment will not be available for a considerable amount of 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 usually not appropriate if:
• A change of authorship is required but there is no reason to doubt the validity of the findings.

Retractions are also used to alert readers to cases of redundant publication (i.e. when authors present the same data in several publications), plagiarism, and failure to disclose a major competing interest likely to influence interpretations or recommendations.

The main purpose of retractions is to correct the literature and ensure its integrity rather than to punish authors who misbehave.

What Form Should a Retraction Take?
Notices of retraction should mention the reasons and basis for the retraction, to distinguish cases of misconduct from those of honest error; they should also specify who is retracting the article. They should be published in all versions of the journal (i.e. print and/or electronic). It is helpful to include the authors and title of the retracted article in the retraction heading.

Retractions should be clearly identified as such in all electronic sources (e.g. on the journal website and any bibliographic databases). Editors are responsible for ensuring that retractions are labeled in such a way that they are identified by bibliographic databases (which should also include a link to the retracted article). The retraction should appear on all electronic searches for the retracted publication. Journals and publishers should ensure that retracted articles are clearly marked on their own websites.

Retracted articles should not be removed from printed copies of the journal (e.g. in libraries) nor from electronic archives but their retracted status should be indicated as clearly as possible.

Which Publications Should Be Retracted?
If only a small part of an article reports flawed data, and especially if this is the result of genuine error, then the problem is best rectified by a correction or erratum. (The term erratum usually refers to a production error caused by the journal, while the term corrigendum (or correction) usually refers to an author error.) Partial retractions are not helpful because they make it difficult for readers to determine the status of the article and which parts may be relied upon.

The Purpose of Retraction
Retraction is a mechanism for correcting the literature and alerting readers to publications that contain such seriously flawed or erroneous data that their findings and conclusions cannot be relied upon. Unreliable data may result from honest error or from research misconduct.

“Retraction should usually be reserved for publications that are so seriously flawed that their findings or conclusions should not be relied upon.”
Similarly, if only a small section of an article (e.g. a few sentences in the discussion) is plagiarised, editors should consider whether readers (and the plagiarised author) would be best served by a correction (which could note the fact that text was used without appropriate acknowledgement), rather than retracting the entire article which may contain sound, original data in other parts.

Retraction should usually be reserved for publications that are so seriously flawed (for whatever reason) that their findings or conclusions should not be relied upon.

If redundant publication has occurred (i.e. authors have published the same data or article in more than one journal without appropriate justification, permission, or cross-referencing), the journal that first published the article may issue a notice of redundant publication but should not retract the article unless the findings are unreliable. Any journals that subsequently publish a redundant article should retract it and state the reason for the retraction.

If an article is submitted to more than one journal simultaneously, and is accepted and published in both journals (either electronically or in print) at the same time, precedence may be determined by the date on which a license to publish or a copyright transfer agreement was signed by the authors.

In cases of partial overlap (i.e. when authors present some new findings in an article that also contains a substantial amount of previously published information), editors need to consider whether readers are best served if the entire article is retracted or whether it would be best to issue a notice of redundant publication clarifying which aspects had been published previously and providing appropriate cross-references to the earlier work. This will depend on the amount of overlap.

Editors should bear in mind that the main purpose of retractions is to correct the literature and ensure its integrity rather than to punish authors who misbehave.

Only published items can be retracted. Guidelines on dealing with redundant publications identified in submitted manuscripts can be found in the relevant COPE flowchart [http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/01A_Redundant_Submitted.pdf]. Posting a final version on a website constitutes publication even if an article has not appeared (or will not appear) in print. If an article is retracted before it appears in the print version of a journal, the electronic version should be retained on the journal’s website with a clear notice of retraction and it should be included on bibliographic databases (e.g. with a digital object identifier [doi] or other permanent citation that will locate it) even if it does not appear in the printed journal and therefore does not receive a page allocation. This is because electronic versions may already have been accessed and cited by researchers who need to be alerted to the fact that the article has been retracted.

Who Should Issue the Retraction?
Articles may be retracted by their author(s) or by the journal editor. In some cases, retractions are issued jointly or on behalf of the journal’s owner (e.g. a learned society or publisher). However, because responsibility for the journal’s content rests with the editor he or she should always have the final decision about retracting material. Journal editors may retract publications (or issue expressions of concern) even if all or some of the authors refuse to retract the publication themselves.

When Should a Publication Be Retracted?
Publications should be retracted as soon as possible after the journal editor is convinced that the publication is seriously flawed and misleading (or is redundant or plagiarised). Prompt retraction should minimize the number of researchers who cite the erroneous work, act on its findings,
or draw incorrect conclusions, such as ‘double counting’ redundant publications in meta-analyses or similar instances.

If editors have convincing evidence that a retraction is required they should not delay simply because the authors are not cooperative. However, if an allegation of misconduct related to a potential retraction results in a disciplinary hearing or institutional investigation, it is normally appropriate to wait for the outcome of this before issuing a retraction (but an expression of concern may be published to alert readers in the interim – see below).

What Should Editors Do in the Face of Inconclusive Evidence About a Publication’s Reliability?

If conclusive evidence about the reliability of a publication cannot be obtained (e.g. if authors produce conflicting accounts of the case, authors’ institutions refuse to investigate alleged misconduct or to release the findings of such investigations, or if investigations appear not to have been carried out fairly or are taking an unreasonably long time to reach a conclusion), editors should issue an expression of concern rather than retracting the publication immediately.

Such expressions of concern, like retraction notices, should be clearly linked to the original publication (i.e. in electronic databases and by including the author and title of the original publication as a heading) and should state the reasons for the concern. If more conclusive evidence about the publication’s reliability becomes available later, the expression of concern should be replaced by a notice of retraction (if the article is shown to be unreliable) or by an exonerating statement linked to the expression of concern (if the article is shown to be reliable and the author exonerated).

Should Retraction Be Applied in Cases of Disputed Authorship?

Authors sometimes request that articles be retracted when authorship is disputed after publication. If there is no reason to doubt the validity of the findings or the reliability of the data it is not appropriate to retract a publication solely on the grounds of an authorship dispute. In such cases, the journal editor should inform those involved in the dispute that he or she cannot adjudicate in such cases but will be willing to publish a correction to the author/contributor list if the authors/contributors (or their institutions) provide appropriate proof that such a change is justified.

(For authorship disputes occurring before publication, see the relevant COPE flowcharts. http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/04A_Author_Add_Submitted.pdf and http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/04B_Author_Remove_Submitted.pdf)

Can Authors Dissociate Themselves from a Retracted Publication?

If retraction is due to the actions of some, but not all, authors of a publication, the notice of retraction should mention this. However, most editors consider that authorship entails some degree of joint responsibility for the integrity of the reported research so it is not appropriate for authors to dissociate themselves from a retracted publication even if they were not directly culpable of any misconduct.

Are There Grounds for Legal Proceedings if an Author Sues a Journal for Retracting, or Refusing to Retract, a Publication?

Authors who disagree with a retraction (or whose request to retract a publication is refused) sometimes threaten journal editors with legal action. Concern over litigation can make editors reluctant to retract articles, especially in the face of opposition from authors.

Journals’ instructions for authors should explain the retraction procedure and describe the circumstances under which articles might be retracted. This information should be incorporated (e.g. by references) into any publishing agreements and brought to the authors’ attention. However, even if the publishing agreement or journal instructions do not set out specific conditions for retraction, authors usually would not have grounds for taking legal action against a journal over the act of retraction if it follows a suitable investigation and proper procedures.
Still, legal advice may be helpful to determine appropriate wording for a notice of retraction or expression of concern to ensure that these are not defamatory or libelous. Nevertheless, retraction notices should always mention the reason(s) for retraction to distinguish honest error from misconduct.

Whenever possible, editors should negotiate with authors and attempt to agree on a form of wording that is clear and informative to readers and acceptable to all parties. If authors consent to the wording of a retraction statement, this provides defence against a libel claim. However, prolonged negotiations about wording should not be allowed to delay the publication of a retraction unreasonably and editors should publish retractions even if a consensus cannot be reached.

© 2009 COPE. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

seeing green

Printing Green?

As consumers have become more environmentally conscious, communication regarding the printing and publishing industry’s efforts to find sustainable solutions is extremely important. While many are quick to assume that the printing industry is a villain in the environmental concerns of our planet, in truth our industry is a long standing, staunch supporter of environmental initiatives. In an effort to assist industry members communicate this message The Print Council released a new position paper titled “Why Print Is Green” at Print® 09.

A leader in recycling, sustainability, and pollution control, the printing industry has been championing environmental responsibility for more than three decades. However, in the past the industry’s efforts have been quiet and garnered little in the way of positive media attention. The Print Council hopes the position paper will be used by printers and designers to communicate why print media is the environmentally responsible choice for reaching their intended audience.

Presenting 10 specific ways in which print is green, The Print Council’s report is an effort to educate consumers on the industry’s ongoing environmental efforts. The report documents some of the following facts on why print is green:

- In 2008, more than 57% of paper consumed in the United States was recovered for recycling (more than any other material).
- The paper industry is aiming to reach 60% recycling by 2012. Every additional percentage point equals one million tons of paper recovered.
- Less than 10% of U.S. power comes from renewable sources – in the pulp and paper industry that figure is greater than 60%.
- Printers are frequent buyers of renewable-energy certificates. These certificates, which represent power generated by wind, hydro, solar, or biomass, support the growth of renewable energy producers.
- The average person’s paper use for a year, 440 pounds, is produced by 500 kilowatt-hours of electricity – the same amount used to power one computer continuously for five months.

The Print Council is committed to serving the print industry to develop, maintain, and increase the market for printed materials. Want to read it for yourself? Request a printed copy of “Why Print Is Green” from jnvinyard@msn.com.

Amanda Heather, Sales Administration
The Politics of Piracy: A Copyright Infringement Portal for the Publishing Industry

Online criminals target the publishing industry in a number of ways. The spectrum of offenses includes websites offering infringing copies of works to download, peer-to-peer file sharing of infringing copies, as well as the commercial sale of counterfeit copies of publications.

The industry has growing expertise in tackling each type of threat in an appropriate and effective manner, often by working with commercial partners. The Publishers Association has launched the Copyright Infringement Portal—a service developed by and for the industry. It offers an array of benefits to publishers and Trade Associations.

The following describes just some of the benefits of using the Copyright Infringement Portal:

- It offers an easy and efficient way to generate take-down notices. Rather than each publisher correctly identifying the relevant Internet service provider, drafting an appropriate legal notice, and issuing this to the correct address, the portal does each of these steps automatically.

- It offers an easy and efficient way to monitor responses to take-down notices. A quick glance will let you know whether the take-down has been achieved. A user-friendly ‘traffic light’ system of green, amber, and red icons is used throughout the portal.

- The portal provides industry-wide benefits by sharing information about infringements, take-down requests, and responses. It also offers real-time intelligence to its users, which can enable a very rapid industry-wide response to piracy. The portal collates intelligence information to inform an array of industry responses including licencing, litigation, and lobbying.

The portal currently issues take-down notices for both copyrights and territorial rights. The Publishers Association (PA) aims to develop the portal to extend its ability to issue notices related to peer-to-peer file sharing. The PA is also investigating, with a variety of service providers, potential ways of offering an automated detection service to publishers who use the Copyright Infringement Portal.

To use the portal, publishers need to register at www.copyrightinfringementportal.com. The cost to use the portal depends on the publisher’s annual turnover and its affiliation to participating Trade Associations. List prices are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>Annual licence fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to £1,000,000</td>
<td>£495 + VAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1,000,001-£5,000,000</td>
<td>£995 + VAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5,000,001-£10,000,000</td>
<td>£1,995 + VAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over £10,000,000</td>
<td>£2,995 + VAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The licence fee is for a single user, and additional user licences are available at £495 + VAT per annum.

Members of the PA are entitled to use the Copyright Infringement Portal at no cost. Other Trade Associations are negotiating discounted pricing arrangements for their members. For example, members of the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers are entitled to a 50% discount on the list prices.

To register, ALPSP members should go to www.alpsp.copyrightinfringementportal.com and other publishers should navigate to www.copyrightinfringementportal.com


2010 Mail Price Update

John E. Potter, the Postmaster General, announced October 15th that the Postal Service will not increase prices for First-Class Mail, Standard Mail, periodicals or single-piece Parcel Post in 2010. Changes in pricing for Priority Mail, Express Mail, Parcel Select, and most international products were still under consideration with a decision to come in November.
Getting the Most from Your Marketing Budget

Finding money for marketing can be a challenge in any economic condition and when a recession hits, the first instinct for most is to cut the marketing budget. Unfortunately, this is the time when marketing is most important. Those whose presence in the market fades instead of staying in front of their audience is destined to be forgotten.

The good news is that there are many affordable ways to remind potential members and subscribers that your organization is alive and well. This is the second section of our three part series providing details about what your organization can do in times like these.

Glossaries, Wikis, and other Resources

These can be useful vehicles to raise awareness of your publication and position it as an industry authority. Target students, faculty, and researchers with a free print or online glossary, image library, or wiki. Seek out sponsors or advertisers to underwrite the project. These are good ways to build name recognition and a reputation for supporting the community. Such reference guides can position the publication as a valuable resource for additional information on the subject.

Remember to collect mail and e-mail addresses for future marketing efforts by asking users of these free resources to register before granting access.

Buyer’s Guides

Buyer’s Guides are an inexpensive way to advertise your publication both in print and online, as well as target librarians and subscription agents who use these quick reference tools to get pricing and availability information. Publishers get a wide distribution of their advertisement for minimal cost, as librarians often share these tools with faculty. One example of this—publishers who advertise in the Allen Press Buyer’s Guide to Scientific, Medical, and Scholarly Journals™ reach 8,000 libraries and 2,000 agencies in more than 100 countries with their advertisement and current rate information.

Science fiction can be defined as that branch of literature which deals with the reaction of human beings to changes in science and technology. — Isaac Asimov