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1) Digitalization in academic publishing

What is digitalization?

What has it done for us?

Is it a boon or a bane?
To progress his/her research career, a researcher is faced with this simple fact:

In order to apply for grants, conduct novel research, summarize research findings, or write original research articles.

A researcher must find, read, and cite relevant research material.

A researcher reads > 300 articles per year

Researchers spend an average 10 hours per week searching for and reading articles

...of which, 3.5 hours is spent searching for research articles and 5.5 hours reading.

- Researchers in Chemistry and Life Science spend longer than average searching for articles and chemists spend longer reading
- Younger researchers spend > 4hrs a week searching.
- Researchers from China spend longer searching (six hours) and reading (nine hours) articles than any other country.

• A researcher typically reads six articles per week.
• Chemists read nine per week. Mathematicians read four articles per week.
• China-based researchers read one more than average per week (7 articles).
• After searching and reading for 10 hrs per week only 42% of the papers read are considered important.
Scopus can help researchers & students

- Find out what already exists in the global world of research output
- Determine how to differentiate research topics and find new ideas
- Decide what, where and with whom to partner or collaborate with
- Track impact of research; monitor global research trends
- Identify and analyze which journals to read or where to submit an article
- Help researchers manage their career through citation counts and the h-index

Scopus is designed to accelerate the literature research process

1) What's the best journal for my research?
2) Related interdisciplinary, global, research?
3) Who is citing my work?
4) What's the trend - is this a growing or declining field?
5) Who else is working on this in my country or elsewhere in the world?

69% agree that Scopus saves them time in the research process

Scopus coverage:
- All disciplines
- 360 book series
- 22,000 journals
- 5,000 publishers
- Global coverage
2) Quick Overview: Scopus Journal Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOURNALS</th>
<th>22,025 peer-reviewed journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>359 trade journals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Full metadata, abstracts and cited references (references for post-1995 only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- &gt;2,800 fully Open Access titles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Articles in Press for &gt;5,100 Titles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Going back to 1823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funding data from acknowledgements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFERENCES</th>
<th>82K events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.8M records (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf. expansion (2005 – 2013):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.817 conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,022 conf. events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410K conf. papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5M citations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly Engineering and Physical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOKS</th>
<th>512 book series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20K Volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0M items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86,969 books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709K items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books expansion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126K books by 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Social Sciences and A&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATENTS</th>
<th>24M patents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from 5 major patent offices:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57 M records from 22,025 active serial titles and 86,969 books

21.4 pre 1996 records
35.8M post 1995 records
Scopus is the Gold standard: more than 150 leading research organizations rely on Scopus data

How does Scopus choose serial content?

Stage 1:
All titles should meet all minimum criteria in order to be considered for Scopus review:
- Peer-review
- English abstracts
- Regular publication
- Roman script references
- Pub. ethics statement

Stage 2:
Eligible titles are reviewed by the Content Selection & Advisory Board according to a combination of 14 quantitative and qualitative selection criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Policy</th>
<th>Quality of Content</th>
<th>Journal Standing</th>
<th>Regularity</th>
<th>Online Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Convincing editorial concept/policy</td>
<td>• Academic contribution to the field</td>
<td>• Citedness of journal articles in Scopus</td>
<td>• No delay in publication schedule</td>
<td>• Content available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Type of peer-review</td>
<td>• Clarity of abstracts</td>
<td>• Editor standing</td>
<td></td>
<td>• English-language journal home page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity geographic distribution of editors</td>
<td>• Quality and conformity with stated aims &amp; scope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality of home page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity geographic distribution of authors</td>
<td>• Readability of articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Info: http://www.elsevier.com/online-tools/scopus/content-overview
Questions: titlesuggestion@scopus.com
2) Publication Ethics: Plagiarism

Publication Ethics

- Scopus requires that every journal which accrues to the system must publish a clear and consistent statement of Publication Ethics and Policies in respect of Malpractice, and that each publisher will be held to account for the performance and compliance with this policy.

- Important issues include:
  - Plagiarism
  - Collaboration
  - Originality
  - Fraud
  - Conflict of Interest
Types of ethics complaints

- Fabrication of data or cases
- Wilful falsification of data
- Plagiarism

- No ethics approval
- Not admitting missing data
- Ignoring outliers
- No data on side effects
- Gift authorship
- Redundant publication
- Inadequate literature search

FFP = Falsification, Fabrication, Plagiarism
QRP = Questionable Research Practice

Plagiarism

- Taking credit for others' text and ideas
- Literal copying without acknowledgement or permission
- Substantial copying
- Paraphrasing ideas without acknowledgement
- Reproducing portions of an author's own work
- Unintentional: Self-plagiarism?
"Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, or words without giving appropriate credit, including those obtained through confidential review of others’ research proposals and manuscripts."

Federal Office of Science and Technology Policy, 1999

3) Consequences
The Consequences

- Consequences vary depending on the misconduct and the journal, institutions and funding body involved

Authors could:
- Have articles retracted (carrying a note why they were retracted e.g. for plagiarism
- Have letters of concern or reprimand written to them
- Institutes and funding bodies could carry out disciplinary action

Options for corrections and sanctions

- Important: sanctions proportionate to the violation
- Rejection of submission
- Notification of author’s institute
- Notification of funding body
- Corrigendum (honest mistakes, author in full agreement)
- Expression of Concern (temporary, inconclusive evidence)
- Temporary banning of author: keep for very serious cases
- Retraction: a note accompanying the article explaining what happened
- Removal: making the article disappear. Used very sparingly.
- All retractions & removals (except AiP) are reviewed by Retraction Committee within Elsevier
Elsevier Policy on Article Withdrawal

- **Withdrawal** – *only for Articles in Press*
- **Retraction** – *infringements of professional ethical codes*
- **Removal** – *extremely limited number of cases*
  - clearly defamatory article,
  - infringes others’ legal rights,
  - the article is (expected to be) the subject of a court order,
  - might pose a serious health risk.

- [http://www.elsevier.com/about/companyinformation/policies/article-withdrawal](http://www.elsevier.com/about/companyinformation/policies/article-withdrawal)

**What is the community doing?**

- **CrossCheck**: A growing problem for journal editors. Elsevier offers CrossCheck®️, a plagiarism detection service, for use within the editorial workflow as part of its efforts to support the peer review process and assist the scientific community. Although only an estimated 0.1% of submitted articles are ever suspect—with considerable variation of occurrence between different academic areas—a workable software solution for plagiarism detection can lower the burden on editors and ensure misconduct is caught.

- **The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)**: A non-profit organization that provides a forum for editors of peer-reviewed journals to seek guidance on ethical issues. It supports and encourages editors to report, catalogue, and investigate investigations into misconduct in the publication process. COPE fosters a deep understanding of publication ethics by offering practical guidance and resources including eLearning training modules, a database of case studies, podcasts of forum discussions, newsletters, and guidelines on retraction, best practices, and other ethical topics.

- **The Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK)**: A single point of access for step-by-step guidelines on publishing ethics that helps editors navigate the often complex processes involved in handling different types of misconduct. It was...

- **Mandatory Ethics Statement for all Submissions**: As part of its ongoing efforts to ensure all authors understand and abide by ethical standards in publishing, Elsevier has a mandatory ethics statement for all submissions. All authors are required to read and to commit...
CrossCheck

- Consists of database of published content and plagiarism-detecting software from Iparadigms
- Huge database: 31 million+ articles from 175,000+ journals and books from 300+ publishers
- Software shows any similarities between the article and previously published articles, incl. a “similarity rating”

- 700 journals have CrossCheck accounts: some Editors check all submissions, some check all accepted papers, some check only suspicious papers

COPE

- Independent body
- Started in 1997 as “self-help” group of editors (e.g. Richard Horton, Lancet)
- As of 2008, all Elsevier journals part of COPE: first major publisher to do so
- Website with searchable database of sample cases back to 1997
- Teleconferences where editors can seek advice on tricky cases
- Online distance-learning modules for Editors

http://publicationethics.org/
Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK)

- First stop for editors: advice on how to handle ethics cases

- Policy statements, form letters, case studies (some from COPE), flow-charts and decision-trees

http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk
Educating researchers on the do’s & don’ts

As researchers, you can make valuable and lasting

www.ethics.elsevier.com

Ethics education program

- www.ethics.elsevier.com

- Developed with advice from independent experts incl. COPE, librarians, editors

- Teaching the “ground rules”

- ...and what happens when they’re broken

- Real-life stories of those affected by plagiarism etc
Publication Ethics & Malpractice Statement (PEMS)

- An EXAMPLE of a valid Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement can be found here: http://journals.cambridge.org/action/stream?pageId=6728&level=2

- The monitoring of publishing ethics is a major aspect of the editorial and peer-review process, and as such lies within the area of responsibility of the editor-in-chief, or scientific editor, of each title. You can find an example of a recognized publication ethics and malpractice statement here: http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/New_Code.pdf

- A Code of Conduct and guidelines can be found here: http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines

- As part of our commitment to the protection and enhancement of peer review, our publishing team offers editors assistance and guidance in these matters. A Publishing Ethics Resource Kit was developed in response to requests from editors for helpful tools to manage these challenging situations. It provides flowcharts to guide editors through processes required to deal with different forms of publishing ethics abuse, template letters to adapt and use for various situations, Q & A information and much more. http://www.elsevier.com/editors/publishing-ethics/perk

Publication Ethics & Malpractice Statement (PEMS)

- Publication ethics and malpractice statement required
- No specific wording suggested
- Useful resources:

  http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk/what-is-elseviers-position-on-publishing-ethics

  http://publicationethics.org/

  http://www.icmje.org/

  www.ethics.elsevier.com
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