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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

3.7 Hrs spent SEARCHING for articles per week

5.6 Hrs spent READING articles per week

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. n=4,225

- 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.

42% regarded as ‘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
2) Quick Overview:
Scopus Journal Selection Criteria
# Scopus® - the World’s largest Abstract & Citation Database

## JOURNALS
- **22,025** peer-reviewed journals
- **359** trade journals
  - Full metadata, abstracts and cited references (references for post-1995 only)
  - >2,800 fully Open Access titles
  - Articles in Press for >5,100 Titles
  - Going back to 1823
  - Funding data from acknowledgements

## CONFERENCES
- **82K** events
- **6.8M** records (12%)
  - Conf. expansion (2005 – 2013): **1,017** conferences
  - **6,022** conf. events
  - **410K** conf. papers
  - **5M** citations
  - Mainly Engineering and Physical Sciences

## BOOKS
- **512** book series
  - 28K Volumes
  - **1.0M** items
- **86,969** books
  - **709K** items
  - Books expansion: **120K** books by 2015
    - Focus on Social Sciences and A&H

## PATENTS
- **24M** patents from 5 major patent offices:
  - UK
  - US
  - Japan
  - Europe
  - World

## Health Sciences
- **6,834**

## Social Sciences
- **8,042**

## Life Sciences
- **4,509**

## Physical Sciences
- **7,456**

## Summary
- **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&lt;br&gt;• Type of peer-review&lt;br&gt;• Diversity geographic distribution of editors&lt;br&gt;• Diversity geographic distribution of authors</td>
<td>• Academic contribution to the field&lt;br&gt;• Clarity of abstracts&lt;br&gt;• Quality and conformity with stated aims &amp; scope&lt;br&gt;• Readability of articles</td>
<td>• Citedness of journal articles in Scopus&lt;br&gt;• Editor standing</td>
<td>• No delay in publication schedule</td>
<td>• Content available online&lt;br&gt;• English-language journal home page&lt;br&gt;• Quality of home page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Info: [http://www.elsevier.com/online-tools/scopus/content-overview](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

With plagiarism 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 plagiarim detection can lower the burden on editors and ensure misconduct is caught.

The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) is 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 instigate 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 critical topics.

The Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK)

The Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK) is 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 confirm
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
• 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/
CSAB Subject Chair for Medicine

David Few, MA, MB, BCH (Cantab), FRCS (London)

Medical Subject Chair, ICPETH, Current Selection and Advisory Board, 2019

David Few has been a Consultant General Surgeon with Southampton University Hospitals in the United Kingdom and Honorary Senior Lecturer to the University of Southampton since 1996. He was previously on the Visiting Consultant Surgeon to the University Hospitals of Leicester from 1991 to 1999.

He was Editor-in-Chief of the SRDO, the European Journal of Surgical Oncology from 2003 to 2016 and a member of the COPE/Committee on Publication Ethics Council from 2008 to 2011.

A T (Sandy) Florence CBE, PhD, DSc, FRSC, FRS, FRPharmS

Editor-in-Chief, International Journal of Pharmaceutics; Emeritus Professor of Pharmacy (Centre for Drug Delivery Research)

Alexander Sandy/Florence is editor-in-chief (Europe) of the International Journal of Pharmaceutics and was founding co-editor with; Professor Michael Most of the Journal of Drug Targeting. He is the author of more than 250 papers, reviews and chapters in books, and is the co-author (with Professor David Aitken & others) of Pharmaceutical Principles of Pharmacy now in its 4th edition, and Surfactant Systems: their Chemistry, Pharmacy and Biology, published in 1989. Another book, published by Elsevier, Active Agents, co-authored with the late Peter J. Hirst and C. B. Pilkington, was published in 1993.

Ole Gunnar Evensen

Assistant Director, University of Bergen Library, Norway

Ole G. Evensen (O.G.) has held a leadership role for University of Bergen Library in Norway since 2018. As Assistant Director for the library he is actively involved in educating the academic community about publishing ethics through the development of a series of highly creative and successful training materials. These include the video, ‘A Requirement: Good and the University’s educational resource Search and Write’, which helps students understand the essentials of writing papers and research papers. In addition to mentoring students with these key learning, Ole G. strives to reach the wider community by ensuring translations are made available, and by using popular distribution and social media channels such as YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter.

Margaret Rees, MA, DPhil, FRCOG

Secretary Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), United Kingdom; Editor-in-Chief, BMJ, Emeritus Reader in Reproductive Medicine, Oxford

Margaret Rees has a long-standing career focused on the publishing aspects of scientific and professional knowledge. She chairs a National Health Service research ethics committee, is a member of the Oxford Centre University Research Ethics Committee and the chair-aid of the UK Association of Research Ethics Committee and COPE secretary. Her extensive experience in publishing is based on editing, assessing and producing A�santha’s International Journal of Women’s Health, as well as 20 books on women’s health. For COPE in 2015, she wrote A Guide for new editors.
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://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk/what-is-elseviers-position-on-publishing-ethics)


  [www.ethics.elsevier.com](http://www.ethics.elsevier.com)
Thank you