

GUIDELINES:

A SHORT GUIDE TO ETHICAL EDITING FOR NEW EDITORS

GUIDELINES

PROMOTING INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH AND ITS PUBLICATION

***COPE** provides leadership in thinking on publication ethics and practical resources to educate and support members, and offers a professional voice in current debates.*

© 2019 Committee on Publication Ethics

Registered charity No 1123023


Registered in England and Wales, Company No 6389120

Registered office: **COPE**, New Kings Court, Tollgate, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO53 3LG, United Kingdom

Our **COPE** materials are available to use under the **Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs** license
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Attribution — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work). **Non-commercial** — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

No Derivative Works — You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work. We ask that you give full accreditation to **COPE** with a link to our website: publicationethics.org



A SHORT GUIDE TO ETHICAL EDITING FOR NEW EDITORS

Background/structure

Becoming an editor of a journal is an exciting but daunting task, especially if you are working alone without day to day contact with editorial colleagues. This short guide aims to summarise key issues and to provide links to relevant pages of the **COPE website** as well as those of other organisations.

1. Initial assessment of the journal when you take over

After getting to grips with the mechanics of the journal, such as the submission system and timelines for manuscripts, preferably in conjunction with the previous editor, we recommend assessing current practice using the **COPE Journal Audit** (<https://bit.ly/2SFVkJA>). This tool is designed to help editors identify areas of their journal's policy, processes or practices that may require attention or may need to be revised so that they adhere to **COPE's Core Practices** (<https://bit.ly/2puBdb4>) on publication ethics. Journals vary in the ways they prevent or handle ethical issues, depending on the size of the journal staff, the resources available and the discipline they cover. We therefore recommend using the **COPE Journal Audit** in consultation with those who are most familiar with the journal's abilities and constraints (ie, the publisher and journal manager). If you identify any substantive issues in need of change, be aware that it may take a considerable time to alter the journal's practices.

2. Relations with the outgoing editor

Ideally there should be a handover period with the new and old editor working together. The duration of this period should be established in agreement with the publisher. This should allow the outgoing editor to complete submissions they had started. You should not overturn the previous editor's acceptance decisions unless serious problems are identified, such as plagiarism or data fabrication.

3. Relations with the other editors/editorial board

In some journals, the editor-in-chief will be expected to work with a team of co-editors. Your appointment as a new editor offers a good opportunity to review and confirm the roles and responsibilities of all editors and editorial staff, so that everyone is clear about their roles. Most journals also have an editorial board, although their levels of activity and involvement vary. We recommend that you contact your board members and discuss your expectations of them (eg, reviewing a certain number of manuscripts each year). Based on their response, you may find that you wish to add new editorial board members, ask existing editorial board members to step down and/or restructure the editorial board. Some journals have a policy of appointing editors for a fixed time period, and you will need to consult the publisher on these changes.

You may also wish to change the direction of the journal or redefine its scope. This must be undertaken in agreement with the other editors and the publisher or journal owner; otherwise editorial decisions may be inconsistent. New aims and scope need to be agreed on and clearly published in the medium the journal uses to communicate with authors, reviewers and editors.

4. Relations with authors

We recommend that you review the journal's *Instructions to Authors* to ensure they are up to date with current guidelines. These instructions should clearly state what is expected of authors and what the journal will do in cases of suspected misconduct such as plagiarism or data fabrication. You may wish to provide a link to the **COPE Flowcharts** (<https://bit.ly/2FJRNHh>) and the **COPE Retraction Guidelines** (<https://bit.ly/2TM4Ros>). Writing clear instructions is not easy. You should consider consulting with colleagues, the publisher or journal owner, or a language editor to ensure journal instructions are not ambiguous. In the submission system, you may wish to provide a checklist of what is expected from authors to maintain standards of manuscripts.

As the editor, you are responsible for everything published in your journal, and you should therefore take all reasonable steps to ensure the quality of this material, recognising that journals and sections within journals will have different aims and standards.

Decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based only on the paper's importance, originality and clarity, and the study's relevance to the remit of the journal (see also section 9 on editorial independence).

5. Journal Management:

COPE's Core Practices state that a well-managed infrastructure is essential to a journal's success. This includes appropriate training for editors, reviewers and staff and the establishment of policies to address the variety of issues that are identified in **COPE's Core Practices** or that otherwise may arise in the editorial process.

Work with the journal publisher or owner/editorial office to determine processes for handling submissions that are the most efficient and appropriate for the journal. Electronic submission systems can be designed to ensure authors provide all required information (eg, authorship declarations, funding information), but this should be balanced against the need to avoid over complex submission systems which may be off putting. It may be helpful to require that all elements are complete before a manuscript is sent for peer review (chasing details at a later stage can delay publication and upset schedules). You might consider checking for the following elements (as appropriate):

- Confirmation that the authors have read and understood the **Instructions to Authors**
- Authorship statement explaining what each author contributed to the paper (see below)
- Funding information
- Competing interests declaration
- Permission obtained for use of copyrighted material from other sources (including the Web)
- Documentation for any citations to unpublished work (eg, articles in press/personal communications)
- Information about previous submissions to other journals (eg, name of journal, reviewer comments)
- Confirmation that the manuscript has been submitted solely to your journal and is not published, in press or submitted elsewhere.

Journals should adopt and promote an authorship policy that is appropriate to the field of research. Your procedures should encourage appropriate authorship attribution and discourage guest and ghost authorships. These will vary from journal to journal but might include:

- Requiring statements of each individual's contribution to the research and publication
- Use of checklists to prevent ghost authorship
See PLoS: <https://bit.ly/2uL8HUx>
- Requiring all authors to sign an authorship declaration
- Including all authors in communications (eg, acknowledging receipt of a submission), not just the corresponding author
- Clearly specifying authorship criteria in the **Instructions to Authors**.

COPE's Core Practices also specify the need for editors to maintain ethical oversight of published research. If appropriate to the subject areas covered by your journal, you might also need to establish policies and procedures to address:

- Details of ethical approval and informed consent for studies in humans
- Registration of clinical trials and other study designs according to standard practice
- Details of approval and ethical conduct for animal experimentation
- Data availability and the appropriate handling of confidential data or proprietary business information.

For studies in humans, regulations regarding what type of study requires ethical approval vary worldwide. In some countries, all studies require ethical approval. You should determine a process for handling submitted manuscripts relating to such studies that do not satisfy your journal's normal requirement for independent ethical approval. Guidance is available from **COPE Guidance for Editors: Research, Audit and Service Evaluations** (<https://bit.ly/2V7XM2Z>).

6. The submission system

Electronic submissions usually include standard communications to authors, reviewers and other editors. If these are specific to your journal (rather than used throughout the publisher), you should review them to ensure that they reflect current practices, are consistent with the **Instructions to Authors** and are clear. Getting standard letters reviewed by other editors, editorial staff or a language editor may also help improve them and ensure they are clear.

7. Relationship with reviewers

Provide explicit guidance to reviewers on what is expected of them. Guidelines are available: **COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers** (<https://bit.ly/2xkGTcq>). This guidance should be regularly updated and, as applicable, should refer or link to **COPE's Core Practices** (<https://bit.ly/2puBdb4>). You should consider including the following points:

- Reviews should be conducted objectively
- Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate
- Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments and references as necessary and not be defamatory or libellous
- Reviewers should declare any competing interests
- Reviewers should decline to review manuscripts in which they have a competing interest resulting from competitive, collaborative or other relationships, or connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions connected to the papers
- Reviewers should respect the confidentiality of material supplied to them and may not discuss unpublished manuscripts with colleagues or use the information in their own work
- Any reviewer that wants to pass a review request onto a colleague must obtain the editor's permission first.

Journals should have systems for assessing the performance of reviewers and removing from the database those whose performance is not acceptable.

You should also have systems in place to ensure that peer reviewers' identities are protected — unless your journal has an open review system that is declared to authors and reviewers.

Reviewers should be asked to address ethical aspects of the submission such as:

- Has the author published this research before?
- Has the author plagiarised another publication?
- Is the research ethical and have the appropriate approvals/consent been obtained?
- Is there any indication that the data have been fabricated or inappropriately manipulated?
- Have the authors declared all relevant competing interests?

8. The peer-review process

Adopt a peer-review process that is appropriate for your journal/field of work and resources/systems available. You should think about the number of reviewers to be used, whether reviews are anonymous or signed, whether author names and affiliations are masked and whether reviewers must complete any checklists/forms.

You should have systems to ensure that material submitted to your journal remains confidential while under review.

Additionally, you should ensure that peer review is undertaken in a timely fashion so that authors do not experience undue delays. This will usually involve monitoring the process regularly and trying to increase efficiency and prevent delays.

9. Can editors publish in their own journal?

While you should not be denied the ability to publish in your own journal, you must take extra precautions not to exploit your position or to create an impression of impropriety. Your journal must have a procedure for handling submissions from editors or members of the editorial board that will ensure that the peer review is handled independently of the author/editor. We also recommend that you describe the process in a commentary or similar note once the paper is published, see: (<https://bit.ly/2OGsPk3>).

10. Editorial independence/relation with publisher/journal owner

(eg, academic/professional society):

The relationship of editors to publishers and journal owners is often complex but should always be based on the principle of editorial independence. Notwithstanding the economic and political realities of your journal, you should select submissions on the basis of their quality and suitability for readers rather than for immediate financial, political or personal gain see **COPE's Guidelines for Transparent Relationships Between Journals and Society Owners** (<https://bit.ly/2JltbE7>).

Given the complexity of the relationship, we recommend that you ensure that the terms of your appointment are spelled out in a signed, written agreement. Be prepared to negotiate with the publisher/journal owner to ensure the contract is in line with the **COPE Core Practices** and acceptable to you. Make sure you understand the procedures for handling grievances or disagreements (even though you hope never to have to use them). If there are no written procedures, try to develop these in conjunction with the publisher/owner.

11. Commercial issues (eg, advertising, commercial supplements, tendering process):

If your journal carries advertising or publishes sponsored supplements, you should ensure there are declared policies and accessible guidance on these to maintain the quality of the journal and to ensure that commercial considerations do not affect editorial decisions. As editor, you may also be involved in tendering for commercial services (such as printing or selecting a publisher). Your journal should have fair and transparent processes for handling such decisions. Individuals involved with such decisions should declare any competing interests and, if these are major, should withdraw from the process.

12. Responding to possible misconduct/inappropriate behaviour and dealing with complaints:

As an editor, you play an essential role in preserving the integrity of scholarly publishing. This includes a responsibility to pursue cases of suspected misconduct, even in submissions you have not, and do not, intend to publish. It is important that you act politely, fairly but firmly at all times. **COPE's Core Practices** state that journals must have procedures in place to address and respond to complaints, including anonymous complaints. In administering such issues, you may want to look to **COPE's Discussion Documents** for guidance eg, (<https://bit.ly/2YLfDz8>).

COPE's Flowcharts (<https://bit.ly/2FJRNlh>) on handling complaints offer recommended actions, and this usually starts with contacting the author or reviewer to ask for an explanation. Such letters can be difficult to write; they should not accuse authors or reviewers, but rather should state the facts clearly, giving any evidence, and allow authors or reviewers a chance to explain their actions before coming to a decision. **COPE** has prepared sample letters (<https://bit.ly/2WHZisZ>) to help you, and these can be adapted as required.

If you have concerns about plagiarism, data fabrication or an authorship dispute, you should (if possible) involve other editors (preferably the one who was involved directly in dealing with the manuscript) and inform the publisher or journal owner. You may wish to consult the cases discussed at the **COPE Forum** as well as the flowcharts and other guidance:

- Cases: <https://bit.ly/2l6rDFp>
- Flowcharts: <https://bit.ly/2FJRNLh>
- Guidelines: <https://bit.ly/2TNrp89>

It is essential to handle serious cases appropriately because they may have important implications for the individuals involved and may even have legal and financial implications for your journal, see: **Further Reading, Author Guidelines and Best Practice for Journals** on page 10.

You should always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. **COPE** has produced guidance on retractions (<https://bit.ly/2TM4Ros>). Prompt retraction of a seriously flawed article should not be viewed as an admission of failure on the part of the journal but as a responsible action to safeguard the academic record.

Be sure that your journal adopts and publishes its procedures for considering authors' appeals against editorial decisions and for handling complaints (eg, about journal processes). It can be helpful to appoint an independent ombudsman to advise on complaints that cannot be resolved internally.

13. Closing remarks:

Enjoy being an editor! It is a lot of work but tremendously exciting. Make sure you keep up to date with new developments—come to the **COPE Forum** if you are a member, sign up for conferences in editing, join editorial associations, such as the **European Association for Science Editors (EASE)**, **Council of Science Editors (CSE)**, or as appropriate to your speciality, and make contact with fellow editors. Make sure you follow discussions on new publishing models, new models of peer review and changing practices, and be continuously thinking about ways your journal might develop.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualisation:

Tara Hoke revised the 2011 guidelines that were originally conceptualised and written by Margaret Rees on behalf of COPE Council. We describe contributions to this project as follows:

2011 Version:	2016 Version:	2019 Version:
Writing: MR	Writing – review and editing: TH	Writing – review and editing: TH

AUTHOR GUIDELINES

- 1: How to Handle Authorship Disputes:
A Guide for New Researchers: <https://bit.ly/2KWD1IO>
- 2: ICMJE: Defining the Role of Authors and Contributors:
<https://bit.ly/1ruKdnU>
- 3: The World Association of Medical Editors has provided a statement on conflict of interest:
<https://bit.ly/2V8eldN>
- 4: The American Chemical Society has provided the following guidance for authors: <https://bit.ly/2up2NbN>
- 5: Royal Society Publishing:
<https://bit.ly/2GTp5bB>

FURTHER READING

- 1: UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO):
<https://bit.ly/2l89BSX>
- 2: US Government Office of Research Integrity:
<https://ori.hhs.gov>
- 3: American Physical Society Ethics Education Resources:
<https://bit.ly/2PCa5ma>
- 4: Royal Society of Chemistry Ethical Guidelines:
<https://rsc.li/2LaaBco>
- 5: American Society of Plant Biologists:
<https://bit.ly/2V0OtpJ>
- 6: Council of Science Editors: <https://bit.ly/2MKdhdy>
- 7: European Association for Science Editors:
<https://bit.ly/2UKVu99>

BEST PRACTICE FOR JOURNALS

- 1: International Mathematical Union's Statement on Best Practices for Journals:
<https://bit.ly/2utyxMJ>
- 2: CEIC Best Current Practices:
<https://bit.ly/2PysaBD>
- 3: Legal and Financial Implications: Research Misconduct, Retraction, and Cleansing the Medical Literature: Lessons from the Poehlman Case. Sox HC, Rennie D. Ann Intern Med. 2006 Apr 18;144(8):609-13. Epub 2006 Mar 6. PubMed PMID: 16522625:
<https://bit.ly/2OHRxQR>
- 4: Editorial Expression of Concern. Kennedy D. Science. 2006 Jan 6;311(5757):36. Epub 2005 Dec 22. PubMed PMID: 16373531: <https://bit.ly/2ZKW2zB>

Links to other sites are provided for your convenience but COPE accepts no responsibility or liability for the content of those sites.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.8>

Our COPE materials are available to use under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs license
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Attribution — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work). **Non-commercial** — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

No Derivative Works — You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work. We ask that you give full accreditation to COPE with a link to our website: publicationethics.org



Registered charity No 1123023
Registered in England and Wales, Company No 6389120
Registered office: COPE, New Kings Court,
Tollgate, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, Hampshire,
SO53 3LG, United Kingdom

PROMOTING INTEGRITY IN
RESEARCH AND ITS PUBLICATION

UNT_003314