

Listy klinické logopedie

časopis Asociace klinických logopedů ČR, ISSN 2570-6179

Ethical codex for publication in the journal Listy klinické logopedie, journal of the Association of Speech-Language Pathologists of the Czech Republic

(Shortened and adopted version of the original text published at: Elsevier.com. (2020). [online] Available at: https://www.elsevier.com/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/653885/Ethics-in-research-and-publication-brochure.pdf [Accessed 5 Jan. 2020].

Anotated by members of the Editorial board of the LKL journal.

All researchers (experienced and beginners) must be aware of the importance of ethics. Harmful examples are, for example: plagiarism, cheating during research, undisclosed conflicts of interests. These can threaten the researcher's position among the research community. This ethical codex was created to serve the purpose of publishing in the journal Listy klinické logopedie. The codex was created as an ethics guideline in the field of publishing and research, and is considered to be crucial.

COPYRIGHT:

The aim of signing research articles is to create trustworthiness and responsibility of the authors. Intentional falsification of the relationship between a researcher and the research is considered to a mistake which threatens the integrity of the presentation of the research.

FOR AN AUTHOR TO SIGN, THE FOLLOWING THREE CONDITIONS MUST APPLY¹:

- Significant assistance during study proposal and its realisation; research, interpretation and analysis of sources/facts
- Suggestions and article amendments with the aim to improve content
- Authorisation of the final version

LISTED ARE GENERAL GUIDELINES. THESE GUIDELINES CAN BE CONTEXTUALLY VARIABLE¹.

¹ International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Authorship and Contributorship. Available at: icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

- Succession of authors should be the “collective decision of all co-authors”; individuals who were participating in the research, but not qualifying under the Journal's authorship's criteria, should be listed as contributors or supportive members
- Significant research publishes an index of clinical employers and centers. This is usually published alongside an announcement about individual contributions. An index of authors/contributors are listed with annotations about the specificity and significance of their contribution.

THREE TYPES OF AUTHORSHIPS ARE DEEMED AS UNACCEPTABLE²:

- “Ghostwriters” are authors who are significantly contributors, but are not acknowledged. Ghostwriters are often paid by commercial sponsors.
- “Guestwriters” are authors who are not actually contributing. They are listed because their name increases chances for publication.
- “Givers” are authors whose contribution is based only on ambiguous connection with the research.
- The following suggestions are to be vigorously followed. The reason for these recommendations is to avoid ambiguity and disappointment caused by different expectations. Before the commencement of the research, it is recommended to meet and consult documentation. The aim of this meeting is to solve the authorship and its future claims.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

Transparency and objectivity are paramount for scientific research, and for the process of its assessment. If a resolver, author, editor or reviewer has a financial/personal interest or belief, which could potentially influence his/her objectivity, the potential for a conflict of interest exists. These relationships are also known as double commitments, competitive interests or competitive loyalty.

THE MOST VISIBLE CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS ARE IN FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS:

- Direct: occupation, stocks and shares ownership, grants, patents
- Indirect: royalties, event organiser's consultations, reciprocal unit trust, expert testimony's fee

Undeclared conflicts of interests might seriously threaten the integrity of the journal, authors and science itself as, for example, a resolver who is the owner of stocks of a pharmaceutical society which is presented in the research.

² Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers. 2003. Available at: publicationethics.org/files/2003pdf12.pdf. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) policy statement on ghost writing initiated by commercial companies. Available at: [wame.org/policy-statements#Ghost Writing](http://wame.org/policy-statements#Ghost%20Writing) - ghost. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

A conflict might arise as a consequence of personal relationships, academic competition or personal excitement. An example can be a researcher, who³:

- Has a relative working for a company. The same company would have a product judged by the research.
- Independently sells part of research outcomes (for example, the potential for advertising / career advancement “in exchange”)
- Personal beliefs which directly conflict with the topic of research.

The editor's office should be fully informed about the possibly conflicting relationship. This should be disclosed even in the case when a subject is not convinced that his decision-making is possibly influenced. Information should be given to the editor's office which is given the text for publication. Disclosure of these relationships is noted in an accompanying letter or in the footnote in the actual paper⁴.

Under certain circumstances, conflicts of interest are unavoidable. Therefore, conflict of interest is not unethical in itself. The best guideline is full transparency and publication of all information in case of necessity⁴.

PLAGIARISM:

Plagiarism is the most common form of academic misconduct. Plagiarism is done when one author intentionally uses the work of another person without permission. Plagiarism has different forms, from direct copying, paraphrasing of the work of someone else, and it can include data, words and phrases, thoughts, and concepts⁴.

Plagiarism has distinct levels of severity for the misconduct. For example, how much of another person's work was used (a few sentences, paragraphs, pages, whole articles?), what was the objective of copying (results, methods, or introductory part?).

Table 1⁴:

Situation	What is it?	Is it unethical?	What action should be taken?
Direct copying.	Reproduction of working word by word, partially or fully, without the permission or confirmation of the original source.	Yes. Direct coping is permitted only if referring to the original source and using the quotation marks.	During your research, record all information sources you used and consequently refer to them. Check, whether the references are correct and complete. Use the quotation marks.
Recycling of the text.	Copying of part of an author's own thesis in a contribution. If the	Yes.	Anything which is stated by from a previously published thesis needs to be given in

³ International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Conflicts of Interest. Available at: icmje.org/conflicts-of-interest/. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

⁴ Elsevier.com. (2020). [online] Available at: https://www.elsevier.com/___data/assets/pdf_file/0008/653885/Ethics-in-research-and-publication-brochure.pdf [Accessed 5 Jan. 2020].

	contribution is duplicit and is reintroduced for publication as a completely new document.	Read the information about parallel handling in, please.	quotes (including the case of repetitive use of your own words). Check yourself to appropriately reference the source.
Substantial copying	It can include experimental material, processes, tables or equipments.	Yes. "Substantial copying" can be defined in the quality and quantity of the copied text. If your work includes fundamentals from other author's work, it should be properly referenced.	Ask yourself if your thesis has a substantial source of another author's work or scientific skill. How much you answer "yes" indicates if substantial copying took place. If yes, please do not forget to reference the original source.
Paraphrasing	Reproduction of other author's thoughts without their agreement and confirmation of the original source.	Yes. Paraphrasing is acceptable only when that source is appropriately given. You need to be sure that the meaning is not amended.	Double check yourself, that you fully understood the meaning of the text of original author. Never copy words which you lack full comprehension of. Contemplate how core thoughts of the source relate to your thesis.

4. PARALLEL HANDLING IN

The author's duty is to ensure that their work is based on original research, previously unpublished. Intentional or repetitive handling in of duplicit research is deemed to be breaching of the publication's ethics⁵.

Parallel hand in happens in the case when an author hands in one article to different publishers, which can cause one article being published in several journals.

Publishing of multiple duplicates happens in the case when two or more documents share in their core the same hypothesis, disclosures, discussion and/or outcomes, and that happens without full crosswising of the source. Among the main reasons why duplicit publication of original research is deemed unethical is the possible effect of "unintentional overlap or inappropriate connections of one research outcomes, which impair available findings to the topic."⁶

⁵ Elsevier.com. (2020). [online] Available at: https://www.elsevier.com/___data/assets/pdf_file/0008/653885/Ethics-in-research-and-publication-brochure.pdf [Accessed 5 Jan. 2020].

⁶ International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Publishing and Editorial Issues Related to Publication in Biomedical Journals: Overlapping Publications. Available at: <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/publishing-and-editorial-issues/overlapping-publications.html>. Accessed on June 17, 2017

Under certain circumstances, publishers of two journals can prearrange and agree upon using of “duplicity work”. These circumstances include^{5,6}:

- combined lead articles (for example, “About the case of plagiarism”, which includes two journals)
- (clinical) instructions, local announcement;
- articles' translations, assuming that the original publisher has given approval for full and prominent publication of their sources at the time of publishing.

Basic guideline: Articles for publication must be originals and they must not be published in any other publication. During hand-in authors must disclose all details which are connected with handed foundations (inclusive of those in different languages), about similar materials in the press and translations.

Table 2^{5,6,7}:

Situation	What is it?	Is it unethical?	What should be done correctly?
Parallel hand-in	Sending of the contribution to one or two journals together.	Yes. Hand-in is not allowed when that manuscript is in the hands of editors of other periodicals (journals).	Please be sure that your document is used in no more than one publication only. This rule should be followed when the presented document is in the present time assessed by other editors. If you, as an author, are unaware of other publisher's assessment outcomes, please take your time before they give you their final feedback. You are welcome to present your article to other journals the moment when a previous publisher rejects your contribution.

⁷ Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing, Version 2, 2015. Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Duplicate publication.	If an author presents their article or parts of their own contribution, which were previously already presented, without disclosing previous submissions.	Yes.	<p>Avoid using your own already published contribution in other journals.</p> <p>Avoid submitting publications which are fundamentally describing the same research to more than one periodical journal.</p> <p>All information in full about all previous appointments', presentations, and disclosing of research outcomes in registries which could be deemed as duplicit publications always need to be disclosed.</p> <p>This should also include previous disclosure of abstracts during conferences and reunions.</p>
Duplication done by paraphrasing, also known as "recycling of the text"	If an author writes about their own research from different points of view, and they do so in two or more articles without disclosure of their original contribution, then they commit duplication done by paraphrasing.	<p>Yes.</p> <p>It is seen as manipulation if several publications are created from the same research.</p>	<p>Anything that is directly taken from previously published contributions needs to be inserted in quotes. That includes cases when an author repetitively uses any part of their own contribution.</p> <p>Please remember to reference your sources appropriately.</p>
Translations of contributions which were already published in other languages.	Submitting contributions in different languages to journals without acknowledging original contributions.	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Translated articles are acceptable only if previous publishers of a contribution have given all necessary agreements. The case would include all and any foreign language contributions. All agreements need to be obtained from anyone who holds author's rights.</p>	<p>In case you aim to hand in your contribution to a journal which is published in another country or language, please seek the publisher's advice if doing so is appropriate. Please acknowledge all details relating to contextual documents in a foreign language and all existing translations. Please admit all of this at the time your submission</p>

5. FRAUDULENT RESEARCH

Fraudulent research is publishing statements or outcomes which were not obtained through the means of experiments or observation, but with the help of manipulation of data/figures. Two kinds of fraudulent research exists in the field of research and scientific work⁸:

- adjustment: amendments of research facts and outcomes, their evidence or reports
- falsification: manipulation with research materials, pictures, facts, equipment or processes.
(Falsification includes amending or dismissing of facts or outcomes in a way that they are not accurately represented in the final outcome. Falsification amends pieces of information in a way that they would correspond with a requested research's outcome.)

Both aforementioned types of falsifications are deemed to be very serious because their consequence leads to a scientific record which does not align with accurately observed truth and, therefore, misrepresents information⁹.

Certain cases of falsification are easily discovered, for example, if a reviewer is aware about a certain laboratory's lack of background for the published research. Other examples are if manipulation is simply obvious or if it consists of numerous different experiments. Data from controlling experiments can be "too perfect". In such cases, investigation, which will assess whether falsification occurred, needs to be done¹⁰.

GENERAL GUIDELINES (WHICH CAN BE VARIABLE) FOR MANIPULATION WITH INFORMATION ARE¹¹:

MANIPULATION WITH VISUAL MATERIAL

- pictures can be manipulated only in order to enhance their brightness
- no specific functions in a picture's framework can not be accentuated, suppressed, displaced, disposed, or implemented
- amendment of brightness, contrast or balancing of colours is usually acceptable, if no information presented in the original is not eliminated or clouded.

ACCESS AND STORING OF DATA:

- authors might be requested to hand in basic contributions' facts in the context of editorial control. For that sake, all pieces of information for concrete contributions should be stored during the appropriate period after the publication. Any trustee who is responsible to look after this data should be named.
- studies which include human participants, for example clinical studies, have specific guidelines about the duration of data storage

⁸ Office of Research Integrity U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Definition of Research Misconduct. Available at: ori.hhs.gov/definition-misconduct. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

⁹ Scott-Lichter D and the Editorial Policy Committee, Council of Science Editors. CSE's White Paper on Promoting Integrity in Scientific Journal Publications, 2012 Update. 3rd Revised Edition. Wheat Ridge, CO: 2012. Available at: councilscienceeditors.org/wp-content/uploads/entire_whitepaper.pdf. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

¹⁰ Elsevier Publishing Ethics policies: Duties of Authors. Available at: elsevier.com/publishingethics. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

¹¹ Rossner M, Yamada K. What's In a Picture: The Temptation of Image Manipulation Journal Cell Biology 2004. Available at: <http://jcb.rupress.org/content/166/1/11>. Accessed on June 17, 2017

6. PRACTICE/METHOD KNOWN AS “SAUSAGE” PUBLICATION (UNREASONABLY-PARTITIONED ARTICLE)

This method is a case of splitting one research article which can be published in joint and integrated manners. Partitioned articles would be the research split into fragmentary research reports, with their publications in different periodic and relative scientific fields. This is a significant difference from duplicate publication, which includes handing in the same figures in two or more journals¹².

The potential consequence might be a distortion of understanding, especially for unsuspecting readers. The reading public might believe that pieces of information introduced in each “unreasonably-partitioned article” (in a journal or an article) are derived from a distinct investigated sample. That influences a “scientific database”, but it also creates repetition and steals the reader's, editor's and reviewer's time because they need to study each part separately^{12, 13}.

Certain cases exist where data from big clinical studies or solely epidemiological studies can not be disclosed parallelly because they are occupied with various and different questions with otherwise not-related outcomes. In such cases, it is appropriate to describe each significant study's outcomes separately. However, each article needs to clearly define its hypothesis, which might be part of a much bigger study, and it must have an independent discussion and data analysis with outcomes evidently reflecting the specific research question^{13, 14, 15}.

The text must have a clear reasoning for the uniqueness or necessity of publication of selected fragments of complex research investigation or clinical study. That reasoning needs to be contextualised in light of a thematic journal's focus, or the topic of a specific journal's issue. Furthermore, information about a second or other part of an existing publication needs to be given¹³.

Listed above are reasons why the majority of journals would require authors to accept the guidelines listed below, especially if there is suspicion regarding the manuscripts. These authors must disclose all this information, and they also need to attach all published or unpublished documents which could potentially be part of other articles.

Sources and literature (in alphabet order):

Abraham P (2000). Duplicate and salami publications. *Journal of Postgraduate Medicine*, 46: 67.

AMWA-EMWA-ISMP Joint Position Statement on the Role of Professional Medical Writers. Available at: cymcdn.com/sites/www.amwa.org/resource/resmgr/about_amwa/JointPositionStatement.Profe.pdf. Accessed on June 17, 2017

Angell M, Relman AS. Redundant publication. *N Engl J Med* 1989; 320:1212-1214

¹²Office of Research Integrity. Salami Slicing (i.e., data fragmentation). Available at: ori.hhs.gov/plagiarism-16. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

¹³Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (2005). Cases: Salami publication. Available at: publicationethics.org/search/site/salami. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

¹⁴ Angell M, Relman AS. Redundant publication. *N Engl J Med* 1989; 320:1212-1214

¹⁵ Kassirer JP, Angell M. Redundant publication: a reminder. *N Engl J Med* 1995; 333:449-450

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers. 2003. Available at: publicationethics.org/files/2003pdf12.pdf. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing, Version 2, 2015. Available at: publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines/. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (2005). Cases: Salami publication. Available at: publicationethics.org/search/site/salami. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Elsevier Publishing Ethics policies: Duties of Authors. Available at: elsevier.com/publishingethics. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Elsevier. Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK). Available at: elsevier.com/editors/perk/plagiarism-complaints. Accessed on June 17, 2017

Elsevier.com. (2020). [online] Available at: https://www.elsevier.com/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/653885/Ethics-in-research-and-publication-brochure.pdf [Accessed 5 Jan. 2020].

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Publishing and Editorial Issues Related to Publication in Biomedical Journals: Overlapping Publications. Available at: <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/publishing-and-editorial-issues/overlapping-publications.html>. Accessed on June 17, 2017

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Authorship and Contributorship. Available at: icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Conflicts of Interest. Available at: icmje.org/conflicts-of-interest/. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Jacobs A, Wager E. European Medical Writers Association (EMWA) Guidelines on the role of medical writers in developing peer-reviewed publications. *Curr Med Res Opin*. 2005;21:317-321. Available at: emwa.org/Mum/EMWAguidelines.pdf. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Kassirer JP, Angell M. Redundant publication: a reminder. *N Engl J Med* 1995; 333:449-450

Office of Research Integrity U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Guidelines for Responsible Data Management in Scientific Research. Available at: ori.hhs.gov/images/ddblock/data.pdf. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Office of Research Integrity. Salami Slicing (i.e., data fragmentation). Available at: ori.hhs.gov/plagiarism-16. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Office of Research Integrity U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. A brief overview on Conflict of Interests. Available at: ori.hhs.gov/plagiarism-35. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Office of Research Integrity U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Definition of Research Misconduct. Available at: ori.hhs.gov/definition-misconduct. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing, Version 2, 2015. Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Accessed on June 17, 2017.

Rossner M, Yamada K. What's In a Picture: The Temptation of Image Manipulation Journal Cell Biology 2004. Available at: <http://jcb.rupress.org/content/166/1/11>. Accessed on June 17, 2017

Scott-Lichter D and the Editorial Policy Committee, Council of Science Editors. CSE's White Paper on Promoting Integrity in Scientific Journal Publications, 2012 Update. 3rd Revised Edition. Wheat Ridge, CO: 2012. Available at: councilscienceeditors.org/wp-content/uploads/entire_whitepaper.pdf. Accessed on June 17, 2017.

World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) policy statement on ghost writing initiated by commercial companies. Available at: [wame.org/policy-statements#Ghost Writing - ghost](http://wame.org/policy-statements#Ghost%20Writing%20-%20ghost). Accessed on June 17, 2017.