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1) Quick Overview: Scopus Journal Selection Criteria
Scopus® - the World’s largest Abstract & Citation Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Sciences</th>
<th>JOURNALS</th>
<th>CONFERENCES</th>
<th>BOOKS</th>
<th>PATENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,456</td>
<td>22,025 peer-reviewed journals</td>
<td>82K events</td>
<td>512 book series</td>
<td>24M patents from 5 major patent offices:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>359 trade journals</td>
<td>6.8M records (12%)</td>
<td>- 28K Volumes</td>
<td>• UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,834</td>
<td>• Full metadata, abstracts and cited references (references for post-1995 only)</td>
<td>- 1.0M items</td>
<td>- 86,969 books</td>
<td>• US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>&gt;2,800 fully Open Access titles</td>
<td>6.8M records (12%)</td>
<td>- 709K items</td>
<td>• Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,042</td>
<td>Articles in Press for &gt;5,100 Titles</td>
<td>Conf. expansion (2005 – 2013):</td>
<td>Books expansion:</td>
<td>• Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Going back to 1823</td>
<td>1,017 conferences</td>
<td>120K books by 2015</td>
<td>• World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>Funding data from acknowledgements</td>
<td>6,022 conf. events</td>
<td>- Focus on Social Sciences and A&amp;H</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>
</table>
| • Convincing editorial concept/policy  
• Type of peer-review  
• Diversity geographic distribution of editors  
• Diversity geographic distribution of authors | • Academic contribution to the field  
• Clarity of abstracts  
• Quality and conformity with stated aims & scope  
• Readability of articles | • Citedness of journal articles in Scopus  
• Editor standing | • No delay in publication schedule | • Content available online  
• English-language journal home page  
• Quality of home page |

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

Questions: [titlesuggestion@scopus.com](mailto: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 plagiarism 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/
The Ethics in Research & Publication Program is the collaboration of Elsevier and an independent advisory panel of experts. These are highly respected experts reflecting diverse interests, selected for their deep understanding of current ethical issues and the evolving approaches to solving them.

David Few, MA, MB, BCHir (Cambridge), FRCS (London)
Medical Subject Chair, IDOPT, Content Selection and Advisory Board, 2010

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 2001. He was previously an Honorary Clinical Assistant Surgeon to the University Hospitals of Leicester from 1999 to 1999.

He was Editor-in-Chief of the BJO, the European Journal of Surgical Oncology from 2003 to 2009 and a member of the COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) Council from 2009 to 2010.

A T (Sandy) Florence CBE, PHD, DSc, FRSC, FRS, FRPharmS
Editor-in-Chief, International Journal of Pharmaceutics, Sustent, Professor of Pharmacy at the Centre for Drug Delivery Research.

Alexander Sandy Florence is editor-in-chief of the International Journal of Pharmaceutics, and was founding co-editor with Professor David Atwood of the Journal of Drug Evaluation. He has authored or co-authored more than 250 papers, reviews, and chapters in books, and is co-author of "Dr. Sandy Florence" (Karger 2000) and "Dr. Sandy Florence" (Bioclinic 2001). He is co-editor of "Dr. Sandy Florence" (Bioclinic 2001) and "Dr. Sandy Florence" (Bioclinic 2001).

Ole Gunnar Evesen
Assistant Director, University of Bergen Library, Norway

Ole G. Evesen (OGE) has held a leadership role for the University of Bergen Library in Norway since 2001. He is Assistant Director for the Library, thus 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 videos "A Plagiarism Game" and "The University's Educational Resource Search and Write," which helps students understand the essentials of setting up theories 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; Secretary, Chair of the Association of Reproductive Medicine in Oxford

Margaret Rees has a longstanding commitment of excellence in experience of research and publication ethics. She chairs a National Health Service research ethics committee, a member of the Oxford Central University Research Ethics Committee, and a member of the UK Association of Research Ethics Committee and COPE secretary. Her extensive experience in publishing is based on editing Abortion and previously Abortion in International Perspectives, 1960-2000, as well as 20 books on women's health. COPE is 2013, she wrote a Guide for new edition.
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

[Link to Ethics Toolkit]

[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](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](http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/New_Code.pdf)

• A Code of Conduct and guidelines can be found here: [http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines](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](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
Thank you