



الله أكبر
الله أكبر
الله أكبر
الله أكبر

اخلاق در انتشارات

Publication Ethics

دکتر محسن صابری
متخصص پزشکی اجتماعی
دانشیار و عضو کمیته اخلاق در پژوهش
دانشگاه علوم پزشکی بقیه الله (عج)

تحقیق (Research)

- Research, generally defined as “studious inquiry or examination aimed at the discovery and interpretation of facts, revision of accepted theories or laws in the light of new facts, or practical application of such new or revised theories or laws.”
- تحقیق، به طور کلی به صورت کنکاش یا بررسی دقیق با هدف کشف و تفسیر واقعیتها، بازنگری و ویرایش نظریه های یا قوانین پذیرفته شده با توجه به واقعیت های جدید یا کاربرد عملی نظریه ها یا قوانین جدید تعریف می گردد.

چاپ یا نشر (Publication)

- انتشار یافته ها در جامعه علمی
- انتشارات علمی باید توسط افراد همتا بررسی شوند.

چه مشکلات اخلاقی ممکن است رخ دهد

مثال

- فرض کنید شما بر روی ۱۰۰ نمونه مطالعه ای را انجام داده باشید.
- در ۹۹ مورد نظریه مد نظر شما تایید شده است
- در یک مورد نظریه شما رد شده است و نمی دانید برای چه؟
- شما فکر می کنید که ممکن است این یک نمونه آلوده شده باشد.
- آیا این یک مورد را گزارش می کنید یا نه؟

چه مشکلات اخلاقی ممکن است رخ دهد

- فرض کنید شما فردی باشید به دلیل تجربه بالا در حوزه تخصصی خودتان تقدیر شده اید و این مورد از ۱۵ سال تا کنون ادامه داشته است.
- فرض کنید این نظریه شما ۱۵ سال قبل کشف شده است و شما را مشهور کرده باشد و به شما به همین دلیل احترام زیادی می گذارند و به همین دلیل اعتبار بالایی را برای دانشگاه خود کسب کرده باشید.
- شما مطلع شده اید قرار است به عنوان چهره ماندگار یا دانشمند برتر شما را معرفی کنند و به شما جایزه ارزشمند یا جایگاه ویژه ای اعطا نمایند.
- حالا شما داده های آخرین مطالعه خود را بدست آورده اید و حدس می زنید آیا نظریه مشهور شما اشتباه بوده است یا نه؟
- حالا چه کار می کنید؟

COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics)

• تاریخچه

اولین دستورالعمل ها در سال ۱۹۹۹ تدوین شده اند که حوزه های اصلی آن شامل موارد ذیل است:

- Study design and ethical approval
- Data analysis
- Authorship
- Conflicts of interest
- Peer review
- Redundant publication
- Plagiarism
- Duties of editors
- Media relations
- Advertising

Study design and ethical approval

- Good research should be well justified, well planned, appropriately designed, and ethically approved. To conduct research to a lower standard may constitute misconduct.
 - Laboratory and clinical research should be driven by protocol; pilot studies should have a written rationale.
 - Research protocols should seek to answer specific questions, rather than just collect data.
 - Protocols must be carefully agreed by all contributors and collaborators, including, if appropriate, the participants.
 - The final protocol should form part of the research record.
 - Early agreement on the precise roles of the contributors and collaborators, and on matters of authorship and publication, is advised.
 - Statistical issues should be considered early in study design, including power calculations, to ensure there are neither too few nor too many participants.
 - Formal and documented ethical approval from an appropriately constituted research ethics committee is required for all studies involving people, medical records, and anonymised human tissues.
 - Use of human tissues in research should conform to the highest ethical standards, such as those recommended by the Nuffield Council on Bioethic.

Study design and ethical approval-Cont'd

- Fully informed consent should always be sought. It may not always be possible, however, and in such circumstances, an appropriately constituted research ethics committee should decide if this is ethically acceptable.
- When participants are unable to give fully informed consent, research should follow international guidelines, such as those of the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS).
- Animal experiments require full compliance with local, national, ethical, and regulatory principles, and local licensing arrangements. International standards vary.
- Formal supervision, usually the responsibility of the principal investigator, should be provided for all research projects: this must include quality control, and the frequent review and long term retention (may be up to 15 years) of all records and primary outputs.

Data analysis

- Data should be appropriately analysed, but inappropriate analysis does not necessarily amount to misconduct. Fabrication and falsification of data do constitute misconduct.
 - All sources and methods used to obtain and analyse data, including any electronic pre-processing, should be fully disclosed; detailed explanations should be provided for any exclusions.
 - Methods of analysis must be explained in detail, and referenced, if they are not in common use.
 - The post hoc analysis of subgroups is acceptable, as long as this is disclosed. Failure to disclose that the analysis was post hoc is unacceptable.
 - The discussion section of a paper should mention any issues of bias which have been considered, and explain how they have been dealt with in the design and interpretation of the study.

Authorship

- There is no universally agreed definition of authorship, although attempts have been made (see Appendix). As a minimum, authors should take responsibility for a particular section of the study.
 - The award of authorship should balance intellectual contributions to the conception, design, analysis and writing of the study against the collection of data and other routine work. If there is no task that can reasonably be attributed to a particular individual, then that individual should not be credited with authorship.
 - To avoid disputes over attribution of academic credit, it is helpful to decide early on in the planning of a research project who will be credited as authors, as contributors, and who will be acknowledged.
 - All authors must take public responsibility for the content of their paper. The multidisciplinary nature of much research can make this difficult, but this can be resolved by the disclosure of individual contributions.
 - Careful reading of the target journal's "Advice to Authors" is advised, in the light of current uncertainties.

Conflicts of interest

- Conflicts of interest comprise those which may not be fully apparent and which may influence the judgment of author, reviewers, and editors.
- They have been described as those which, when revealed later, would make a reasonable reader feel misled or deceived.
- They may be personal, commercial, political, academic or financial.
- “Financial” interests may include employment, research funding, stock or share ownership, payment for lectures or travel, consultancies and company support for staff.
 - Such interests, where relevant, must be declared to editors by researchers, authors, and reviewers.
 - Editors should also disclose relevant conflicts of interest to their readers. If in doubt, disclose. Sometimes editors may need to withdraw from the review and selection process for the relevant submission.

Peer review

- Peer reviewers are external experts chosen by editors to provide written opinions, with the aim of improving the study.
- Working methods vary from journal to journal, but some use open procedures in which the name of the reviewer is disclosed, together with the full or “edited” report.

Peer review-Cont'd

- Suggestions from authors as to who might act as reviewers are often useful, but there should be no obligation on editors to use those suggested.
- The duty of confidentiality in the assessment of a manuscript must be maintained by expert reviewers, and this extends to reviewers' colleagues who may be asked (with the editor's permission) to give opinions on specific sections.
- The submitted manuscript should not be retained or copied.
- Reviewers and editors should not make any use of the data, arguments, or interpretations, unless they have the authors' permission.
- Reviewers should provide speedy, accurate, courteous, unbiased and justifiable reports.
- If reviewers suspect misconduct, they should write in confidence to the editor.
- Journals should publish accurate descriptions of their peer review, selection, and appeals processes.
- Journals should also provide regular audits of their acceptance rates and publication times.

Redundant publication

- Redundant publication occurs when two or more papers, without full cross reference, share the same hypothesis, data, discussion points, or conclusions.
 - Published studies do not need to be repeated unless further confirmation is required.
 - Previous publication of an abstract during the proceedings of meetings does not preclude subsequent submission for publication, but full disclosure should be made at the time of submission.
 - Re-publication of a paper in another language is acceptable, provided that there is full and prominent disclosure of its original source at the time of submission.
 - At the time of submission, authors should disclose details of related papers, even if in a different language, and similar papers in press.

Plagiarism

- Plagiarism ranges from the unreferenced use of others' published and unpublished ideas, including research grant applications to submission under “new” authorship of a complete paper, sometimes in a different language.
- It may occur at any stage of planning, research, writing, or publication: it applies to print and electronic versions.
 - All sources should be disclosed, and if large amounts of other people's written or illustrative material is to be used, permission must be sought.

Duties of editors

- Editors are the stewards of journals. They usually take over their journal from the previous editor(s) and always want to hand over the journal in good shape.
- Most editors provide direction for the journal and build a strong management team.
- They must consider and balance the interests of many constituents, including readers, authors, staff, owners, editorial board members, advertisers and the media.

Duties of editors-Cont'd

- Editors' 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.
- Studies that challenge previous work published in the journal should be given an especially sympathetic hearing.
- Studies reporting negative results should not be excluded.
- All original studies should be peer reviewed before publication, taking into full account possible bias due to related or conflicting interests.
- Editors must treat all submitted papers as confidential.
- When a published paper is subsequently found to contain major flaws, editors must accept responsibility for correcting the record prominently and promptly.

Media relations

- Medical research findings are of increasing interest to the print and broadcast media.
- Journalists may attend scientific meetings at which preliminary research findings are presented, leading to their premature publication in the mass media.
 - Authors approached by the media should give as balanced an account of their work as possible, ensuring that they point out where evidence ends and speculation begins.
 - Simultaneous publication in the mass media and a peer reviewed journal is advised, as this usually means that enough evidence and data have been provided to satisfy informed and critical readers.
 - Where this is not possible, authors should help journalists to produce accurate reports, but refrain from supplying additional data.
 - All efforts should be made to ensure that patients who have helped with the research should be informed of the results by the authors before the mass media, especially if there are clinical implications.
 - Authors should be advised by the organisers if journalists are to attend scientific meetings.
 - It may be helpful to authors to be advised of any media policies operated by the journal in which their work is to be published.

Advertising

- Many scientific journals and meetings derive significant income from advertising.
- Reprints may also be lucrative.
 - Editorial decisions must not be influenced by advertising revenue or reprint potential: editorial and advertising administration must be clearly separated.
 - Advertisements that mislead must be refused, and editors must be willing to publish criticisms, according to the same criteria used for material in the rest of the journal.
 - Reprints should be published as they appear in the journal unless a correction is to be added.

<https://publicationethics.org/>

Guidelines on good publication practice

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) GUIDELINES ON GOOD PUBLICATION PRACTICE

Why the guidelines were developed

COPE was founded in 1997 to address breaches of research and publication ethics. A voluntary body providing a discussion forum and advice for scientific editors, it aims to find practical ways of dealing with the issues, and to develop good practice.

We thought it essential to attempt to define best practice in the ethics of scientific publishing. These guidelines should be useful for authors, editors, editorial board members, readers, owners of journals, and publishers.

Intellectual honesty should be actively encouraged in all medical and scientific courses of study, and used to inform publication ethics and prevent misconduct. It is with that in mind that these guidelines have been produced.

Details of other guidelines on the ethics of research and published codes of conduct are listed in the Appendix.

How the guidelines were developed

The guidelines were developed from a preliminary version drafted by individual members of the committee, which was then submitted to extensive consultation. They address: study design and ethical approval, data analysis, authorship, conflict of interests, the peer review process, redundant publication, plagiarism, duties of editors, media relations, advertising, and how to deal with misconduct.

What they aim to do

These guidelines are intended to be advisory rather than prescriptive, and to evolve over time. We hope that they will be disseminated widely, endorsed by editors, and refined by those who use them.

1 Study design and ethical approval

Definition

Good research should be well justified, well planned, appropriately designed, and ethically approved. To conduct research to a lower standard may constitute misconduct.

Action

- (1) Laboratory and clinical research should be driven by protocol; pilot studies should have a written rationale.
- (2) Research protocols should seek to answer specific questions, rather than just collect data.

(3) Protocols must be carefully agreed by all contributors and collaborators, including, if appropriate, the participants.

(4) The final protocol should form part of the research record.

(5) Early agreement on the precise roles of the contributors and collaborators, and on matters of authorship and publication, is advised.

(6) Statistical issues should be considered early in study design, including power calculations, to ensure there are neither too few nor too many participants.

(7) Formal and documented ethical approval from an appropriately constituted research ethics committee is required for all studies involving people, medical records, and anonymised human tissues.

(8) Use of human tissues in research should conform to the highest ethical standards, such as those recommended by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics.

(9) Fully informed consent should always be sought. It may not always be possible, however, and in such circumstances, an appropriately constituted research ethics committee should decide if this is ethically acceptable.

(10) When participants are unable to give fully informed consent, research should follow international guidelines, such as those of the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS).

(11) Animal experiments require full compliance with local, national, ethical, and regulatory principles, and local licensing arrangements. International standards vary.

(12) Formal supervision, usually the responsibility of the principal investigator, should be provided for all research projects: this must include quality control, and the frequent review and long term retention (may be up to 15 years) of all records and primary outputs.

2 Data analysis

Definition

Data should be appropriately analysed, but inappropriate analysis does not necessarily amount to misconduct. Fabrication and falsification of data do constitute misconduct.

Action

- (1) All sources and methods used to obtain and analyse data, including any electronic pre-process-

A vibrant, lush green forest scene featuring a waterfall cascading down a rocky cliff. The water is captured with a long exposure, creating a soft, blurred effect. The surrounding vegetation is dense and varied, including large ferns and numerous trees. The overall atmosphere is serene and natural.

موفق باشید