

About COPE

Core practices

The Core Practices were developed in 2017, replacing the Code of Conduct. They are applicable to all involved in publishing scholarly literature: editors and their journals, publishers, and institutions. The Core Practices should be considered alongside specific national and international codes of conduct for research and are not intended to replace these.

Journals and publishers should have robust and well described, publicly documented practices in all of the following areas for their journals:

Allegations of misconduct

Journals should have a clearly described process for handling allegations, however they are brought to the journal's or publisher's attention. Journals must take seriously allegations of misconduct pre-publication and post-publication. Policies should include how to handle allegations from whistleblowers.

Latest resources

- [Guest editors for single articles](#) (Case)
- [Request to remove author from submitted manuscript due to academic misconduct](#) (Case)
- [Reviewer misconduct and its potential impact on an submitted manuscript](#) (Case)

Authorship and contributorship

Clear policies (that allow for transparency around who contributed to the work and in what capacity) should be in place for requirements for authorship and contributorship as well as processes for managing potential disputes

Latest resources

- [Salami slicing/duplicate publication](#) (Case)
- [Request to remove author from submitted manuscript due to academic misconduct](#) (Case)
- [Universiti Malaysia Seminar: Authorship](#) (Resource)

Complaints and appeals

Journals should have a clearly described process for handling complaints against the journal, its staff, editorial board or publisher

Latest resources

- [Reviewer misconduct and its potential impact on an submitted manuscript](#) (Case)
- [Where should journals escalate serious concerns about an institution or institutional review board?](#) (Case)
- [Ethics toolkit for a successful editorial office](#) (Resource)

Conflicts of interest / Competing interests

There must be clear definitions of conflicts of interest and processes for handling conflicts of interest of authors, reviewers, editors, journals and publishers, whether identified before or after publication

Latest resources

- [Guest editors for single articles](#) (Case)
- [Temporary exception to double anonymised review policy](#) (Case)
- [Reviewer misconduct and its potential impact on an submitted manuscript](#) (Case)

Data and reproducibility

Journals should include policies on data availability and encourage the use of reporting guidelines and registration of clinical trials and other study designs according to standard practice in their discipline

Latest resources

- [Reviewer misconduct and its potential impact on an submitted manuscript](#) (Case)
- [Data availability for vulnerable populations](#) (Case)
- [Dealing with cases with culturally offensive content](#) (Case)

Ethical oversight

Ethical oversight should include, but is not limited to, policies on consent to publication, publication on vulnerable populations, ethical conduct of research using animals, ethical conduct of research using human subjects, handling confidential data and ethical business/marketing practices

Latest resources

- [Request to remove author from submitted manuscript due to academic misconduct](#) (Case)
- [Data availability for vulnerable populations](#) (Case)
- [Dealing with cases with culturally offensive content](#) (Case)

Intellectual property

All policies on intellectual property, including copyright and publishing licenses, should be clearly described. In addition, any costs associated with publishing should be obvious to authors and readers. Policies should be clear on what counts as prepublication that will preclude consideration. What constitutes plagiarism and redundant/overlapping publication should be specified

Latest resources

- [Artificial intelligence in the news](#) (News)
- [Article published at two journals after withdrawal from first journal](#) (Case)
- [Paper mills research](#) (Resource)

Journal management

A well-described and implemented infrastructure is essential, including the business model, policies, processes and software for efficient running of an editorially independent journal, as well as the efficient management and training of editorial boards and editorial and publishing staff

Latest resources

- [Guest editors for single articles](#) (Case)
- [Temporary exception to double anonymised review policy](#) (Case)
- [Request to remove author from submitted manuscript due to academic misconduct](#) (Case)

Peer review processes

All peer review processes must be transparently described and well managed. Journals should provide training for editors and reviewers and have policies on diverse aspects of peer review, especially with respect to adoption of appropriate models of review and processes for handling conflicts of interest, appeals and disputes that may arise in peer review

Latest resources

- [Guest editors for single articles](#) (Case)
- [Temporary exception to double anonymised review policy](#) (Case)
- [Reviewer misconduct and its potential impact on an submitted manuscript](#) (Case)

Post-publication discussions and corrections

Journals must allow debate post publication either on their site, through letters to the editor, or on an external moderated site, such as PubPeer. They must have mechanisms for correcting, revising or retracting articles after publication

Latest resources

- [Salami slicing/duplicate publication](#) (Case)
- [Reviewer misconduct and its potential impact on an submitted manuscript](#) (Case)
- [Article published at two journals after withdrawal from first journal](#) (Case)

Reference: <https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>