

Responsible Conduct of Research: Publication

Presented by:

Jacqui Brinkman

Manager, Graduate Pathways to Success Program

Faculty of Graduate Studies

Jacqui.Brinkman@ubc.ca



FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Publication: Considerations

- Why publish?
 - Reports new scientific findings
 - Academic responsibility
 - Scientific credit
- When to publish
- What to publish
 - ‘Salami’ publishing
 - “least publishable unit”
- Where to publish



Publication: Considerations

Guidelines and Regulations

- ‘Instructions for Authors’: specific to many professional societies, scientific journals, and institutions
- Copyright Law
- Open Access Publishing
- Public disclosure of accepted, but not yet published results? Press release?



Publication:

Why and how irresponsible conduct may occur

- Pressure
 - advancement, promotion
 - continued research funding
 - intellectual property rights
- Statistical Methods/Data
 - Incomplete methods, misused statistics, misleading figures or poor quality writing
- Conflict of Interest
- Plagiarism



Publication: Plagiarism

“Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.” (NIH, ORI)

- Includes info obtained through confidential review of research proposals and manuscripts
- Must reference original source of idea

UBC Policy 85's definition of scholarly misconduct includes:

- Failure to give appropriate recognition, including authorship, to those who have made a material intellectual contribution
- The use of unpublished work of other researchers and scholars without proper permission or acknowledgement



Publication: Notes for Consideration

- Citations
 - From original source
 - Support and do not support hypothesis
- Corrections and retractions
 - Continued citation
- Biosecurity
- Publishing results of clinical trials
- Publishing-related data sharing
- Example: Schön of Bell Labs



Authorship

- Increase collaboration = multiauthored papers (i.e. genome sequencing)
- First author vs senior author? Co-authorship? Order
- Authors must:
 - Have contributed significantly to the work
 - Acknowledgement or authorship: what contributions signify each?
 - Accept responsibility for content of work
 - Consent to paper publication and have read the work
- Honorary authorships?
- Contributorship policies



Authorship

- What does not constitute authorship?
 - Provision of funding, lab space or instrumentation/reagents
 - Group or leader status
 - Routine technical work
 - Collection of data
 - Paid for services or reagents
 - Editing



Peer Review

- Essential in research for grant, manuscript, and personnel reviews
- May influence:
 - professional careers
 - the direction of research programs
 - public policy, health initiatives
- Can help improve manuscripts and report accurate work



Peer Review

- Editorial Board member, ad hoc reviewer
- Anonymous and not (journal dependant)
- Confidentiality
 - Should not communicate with author during review
 - Should not keep a copy of manuscript
 - No publication of reviewer comments
 - Help with review by grad student or post-doc?



Peer Review

Responsibilities:

- Conflict of Interest/ No personal bias (real or perceived)
- Timely and thorough completion
- Acknowledgement of assistance
- Competence
 - Should provide critical analysis, method validity



References

1. Zigmond MJ and Fischer BA. Beyond fabrication and plagiarism: the little murders of everyday science. *Science and Engineering Ethics* 2002; 8 (2): 1- 7.
2. Macrina FL. (2005): *Scientific Integrity: Text and Cases in Responsible Conduct of Research*. 3rd Edition, American Society for Microbiology Press.
3. ORI Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research. Nicholas H. Steneck, PhD HTML Version, September 2006, updated from Revised Printed Edition, June 2004 <http://ori.dhhs.gov/education/products/RCRintro/>
4. Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Writing and Editing for Biomedical Publication - <http://www.icmje.org/>
5. RCREC Internet Course, a product of the Responsible Conduct of Research Education Committee http://ethics.ucsd.edu/courses/rcrec_internet/about.html (©1992-2007)
6. 2009-2010 CIHR Grants and Awards Guide <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/22631.html#2-A20>
7. Johnson, LA. Scientific fraud found at Bell Labs: Star researcher fired for falsifying data September 26, 2002. *Seattle Post Intelligencer* by THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
8. In the Matter of J. Hendrik Schön by David Goodstein. *Physics World*, November, 2002
9. Unger K. and Couzin J. SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT: Even Retracted Papers Endure. *Science* 7 April 2006 312: 40-41
10. A Guide to the Handling of Scientific Misconduct Allegations in the Intramural Research Program at the NIH, January 12, 2001 - prepared by the NIH Committee on Scientific Conduct and Ethics
11. http://bret.mc.vanderbilt.edu/rcr/asp_files/RCR_course_detail.asp?Course_ID=1
12. UBC Policy 85: Scholarly Integrity <http://www.universitycounsel.ubc.ca/policies/policy85.pdf>

