PRINCIPLES OF TRANSPARENCY & Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA), and the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) are scholarly organizations. All have seen increases in the number, and range in quality, of membership applications. Our organizations have collaborated to identify Principles of Transparency & Best Practice for Scholarly Publications. These principles form the basis of the criteria by which suitability for membership is assessed by COPE, DOAJ and OASPA, and part of the criteria on which membership applications are evaluated by WAME.



ALLEGATIONS OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT



PUBLICATION ETHICS



PUBLISHING SCHEDULE



ACCESS

E



Publishers and editors shall take reasonable steps to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred.

This includes but not limited to:

- plagiarism
- citation
- manipulation
- data falsification/fabrication

In no case shall a journal or its editors encourage such misconduct, or knowingly allow such misconduct to take place. In the event that a journal's publisher or editors are made aware of any allegation of research misconduct relating to a published article in their journal, the publisher or editor shall follow **COPE's** guidelines (or equivalent). A journal should have policies on publishing ethics. These should be clearly visible on its website, and should refer to:

- journal policies on authorship and contributorship
- how the journal will handle complaints and appeals
- journal policies on conflicts
- of interest/competing interests – journal policies on data sharing and reproducibility
- journal's policy on ethical oversight
- journal's policy on intellectual property
- journal's options for post-publication discussions and corrections.

The periodicity at which a journal publishes shall be clearly indicated.

The way(s) in which the journal and individual articles are available to readers and whether there are associated subscription or pay per view fees shall be stated.

ARCHIVING



A journal's plan for electronic backup and preservation of access to the journal content shall be clearly indicated (for example, access to main articles via CLOCKSS or PubMedCentral).

This is in the event that a journal is no longer published.



REVENUE SOURCES

Business models or revenue sources shall be clearly stated or otherwise evident on the journal's website.

For example:

- author fees
- subscriptions
- advertising
- reprints
- institutional support
- organizational support

Publishing fees or waiver status should not influence editorial decision making.

ADVERTISING



Journals shall state their advertising policy if relevant including:

- what types of adverts will be considered
 who makes decisions regarding
- accepting adverts
- (online only) whether they are linked to content or reader behavior or are displayed at random.

Advertisements should not be related in any way to editorial decision making and shall be kept separate from the published content.





Any direct marketing activities, including solicitation of manuscripts that are conducted on behalf of the journal, shall be appropriate, well targeted, and unobtrusive.

Information provided about the publisher or journal is expected to be truthful and not misleading for readers or authors.

In the event that a member organization is found to have violated these best practices, or other specific requirements of the organization, OASPA/DOAJ/COPE/WAME shall in the first instance try to work with them in order to address any concerns that have been raised. In the event that the member organization is unable or unwilling to address these concerns, their membership in the organization may be suspended or terminated. All of the member organizations have procedures for dealing with concerns raised about member journals.



Each organization also has their own, additional criteria which are used when evaluating applications. The organizations will not share lists of publishers or journals that failed to demonstrate that they met the criteria for transparency and best practice. This is the third version of a work in progress (published January 2018); the first version was posted on the **COPE** website on January 2014 and a second version in June 2015. We encourage its wide dissemination and continue to welcome feedback on the general principles and the specific criteria.

Our COPE materials are available to use under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs license https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/ Attribution — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor *(but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).* Non-commercial — You may not use this work for commercial purposes. No Derivative Works — You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work. We ask that you give full accreditation to COPE with a link to our website: https://publicationethics.org/