

**Policies on Authorship, Scientific Communication,  
Unethical Publication Practices and  
Research Misconduct**

**Dean (Research) office,  
JIPMER**

**30<sup>th</sup> January, 2021  
Pondicherry**

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Authorship.....	2
2.1. ICMJE guidelines for authorship .....	2
2.1.1. Authorship Criteria and communication .....	2
2.1.2. Authors' responsibilities .....	3
2.2. Sequence of authorship .....	3
2.3. Publication of case reports.....	3
2.4. Research based on review of medical records.....	4
2.5. Publications by PG Students and senior residents.....	4
3. Unethical publication practices and research misconduct .....	6
3.1. What is expected from authors? .....	6
3.2. List of practices to be avoided .....	7
3.3 Inappropriate types of authorship .....	8
3.4 Predatory journals, fake conferences and fake awards.....	9
4. Complaints and Redressal.....	11
4.1 Procedure for dealing with complaints .....	11
4.2 Punitive measures.....	11
5. Publication Ethics Checklist.....	12

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Research integrity is a sine qua non of scientific communication. Integrity of the researchers plays a major role in research in ensuring the quality and credibility of research. The researchers need to follow the standards, regulations and guidelines set for their profession and by their institutions. Research integrity demands that every author accurately reports his or her contributions, methods and findings, and discloses all potential conflicts of interest. Unethical practices in research and publication including authorship issues, abound and can threaten the credibility of scientific community. To prevent such problems, this document lays down the Institute's policies on authorship, publication practices and research misconduct.

All faculty members, senior residents, and students (undergraduate, postgraduate, post-doctoral and PhD) are encouraged to carry out research work and communicate the results to scholarly journals and present it at conferences conducted by academic institutions and/or genuine scientific groups such as scholarly associations. However, one should be aware of predatory journals, fake conferences and dubious awards and avoid publication of research work in such journals, attending such conferences and receiving awards from organisations with no or limited scientific and professional *locus standi*. It is cautioned that the Institute will not give any credit for such publications, presentations and awards; and will not lend any support, either monetary or administrative, for such activities as they paint a bad impression about the researcher and the Institute.

The institute adopts either in *toto* or in part the guidelines published by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, Council of Science Editors, Committee on Publication Ethics and Indian Council of Medical Research, UGC and CCS Conduct Rules. The relevant portions from these groups or documents have been reproduced verbatim with references below.

## 2. AUTHORSHIP

### 2.1 *ICJME guidelines for authorship*

#### **2.1.1. Authorship criteria and communication**

Authorship in a manuscript shall be as per the criteria prescribed by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) (*Reproduced from <http://www.icmje.org/>*):

i) The ICMJE recommends that authorship be based on fulfilment of all the following 4 criteria:

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

All those designated as authors should meet all the four above criteria, and all who meet the four criteria should be identified as authors. Those who do not meet all the four criteria should be acknowledged. These authorship criteria are intended to reserve the status of authorship for those who deserve credit and can take responsibility for the work. The criteria are not intended for use as a means to disqualify colleagues from authorship who otherwise meet authorship criteria by denying them the opportunity to meet criterion(s) 2 or 3. Therefore, all individuals who meet the first criterion should have the opportunity to participate in the review, drafting, and final approval of the manuscript.

ii) *Communication:* The corresponding author shall be the individual who takes primary responsibility for communication with the journal during the manuscript submission, peer review, and publication process. The corresponding author shall ensure that all the journal's administrative requirements, such as providing details of authorship, ethics committee approval, clinical trial registration documentation, and disclosures of relationships and activities, are properly completed and reported, although these duties may be delegated to one or more co-authors. The corresponding author would be available throughout the submission and peer-review process to respond to editorial queries in a timely manner, and should be available after publication to respond to critiques of the work and to cooperate with any requests from the journal for data or additional information in case questions about the paper arise after publication. In a PG thesis/dissertation article submitted to a journal for publication, the guide shall be the corresponding author.

iii) When a large multi-author group has conducted the work e.g. as part of a registry dedicated to a particular subject, the investigators will collectively decide who is an author before submitting the manuscript for publication. All members of the group named as authors should meet all the four criteria for authorship, including approval of the final manuscript, and they should be able to take public responsibility for the work and should have full confidence in the accuracy and integrity of the work of other group authors. They will also be expected as individuals to complete disclosure forms.

iv) Contributors who meet fewer than all 4 of the above criteria for authorship shall not be listed as authors, but shall be acknowledged.

### **2.1.2. Authors' responsibilities**

Following are the responsibilities of authors as per the Council of Science Editors (*Reproduced from <https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/white-paper-on-publication-ethics/2-2-authorship-and-authorship-responsibilities/>*)

- a) *Originality*: The authors should provide a statement attesting to the originality of the study they have submitted for consideration.
- b) *Disclosures*: Authors have a responsibility to be forthright when complying with journal submission requirements. This entails disclosure about the originality of the content, a statement of an author's actual contribution to the study, and financial and conflict of interest disclosures.
- c) *Sources of funding*: Journals require authors to disclose sources of funding for the study they wish to report. ***In case a study was partially or fully supported by intramural funding from JIPMER, it is the authors' responsibility to ensure that the institute is acknowledged in the article, stating the grant number and date of approval.***

In addition, authors should disclose all additional sources of funding (government, corporate, other) and any products or services (such as materials and equipment, statistical analysis, and scientific writing) provided by third parties in the course of the research, analysis, or reporting. Items to be disclosed include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, expert testimony, and patents.

In addition, it shall be the authors' responsibility to follow the publication ethics checklist mentioned in Section 5 of this document.

### **2.2. Sequence of authorship**

The order of authors in the article is a collective decision of the authors or study group. Disagreements about author order should be resolved by the authors before the article is submitted for publication to a journal. Disputes that arise after submission could delay or prevent publication. A situation wherein editors of a journal become embroiled in disputes among authors over name placement in the article brings disrepute to the institute and should be avoided by all means (*<https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/white-paper-on-publication-ethics/2-2-authorship-and-authorship-responsibilities/>*)

### **2.3 Publication of Case reports**

The impetus to write and publish a case report rests on the insight that a particular case offers with regard to issues relating to diagnosis, therapy, disease evolution, pathogenesis or outcome. To warrant publication, such observations must be, in some way, novel and serve to advance our understanding of the disease reported.

Ethical issues that arise from writing a case report are basically twofold: informed consent and confidentiality.

- a) If the manuscript submitted for publication of a case report contains any individual person's data in any form (including any individual details, pictures or videos), consent for publication must be obtained from that person, or in the case of children, their parent or legal guardian. It is generally better to err on the side of extra caution, since it has been found that it is easier to identify individuals even from limited data than is often believed. All presentations of case reports must have written informed consent for publication.

- b) Any images/pictures should protect the patient's anonymity. Any photos or imaging (including chest x-rays, CT scans, MRI etc) should not show patient identifiers such as patient's name, medical record number, or date of birth. Images can be cropped to show only the focussed feature. Though covering the eyes with a black strip is used, it might not be fully effective, especially if the strip is small. It is better to consult to have one or more persons review the image to know if the picture image is adequately anonymized or not.
- c) All financial and non-financial competing interests must be declared in all publications including case reports. The corresponding author should ensure that all the co-authors have declared their competing interests. In case there are any authorship disputes, these can be sorted out in a departmental meeting well before submission to a journal. If the department is not able to resolve the dispute, the issue may be brought to the attention of the JIPMER Research Advisory Committee (See section 4).
- d) As with other articles, authorship for case reports should follow the ICMJE criteria. Such reports should include at least one faculty member from the department involved in diagnosis and management of the case, and/or literature search.
- e) In case of a major inter-departmental collaboration in management of a patient, attempts should be made to involve the concerned department involved in diagnosis and/or management of the case for the purpose of drafting of the case report. The author who initiates the process of reporting a case should discuss the issue with the other departments involved in management of the case at the time of planning and arrive at a consensus regarding the authors and their order.

#### ***2.4 Research based on review of medical records***

For studies/ articles based on review of medical records, the authors should make sure that:

- a) Formal permission of the department/ unit should be taken prior to procurement of data from the Medical Records Department.
- b) Anonymity of subjects' data should be maintained.
- c) Collection of data from incomplete records should be avoided to avoid bias or selective reporting and to lend more credibility and reliability to the data/results.
- d) The authors and the order of authors should be decided at the stage of planning the study and all authors should meet the ICJME criteria.

#### ***2.5 Publication by Junior Residents and Senior Residents***

Junior Residents and Senior Residents are trainees holding tenure positions in a particular department. They are generally not expected to act independently, and are expected to work under the guidance of the faculty. If resident(s) publish something under their own names without involving any faculty member, the institute still carries some responsibility for the publication, since the publication carries the names of the department and the Institute. This may pose a problem when a question is raised about a publication carrying the Institute's name (say by the journal), or additional data or information is requested. Moreover, all projects need approval of some kind, for example from the JSAC, PhDRMC or PGRMC. Even studies involving secondary analyses of data, systematic reviews, or meta-analyses should be discussed by a committee, e. g. at the very least by a meeting within the department, either of the entire faculty or of a smaller group set up for reviewing such projects.

Hence, the following are recommended to lend credibility to publications from the institute:

- a. Any resident or group of residents wishing to take up a project, including that based on secondary analysis of data generated in the Institute or based on prior publications, should discuss the idea with a faculty member. The faculty member can be chosen based on factors such as: the person who has been in-charge of cases whose data is proposed to be analyzed (or a large proportion of such cases), a person who is focussed on the particular subject area to which the proposed work relates, or a person with whom the resident is working closely (e.g. as a thesis guide, or posted in the same unit), etc.

The faculty member will forward the proposal to the HOD for discussion within the department, before a go-ahead is given. The department may decide to require the authors to submit the proposal to JSAC or another appropriate committee, if a substantial issue is involved.

- b. The inclusion of faculty member(s) (including head of the department) in the authorship list should be based on their contribution as per ICMJE criteria. No faculty member should demand an authorship if they do not fulfil the authorship criteria. However, it is generally expected that the faculty member who forwards the idea (or another one who takes the responsibility) will contribute sufficiently to the work to deserve authorship (and to take responsibility for and defend the article). Inclusion of a faculty member would also lend credibility to the publication and ensure that a faculty member is available to answer any questions about the paper, or to respond to requests for additional data or information.

The JIPMER Scientific Advisory Committee (JSAC) has resolved that the faculty members and residents need to be apprised of the following ground rules, since violations of these have been observed:

- a. All data collected by a person while working at JIPMER belong to the Institute and not to the individual who collected these data. Hence, no staff member has a right to publish any data collected while at JIPMER after she/he has left the Institute, except with permission of the Institute.
- b. The name of institution mentioned against an author's name on a manuscript is based on the place where he/she carried out the work and not one where the person is working when the manuscript is written or submitted to a journal. Thus, (i) if a faculty member or resident working at JIPMER submits a manuscript to a journal based on work done in another institution before she/he joined JIPMER, the author affiliation should be indicated as the previous institution and not JIPMER. Any failure to do so is a misrepresentation of facts. (ii) If a faculty member or resident leaves the institution and is included as an author in a paper, her/his affiliation should be indicated as JIPMER and not their new place of work.

### 3. UNETHICAL PUBLICATION PRACTICES AND RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

Honest errors are a part of scientific research and publishing. When detected, these require publication of a correction. Scientific misconduct, in research and non-research publications, on the contrary, includes but is not necessarily limited to data fabrication, data falsification (including deceptive manipulation of images), purposeful failure to disclose relationships and activities and plagiarism.

When scientific misconduct is alleged, or a concern is otherwise raised about the conduct or integrity of work described in a submitted or published paper, the institute will initiate appropriate procedures detailed by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (*publication ethics.org/resources/flowcharts*).

#### 3.1. What is expected from the authors?

The authors must be aware of the principles of research ethics and publication ethics. Following are the responsibilities while conducting research as mandated by the ICMR policy on Research Integrity and Publication Ethics (*Reproduced from [https://ethics.ncdirindia.org//asset/pdf/ICMR\\_PRIPE2019.pdf](https://ethics.ncdirindia.org//asset/pdf/ICMR_PRIPE2019.pdf)*) that are reproduced below:

1. All raw data should be available and securely kept by the corresponding author/lead investigator so that these can be presented later, if needed. Data should be preserved after study completion as it may be necessary to confirm research findings, establish priority, or be re-analysed by other researchers or for monitoring by sponsors or regulators. The present requirement is to maintain research records for three years in case of biomedical and health research and five years for clinical trials as per regulatory requirements.
2. Declaring Conflicts of Interest (COI): COI, both academic and financial, may have serious implications and may threaten the quality of research and its outcomes. The authors must declare in writing all the COI to the Departmental PGRMC, JSAC and ethics committee, and in the manuscripts.
3. All biomedical and health research must follow National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research involving Human Participants, 2017 (*Reproduced from [https://main.icmr.nic.in/sites/default/files/guidelines/ICMR\\_Ethical\\_Guidelines\\_2017.pdf](https://main.icmr.nic.in/sites/default/files/guidelines/ICMR_Ethical_Guidelines_2017.pdf)*) and maintain research integrity in the conduct of research while ensuring the safety of research participants.

[Other applicable guidelines and regulations must also be followed. Before initiating research, all required approvals must be obtained from various committees such as Postgraduate Research Monitoring Committee (PGRMC)/Institute Ethics Committee (IEC), Institutional Animal Ethics Committee (IAEC), Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBSC), Institutional Committee for Stem Cell Research (IC-SCR), Sponsored Clinical Trial Research Committee, Health Ministry's Screening Committee (HMSC), Central Drug Standard Control Organization (CDSCO), Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB), as the case may be. Registration with Clinical Trial Registry-India (CTRI) is mandatory for clinical trials and desirable for other types of research to maintain transparency and accountability]

4. For collaborative research, appropriate memoranda of understanding (MoU) and material transfer agreements (MTA) may be necessary.



5. Investigator (s) should be competent to conduct the research with requisite qualifications, and having relevant experience/training to collect reliable data, undertake accurate analysis, interpretation, and publication.
6. Investigator (s) should be sensitive to societal and cultural values, engage and improve public trust, undertake meaningful research, be accountable to outcomes, and take needful steps to protect participants from harm or risks.
7. Authors should ensure that their research has been conducted honestly.
8. Informed consent should be obtained whenever required, or waiver should be obtained from Institute Ethics Committee (IEC).
9. Any form of research misconduct is unethical, including plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, manipulation of data or images/digital image/use of unreliable or duplicate images, exaggeration on the part of results and interpretation, use of wrong statistical tools, gift/ghost authorship, etc.
10. Authors must ensure the authenticity of research results before publishing or disseminating information, particularly before it is communicated out of the institution.
11. Authors should follow guidelines of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (*ICMJE* - <http://www.icmje.org/>), Committee on Publication Ethics (*COPE* - <https://publicationethics.org/>), research integrity and authorship, and ensure the substantial intellectual role of all authors who are included in the publication or presentation. Ghost authorship and gift authorship are not allowed, and contribution of each author should be clearly identified, collaborations if any, may be declared preferably at the time of dissertation/ thesis/ project initiation or when the collaboration evolves during the conduct of research, with the name and details of collaborators stated. The role of all authors should be clearly identified/justified.
12. Authorship should be duly given to all those who have made substantial scientific contribution to the research; this includes permanent as well as contractual/temporary staff.

Failure of an investigator to follow the above rules and responsibilities will amount to misconduct/fraud. Authors should not deviate from good ethical practices mentioned above.

### ***3.2 List of practices to be avoided***

The following practices shall be considered as Research misconduct and must be avoided at all cost. Authors should avoid them at any cost.

1. Recording wrong observations/data
2. Doing incorrect analysis
3. Insufficient record keeping
4. Withholding the details of methods
5. Duplicate and sliced publications
6. Biased or post-hoc amendment of study design, without informing the appropriate authorities
7. Overlooking or ignoring previous work of others
8. Suppressing own data / dropping data points
9. Failure to declare conflict of interests
10. Conscriptation of authorship without consent
11. Undeserved authorship (includes gaining authorship by power/ harassment).
12. Wrongful denial of authorship to deserving persons

13. Misuse of public funds (research grants)
14. Overlooking or ignoring others' use of flawed data
15. No permission from appropriate scientific advisory committee and Institute Ethics Committee
16. No informed consent (if waiver not obtained)
17. Plagiarism/ Falsification/ fabrication of data
  - a. Using other's ideas, processes, data, or text without giving proper credit is plagiarism.
  - b. Manipulating data/results by altering research materials, equipment, processes, output, and figures leading to inaccurate representation in the research report is a falsification.
  - c. Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them
18. Ignoring supervisory duties, persuading, guiding, encouraging, or knowingly letting others indulge in fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism.
19. Illegal human experiments
20. Unethical publications practices such as simultaneous submission of a manuscript to more than one journal, submission to a predatory journal, duplicate publications, sliced publications, denying authorship to a deserving member of the research team, and gift authorship.

Note: Honest errors do not come under misconduct or fraud. However, it is the responsibility of the authors to prove it.

### ***3.3 Inappropriate authorship including guest authorship, honorary or gift authorship, and ghost authorship.***

***The following categories of 'authorships' are considered unethical, and should be avoided at all costs (Reproduced from <https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/white-paper-on-publication-ethics/2-2-authorship-and-authorship-responsibilities/>):***

- a) *Guest Authorship*: Guest authorship has been defined as authorship based solely on an expectation that inclusion of a particular name will improve the chances that the manuscript will be published or increase the perceived status of the publication. The "guest" author makes no discernible contributions to the study, and often meets none of the criteria for authorship.
- b) *Honorary or Gift Authorship*: Honorary or gift authorship has been defined as authorship based solely on a tenuous affiliation with a study. An example is "authorship" based on one's position as the head of a department in which the study took place.
- c) *Ghost Authorship*: Ghost authors participate in research, data analysis, and/or writing of a manuscript but are not named or disclosed in the author byline or Acknowledgments. Examples of ghost authors include undisclosed contributors who are employees of pharmaceutical or device companies, medical writers, marketing and public relations writers, and junior staff writing for elected or appointed officials. Any person who makes a substantial contribution to a manuscript should be listed in the authors' list, if appropriate, or in the acknowledgments, along with the individuals' institutional affiliations, if relevant.
- d) *Authorship for Sale*. Some instances have been reported in which non-authors have attempted to buy authorship from an author of a paper, at times after the paper has been invited for revision or provisionally accepted.

- e) *Authorship for spouses and relatives*: Unless they meet authorship criteria, it is unethical to lend authorship to one's spouses, children, parents, relatives or close friends.

However, ***other categories of authorship that are acceptable*** in certain circumstances include group authorship and the inclusion of deceased or incapacitated authors.

- A) *Group Authorship*. Group authorship may be appropriate when a group of researchers has collaborated on a project, such as a multicenter trial, a consensus document, or an expert panel. Because it can be inaccurate and impossible to list all collaborators (some would not meet a journal's authorship criteria, and limited byline space may preclude such a listing), authors need to think about how to communicate credit and responsibility for content. Journal editors have outlined two group authorship models: (a) Authorship in which each person in the group meets authorship criteria, in which case the group is listed as the author, with at least one co-author assuming the role of content guarantor. (b) Authorship in which a select subgroup of the whole is listed in the byline on behalf of the whole.
- B) *Deceased or Incapacitated Authors*. For cases in which a co-author is no more or is incapacitated during the writing, submission, or peer-review process, co-authors must obtain disclosure and copyright documentation from a familial or legal proxy.

### **3.4 Publishing in predatory journals, attending fake conferences and accepting fake awards**

Predatory journals have been referred to as “low quality, amateurish, and often unethical academic publishing that is usually Open Access (OA).” (*Berger M. Everything you ever wanted to know about predatory publishing but were afraid to ask. Chicago: American Library Association; 2017. Available:*

[www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/conferences/confsandpreconfs/2017/EverythingYouEverWantedtoKnowAboutPredatoryPublishing.pdf](http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/conferences/confsandpreconfs/2017/EverythingYouEverWantedtoKnowAboutPredatoryPublishing.pdf)).

A set of evidence-based salient features of journals suspected to be predatory has been proposed (*Shamseer L, Moher D, Maduekwe O, et al. Potential predatory and legitimate biomedical journals: can you tell the difference? A cross-sectional comparison. BMC Med 2017;15:28*). These are only indicative and not always true.

- The scope of interest includes non-biomedical subjects with biomedical topics.
- The website contains errors in spelling and grammar.
- Images are distorted or fuzzy, intended to look like something they are not or are unauthorized.
- The language on the home page targets authors.
- The Index Copernicus Value or another invalid measure of journal quality is promoted on the website.
- There is no description of the process for handling manuscripts.
- The website requests that manuscripts should be submitted via email.

- Rapid publication is promised (often ‘paid publication’).
- There is no retraction policy.
- Information on whether and how journal content will be digitally preserved is absent.
- Journals that claim to be open access either retain copyright of the published research or fail to mention copyright policy.
- The contact email address is nonprofessional and not affiliated with a journal (e.g., @gmail.com or @yahoo.com).

Predatory publishing practices allow bad research that is poorly peer-reviewed, or published without peer review, to be published alongside real science that is rigorously reviewed, thus obscuring scientific truth. Faculty are advised to avoid publishing articles in such journals.

Similarly, an academic conference can be the highlight of a researcher’s calendar. It presents a chance to share knowledge with like-minded scientists and hear experts discuss the pressing topics in their field. However, in recent years, an increasing number of conferences are being announced that might look real but have none of the editorial standards expected by academics. These are advertised with fake agendas and often have high registration charges. These are "predatory conferences", named after the more well-known sister industry of "predatory publishing", where typically open-access model publications accept submissions without a proper peer review process, but with an unreasonable publication price. Faculty are advised to check the authenticity of such predatory conferences before they decide to register, attend or present their research and academic work at these, since such participation brings disrepute to the parent institution and to the individual. Accepting fake awards from dubious organisations is likewise, unethical and condemnable.

## **4. COMPLAINTS AND REDRESSAL**

Complaints and conflicts, if any, related to conduct, presentation and publication of research, may be brought to the notice of JIPMER Research Advisory Committee (JRAC) which may redress and resolve the issue. A duly signed written complaint in original should be submitted to the Dean (Research) office.

### ***4.1 Procedure for dealing with complaints***

Any misconduct in research and/or publication whether minor or major, will be viewed seriously. On receipt of a complaint, the competent authority will be notified for initiating an investigation. If found guilty of misconduct, appropriate action will be initiated based on the general procedures outlined by CCS Conduct Rules and those included in the University Grants Commission's Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions Regulations, 2018.

### ***4.2 Punitive measures***

The punitive measure will be commensurate with the degree of misconduct i.e., large scale fraud, small scale fraud, major mistake (intentional) or minor mistake (intentional). Indulgence in unethical practices could also lead to not being considered for career progression or being denied research funding or students. Unintentional mistakes or honest errors will not attract any penal action.

## 5. PUBLICATION ETHICS CHECKLIST

	Item	Details
1	Approval for the study and consent	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approval of the Institute Ethics Committee, Animal Ethics Committee, Institutional Committee for Stem Cell Research (IC-SCR), etc as applicable</li> <li>2. If clinical trial, is it registered in CTRI?</li> <li>3. Documentation of informed consent as per IEC documents/permission</li> <li>4. Permission from the patient to publish case reports (including photographs and diagnostic tests), including declaration to not reveal identity of the patient</li> </ol>
2	Accuracy of data	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Check whether there is any falsification (manipulating research materials, equipment or processes, or changing or omitting/ suppressing data or results without scientific or statistical justification or inaccurate representation) or fabrication (the intentional act of making-up data or results and recording or reporting them) of data?</li> <li>2. Verify data for accuracy</li> </ol>
3	Plagiarism and self-plagiarism check  (The “wrongful appropriation” and “stealing and publication” of another paper or another author’s “language, thoughts, ideas, or expressions” and the representation of them as one’s own original work or duplicating one’s own publication)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Check whether there is a possibility of having copied another person’s thoughts. ideas or language intentionally or inadvertently</li> <li>2. World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) defines plagiarism as a condition where six consecutive words are copied or seven to eleven words are overlapping set in a set of 30 letters. Check for this</li> <li>3. Check whether there is written permission for reproduced material, tables or figures</li> <li>4. If you have used your own prior work or others’ work, have you cited these correctly?</li> </ol>
4	Submission fraud	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do not simultaneously submit the article to two or more journals</li> <li>2. Has the work been published fully or partially (salami-slicing) already? If yes, think whether this publication is justified</li> <li>3. Avoid citing your own work excessively in the manuscript</li> </ol>
5	Authorship ethics (for manuscripts and for conference abstracts)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have all the potential authors been included in a pre-agreed order?</li> <li>2. Is there an agreement between co-authors?</li> <li>3. Are all the authors aware of the content of the publication, and take responsibility for interpretation of data and content of the article?</li> <li>4. Any ‘ghost authors’ or guest authors’?</li> </ol>
6	Conflict of interest	Have all relevant financial and scientific interests and relationships and interests that could be seen as influencing the results and conclusions been declared?