Chicago recently had its first spring-like weekend—blue, sunny skies with comfortable temperatures that felt almost balmy coming out of winter. Spring often puts us in the mood to “clean house,” whether that means cleaning out your closets, launching new endeavors for your journal, or tidying up a process or two.

First up in this issue, check out “Is Your Journal Due for a Redesign? Three Questions to Start the Process,” contributed by the Sheridan Group. Maybe your journal’s look and feel seems outdated or maybe a new editorial team has taken over and they’re hoping for a fresh start. This article will help you focus on what steps to take when it’s time for a redesign.

Nijsje Dorman introduces a new column called “Lend me your EARs.” Enterprise Analytics Reporting (EAR), an addition to Editorial Manager (EM), is a graphical reporting package that enables charts and summary data to be viewed directly within EM. EM users know that EAR is a powerful tool, but it can take a lot of trial and error to set up an effective report. In each installment of this occasional series, an EM user will share an EAR that s/he uses, complete with screenshots of the settings, so that users can easily replicate it.

Have you heard about one of the newest initiatives in scientific publishing—graphical abstracts? Luk Cox discusses how graphical abstracts provide added value to an authors’ research in his article “Are Graphical Abstracts Changing the Way We Publish?”

Editors sit a lot. There are not many opportunities to get up and stretch our legs and this can lead to various types of pain. Dave Bricker explores ergonomic solutions to relieve pain related to repetitive stress problems.

Enjoy these articles in this month’s issue. And, as always, please contact me with your suggestions for ideas and topics or if you are interested in writing for EON.
Is Your Journal Due for a Redesign? Three Questions to Start the Process

Contributed by The Sheridan Group

Spring is here, according to the calendar at least, and a change of seasons is upon us. As we open the windows to enjoy the fresh air, now may be the right time to give your journal a breath of fresh air as well.

Journal redesigns in the print-only era were rare, but today, scholarly publications refine their images more often. It’s also much more of an undertaking than it used to be. So why is a redesign necessary? And when should you consider it?

In the past, redesigns were simpler and mostly cosmetic. However, publications are no longer a single print entity. Publishers have many ways of reaching readers, making content available, and interacting with their audience. In the confusing cacophony of media today, it’s important to create strong brand, cohesive content, and easy navigation.

But that’s easier said than done. Just as readers have a hard time navigating lots of disparate sites and media, undertaking a redesign to combat these flaws is not an easy feat.

When Is It Time for a Redesign?
It’s been a few years since you’ve made major changes to your publication’s design and online presence. You’re starting to hear rumblings from various departments that the publication looks outdated or the website is not meeting the needs of readers. Here are three key questions to ask to determine whether it’s time for a redesign:

1. Do audience metrics support your publication’s goals? Consider how well you are meeting projections for readership, satisfaction, and engagement. Also look at whether those goals will serve your needs over at least the next three years.

2. Has the association’s membership changed? Do your readers have the same goals that they did a few years ago? Are you addressing the same professions? Consider practical ways that readers’ needs or desires have changed and whether the publication’s voice, tone, and content have kept up with those changes. Importantly, are you serving younger members? If so, give thought to how younger generations prefer to digest content. It could have a significant effect on your redesign.

3. Does your publication’s look and feel seem outdated? Think about how your branding appears across platforms—print, Web, and mobile—and consider how new technology advancements could benefit those platforms.

If examining these questions makes you rethink your publication’s relevance, it’s likely time to consider a redesign.

Beginning Your Redesign
Redesigning your publication can be an overwhelming project, but if you start with a clear plan, the process is less daunting and you improve your chance of a good outcome. Here are some key points to remember when planning your overhaul:

- **Discover** what you need to do. Survey members to find out their needs and preferences. Conduct focus groups to find out what your audience likes and dislikes. Ask for employee input. Look at competing or companion publications to get ideas about what works and what doesn’t.

- **Clarify** goals for all publication formats and outlets, including multimedia and social media. Get everyone on board with these goals and objectives and build a strategy to meet them.

- **Establish** tasks and timelines. Create a game plan that communicates who is responsible for what, outline a strategy for accomplishing those tasks, and set deadlines for completing milestones.
Is Your Journal Due for a Redesign?

The Redesign Process
Once you’ve established your game plan, you may wish to bring vendors into the design process. Although vendors won’t necessarily drive your redesign, they can give you sound advice at various stages. Whether you’re considering print, Web, or mobile redesigns, or augmented content, industry vendors can assist with your questions, and can help you as you disseminate your design across different platforms. They can also help you incorporate the latest technology solutions into your new design.

With solid planning and the help of experts in your trusted partner companies, you can perform a successful redesign that won’t overwhelm you and your employees and will ultimately benefit you and your readers.

Discovering Our Roots: A “New World” of Publishing

By Stephanie Kinnan
Editorial Assistant
GIE: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Amid the day-to-day grind of our busy technical editing worlds, we do not often pause to contemplate the long and interesting history of publishing and editing: Who were our predecessors? What were they publishing? A subject of particular interest is the history of publication in the American colonies; a history that began in 1640 with the circulation of the first book published in the new world.

It was the winter of 1638/39 when the first printing press arrived in Massachusetts, along with a British locksmith named Stephen Daye. Daye, like so many other settlers who immigrated in search of more promising futures, forged a new path, creating the first printing shop in what would become the United States of America. Soon to follow was its first published work, *The Whole Booke of Psalmes Faithfully Translated into English Metre*, which (thankfully, for brevity’s sake) became widely referred to as *The Bay Psalm Book*.

Although the book was translated by roughly 30 ministers, including John Eliot and Thomas Welde, most of the editing is attributed to the Puritan clergyman Richard Mather, making him, dare we say, the founding father of editing in America. Seventeen thousand copies of *The Bay Psalm Book* were printed, but only 11 remain in existence today. Quite a collector’s item for anyone in the publishing field, but if you want to get your hands on one, it is going to cost you a pretty penny; one recently sold at auction for over $14 million.

The circulation of *The Bay Psalm Book* opened up a whole new world of publishing in the colonies, paving the way for the books, newspapers, and journals to come. Stephen Daye and Richard Mather left their legacy in ink, as we leave ours with each publication that passes through our hands.

At last year’s ISMTE meeting, Jason Roberts made the case that Editorial Offices should be taking better advantage of the data their manuscript handling systems collect. But, as we all know, the daily pressure of submissions makes it difficult to find the time to retrieve, process, and interpret data. Recognizing this challenge, Aries introduced Enterprise Analytics Reporting (EAR) to Editorial Manager (EM) some five years ago. EAR is a graphical reporting package enabling charts, gauges, and summary data tables to be viewed directly within EM—in other words, there’s no need to export to Excel for subsequent number crunching.

EAR’s power was exhilarating but humbling. For those of us lacking experience with databases, wrapping our heads around operators, functions, and filter logic was not easy. The thrill of bypassing Excel had to be weighed against the danger of making a subtle error in report design that would lead to beautiful but logically flawed graphs and charts (inadvertently calculating an average of averages was a common pitfall).

An informal EAR User Group formed, with eye-opening webinar tutorials that vividly displayed EAR’s potential, but the time pressures of Editorial Office life intervened and the group’s intention to create a library of EARs was never fulfilled. With this article, I hope to resurrect the idea of sharing EARs. By having access to a ready-to-use EAR, EM users can save the time it would otherwise take to build a report from scratch. And, in my experience, the best way to learn about EAR’s capabilities is to see how an existing report works and to adapt it to one’s particular purposes. So, I’d like to propose an occasional series in EON describing reports in use by Editorial Offices. To kick things off and to show how painless lending an EAR can be, I offer a report I’ve found quite useful for monitoring coauthor confirmations. I’m no EAR guru, so this report could no doubt be improved (and reader suggestions of that sort are very welcome). And, despite this article’s focus on EARs, EON is equally interested in sharing report templates for other manuscript handling systems. Please contact me (nijsje@gmail.com) if you’d like to contribute.

EAR for Tracking Coauthor Confirmations

The Problem
Many Editorial Offices require that coauthors confirm their authorship status; in EM, this occurs by sending an email request and asking the recipient to click a link to register confirmation. Determining which manuscripts have all coauthor confirmations complete involves opening up a subwindow of each manuscript’s “Details” window, or using a canned “Coauthor Reminder Report,” which is limited by relatively few customization options (for instance, there’s no way to filter out rejected manuscripts). Thus, a report that displays which authors of which manuscripts haven’t confirmed authorship would provide EM users with an overview of coauthor confirmation status that is not available elsewhere.

The Output
I set up my EAR as a scheduled report, so that each week it emails me a PDF showing which coauthors of research articles currently being reconsidered as revisions haven’t yet confirmed authorship. Recognition of this challenge is exhilarating but humbling. For those of us lacking experience with databases, wrapping our heads around operators, functions, and filter logic was not easy. The thrill of bypassing Excel had to be weighed against the danger of making a subtle error in report design that would lead to beautiful but logically flawed graphs and charts (inadvertently calculating an average of averages was a common pitfall).

An informal EAR User Group formed, with eye-opening webinar tutorials that vividly displayed EAR’s potential, but the time pressures of Editorial Office life intervened and the group’s intention to create a library of EARs was never fulfilled. With this article, I hope to resurrect the idea of sharing EARs. By having access to a ready-to-use EAR, EM users can save the time it would otherwise take to build a report from scratch. And, in my experience, the best way to learn about EAR’s capabilities is to see how an existing report works and to adapt it to one’s particular purposes. So, I’d like to propose an occasional series in EON describing reports in use by Editorial Offices. To kick things off and to show how painless lending an EAR can be, I offer a report I’ve found quite useful for monitoring coauthor confirmations. I’m no EAR guru, so this report could no doubt be improved (and reader suggestions of that sort are very welcome). And, despite this article’s focus on EARs, EON is equally interested in sharing report templates for other manuscript handling systems. Please contact me (nijsje@gmail.com) if you’d like to contribute.

Lend Me Your EARs

By Nijsje Dorman, PhD
Managing Editor
American Journal of Kidney Diseases
The Configuration

Data sources comprise the Author Table, the Other Author Verification Status Table, and the Editors & Submissions View. The former two are connected by the Revision Independent Author ID; the Editors & Submissions View is linked by Unique Document ID to the Document ID of the Author Table. Both joins are of the inner (direct) type.

The Fields tab is set so that the output is visually grouped (VG) by a combined field consisting of Article Type and Manuscript Number; this means that each manuscript that appears in the results is given its own little table. The coauthor and corresponding author first and last names are also combined to make the output more compact and easier to read. The green checkbox on the gear icon for “Other Author Verification Status” shows that the output of this field is customized. In this case I typed “0: No response; 1: DECLINED” into the Value Ranges input box found at the bottom of the customization pop-up window. This way, instead of spitting out status code 0 or 1, the report provides human-understandable status descriptions.
I decided that I wanted the report to show me only those manuscripts for which there were pending confirmations, so I set the filters to restrict results to the status codes corresponding to coauthors who either hadn’t responded or had responded to decline their authorship status. I confined the report to the two article types we consider research articles using a popup selector (I could have used the “Equals (Multiple)” selector instead, but I once had some issues with the selections being remembered—possibly a browser issue—and have preferred the popup selector ever since). I set the Editorial Status filter to exclude manuscripts out for revision or with a decision (I have a separate report for manuscripts that are accepted). The filter requiring the Final Disposition Term to be blank is probably unnecessary given the Editorial Status filter, but since I can no longer remember the motivation for adding it, I leave it in place for fear of disrupting a working report.

Save the Date!

8th Annual North American ISMTE Conference
August 20-21, 2015
Sheraton Inner Harbor Hotel
Baltimore, Maryland, USA
COPE to have a full day meeting on August 19

8th Annual ISMTE European Conference
October 13, 2015
Park Inn Hotel London Heathrow
Heathrow, Middlesex, United Kingdom
COPE to have a half day meeting on October 12
Are Graphical Abstracts Changing the Way We Publish?

By Luk Cox, PhD
3D Artist and Illustrator
somersault18:24

Safe is good for sidewalks and swimming pools but life requires risk if we are to get anywhere.

This inspiring quote by author and motivational speaker Simon Sinek made something click in my head. As a rigid process with a rigid structure, scientific publishing hasn’t changed much in the last few decades. It is safe for the author and publisher, and has always been done this way, but are we getting anywhere?

The “optimised” format of title, abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion, and references certainly works. It has proven its efficacy countless times. This form of publishing is so obvious that it is not even challenged anymore. This unquestioning acceptance might be rather strange for scientists, but it feels safe.

We all know that safe is the enemy of innovation. Even in the innovative field of science, most of us are constantly looking for a safe place. This is perfectly understandable, as most of the time during our evolution we were living in dangerous environments and finding a safe place was the best or only strategy for survival. To survive in dangerous environments it is key to keep a low profile and not attract attention. Nowadays, this constant life-threatening danger is gone, but our behaviour hasn’t changed a lot. Even though the threats are of a totally different caliber, we’re always still looking for safety, which often equates to fitting in.

Maybe the real danger of today is the false feeling of safety. We tell ourselves that it is safe to do things (like scientific publishing) as they have always been done. But the danger is that innovative strategies might disrupt long-lasting standards with incredible speed, as happened when digital photography moved analog photography out of the market, or when the music industry was turned upside down in a matter of months by new ways of music distribution.

We live in a media landscape where information consumption has changed drastically in the last two decades. Today, most information uptake happens via online media and we digest the news in little chunks rather than big bodies of text. The time is now for some innovative journals to come up with new ways of scientific publishing. One step in this direction is already happening with the emerging phenomenon of graphical abstracts.

A graphical abstract is a single and concise visual representation of the presented research. It should be a summary of the main findings of the paper captured in a specially designed figure. That is how most, if not all, scientific journals communicate the meaning of a graphical abstract to authors. It makes sense. It is a step towards making the information more easily accessible and it communicates the main message in short time frame. A picture is worth a thousand words, remember.

A graphical abstract is certainly not a replacement for the classical way of publishing research, but it is a welcome addition. But yet, not everybody in the scientific community is pleased with this new format. One of the most frequent objections is the extra work. Authors often see it as just another figure. As a result, most graphical abstracts are an upgraded version of the conclusion slide of the talk that goes along with the publication.

I’m not sure if this very helpful for the perceived quality of the publication and I’m not sure if this is an improvement at all. But let’s try to approach it from another angle.

Graphical abstract from Kim et al., Journal of Cheminformatics, DOI: 10.1186/1758-2946-4-28
Change always creates opportunity. However, most people don’t like change, because change is often seen as unsafe. Most people avoid new things and prefer to stick to the methods they know very well, the safe place. For them change creates a chance for failure and the resulting fear overwhelms them so much that they don’t see the huge opportunity anymore. The innovative scientist, on the other hand, embraces change, reaches out to the unsafe and unknown, and is prepared to fail. She knows that the possibility of failure is the only way to success.

This might sound as if the reckless scientist, the one who tries it all, will succeed. This is of course flawed. The rationale and motivation to try new approaches have to be sound. The motivation has to come from the inside and the scientist who will be open to new approaches needs to be informed and persuaded adequately. Here it often goes wrong.

Most publishing authors know “what” a graphical abstract is. Journals that publish graphical abstracts describe nicely what it is on their websites. However, it is much more difficult to answer the more important questions “why” and “how.” This information is absent on most publishers’ websites and is not mentioned in the instructions to authors. It is understandable that, without a clear rationale, not many authors see the added value or the opportunity for them. Consequently, the only thing they see is the extra work. Isn’t it much more motivating to do the work when we have a good reason?

If authors publish a research paper that cost them endless experiments and months of hard work, presumably they would like people to read their findings. In fact, it may be considered their moral obligation to reach as many fellow scientists as possible. It is an essential aspect of effective science communication and it is key to the advancement of science.

The huge and unique opportunity a graphical abstract offers to authors is the possibility to drive traffic to their research. It is more than a summary of research. Authors should envision it as the marketing message, the advertisement of their work. It is the authors’ chance to capture their audience’s attention, to make them so interested that they want to read more. If authors want to succeed they’ll need to adapt their communication to the fast-evolving media landscape, including social media platforms. Graphical abstracts are very well suited for this.

If authors start with this motivation and rationale, the next step is to define how this can be achieved with a graphical abstract. Authors should focus on design, composition, and aesthetics to emphasise the most important findings. People get inspired by beauty, and aesthetic compositions are easier to understand. Authors should consider the context in which the graphical abstract will be seen. This is mostly online (in contrast to a seminar room, which is likely the venue for which the PowerPoint slide now submitted as a graphical abstract was first created). Authors should try to put themselves in the shoes of potential readers and find out what sparks their interest. A good starting point is for authors to look at themselves, and consider what attracts their own attention.

Giving a different focus and purpose to a graphical abstract—opening the door to one’s research versus making a concise visual representation of the paper—creates an opportunity for authors to get more people to read their research. The innovative scientist who uses this knowledge and optimises a graphical abstract to attract the right attention will benefit. Her work will be seen by more people, possibly leading to more interest in her research. This may lead to unexpected collaborations and more funding, citations, and recognition. All this works as a positive feedback loop, accelerating the momentum to get even more opportunities. The innovative scientist values her research and takes the leap.
Writing Ergonomics: Avoiding Injury at Your Desk

By Dave Bricker

Editor’s Note: This article was originally posted on February 16, 2015 on the blog, The World's Greatest Book.

This article explores ergonomic solutions to writers’ repetitive stress problems. As static as it may seem, writing is a physically demanding endeavor. I’ve spent decades sitting in a chair staring at a screen, tapping on a keyboard. During that time, I’ve experienced neck pain, shoulder pain, elbow pain, wrist pain, forearm pain, and back pain—sometimes to a point where I questioned whether I’d be able to continue writing, designing, programming, editing, or any of the other computer-centric activities from which I derive income and enjoyment.

Caveat: I’m not a doctor and this isn’t medical advice (insert customary legal disclaimer here). If the commonsense writing ergonomics adjustments described in this article don’t work for you, see a physician. Repetitive stress injuries can end your writing career, and some injuries do require surgical fixes.

Some basic principles apply when exploring the world of writing ergonomics:

- **Muscles are elastic.** Relax them; they’ll show you where they like to rest when you take tension off them—which is our goal; tension causes pain. When some poor kid is given a wedgie, his elastic underwear waistband gets permanently distorted. When we overload our muscles and tendons—either by putting too much weight on them or by not allowing them to relax—they stretch out and become inflamed for the same reason.

- **Compression loading** requires no tension to maintain. You can stack dishes to the ceiling because the weight is directed downward to the kitchen counter. **Side loads** require tension to offset. If you stick a spatula into your stack of dishes and hang a pot on it, you’ll have to pull down on the opposite side of the top dish to keep the stack from flying...
A R T I C L E
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The vertebrae in your back work much like that stack of dishes.

- **Lifting requires leverage.** Imagine a 14-inch piece of wood sticking forward from the front of your shoe. Tie a piece of rope to the outer edge and you can easily pivot the wood up toward your knee. Tie the rope halfway along the wood and the lifting becomes harder. Now tie the rope an inch forward of your shoe. Lifting is difficult—and you have just built a model of your elbow; the tendons that lift your forearm (and whatever you have in your hand) pull with amazing strength from the base of the arm.

Writing Ergonomics: The Spine

Spines are structures comprised of stacks of vertebrae with rings of “padding” between them. Muscles connecting the vertebrae allow us to bend and flex our backs—forward, backward, and from side-to-side. Because of the natural curves of the spine—inward at the lower back and outward at the upper back, our spines will never align perfectly like a stack of dishes. But if we lean forward, the weight of our head and upper body tries to slump us over in the same way. Muscles along the back of the spine contract to counteract this weight, resulting in tension, pain, and potential injury if the counterforce is sustained for long periods of time—which is why a good office chair has a contoured back that supports the curves of your spine.

What causes ergonomic back injuries? Aside from general, habitual bad posture, if the monitor is too far from your eyes to allow comfortable focusing, or at too low a position, you naturally lean forward. If your monitor is farther away than arm’s length, bring it closer to help bring the backbones into comfortable vertical alignment against the supporting back of your chair.

Years in front of a monitor (and general aging) can compromise your ability to focus on close objects. Cheap over-the-counter reading glasses make it possible for me to keep my monitor at the correct distance set to its highest resolution. Don’t let easily correctable vision problems turn into painful back problems.

Writing Ergonomics: The Neck

The head and neck have an important relationship. Touch your chin to your chest and then slowly rotate your head backward until you face the ceiling. At some middle point, about where you’re facing straight ahead, your head balances atop your neck. If your monitor is too low or is improperly angled, you’ll compensate by leaning your head forward—resulting in stress on the tendons and muscles of the back of the neck.

Most injuries come from adjusting your body to your workspace instead of the other way around. Sit straight up at your desk with shoulders relaxed and your hands in your lap, looking straight ahead. Adjust the height, angle, and distance of your monitor and/or your chair to complement this “neutral” posture. Make adjustments. Listen to your body. Remove as much tension as possible. The proximity of your eyes to your screen can actually encourage good posture if you set your workspace up correctly.

Writing Ergonomics: Arms & Hands

With the body and head properly positioned, consider the positions of the arms and hands. Let
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your arms hang straight down from the shoulders. If you chair has arm rests, adjust their heights to gently support the elbows.

Position your keyboard in a keyboard tray slightly below the elbows. Remember the piece of wood we attempted to lift with the string? If your elbows have to lift your hands off the keyboard or keep your hands hovering while you type each phrase or sentence, the amount of cumulative weight kept suspended over time is staggering. Symptoms of tendonitis, like “tennis elbow,” can often be alleviated simply by lowering your keyboard a few inches. Fingers and hands should arc gracefully down from the wrists to rest almost weightlessly on the keyboard. If needed, use a wrist rest containing soft gel or beads to support the hands at the correct height over the keyboard.

Writing Ergonomics: Keyboard & Mouse

Relax your hands and arms and place them in your lap. Observe the natural position of the hands and the ideal keyboard position. Hold your hands flat as if typing, and then relax the muscles in the forearms. Your hands will rotate outward, bringing the thumbs to the top—like the hands of a potter shaping a ball of clay. How many hundreds of millions of flat keyboards have been manufactured without regard to ergonomics? Flat keyboards require the two bones in the forearm to cross, stretching the muscles and requiring the tendons that control the fingers to pull “around a corner.”

A traditional, flat computer mouse is likewise an ergonomic liability. How many times will you click, press, and drag during your writing career?

The solutions to the mouse and keyboard problem are simple:

The Kinesis Freestyle II split keyboard comes in Mac and PC versions. The two halves of the keyboard can be adjusted independently to accommodate the angle of the arms inward from the elbow. The VIP base allows you to angle the inside halves of the keyboard upward to follow the natural upward angle of the hands at rest.

The “vertical mouse” is offered by various manufacturers at various price points. The $19 SHARKK wireless ergonomic mouse has the buttons on the side. I’d like to see a hair less resistance on the button, but I found this mouse easy to adapt to and fine for precision graphic work.

Writing Ergonomics: Conclusion

Add up the costs of a good office chair, a monitor stand, a keyboard tray, an ergonomic keyboard, and a vertical mouse, and you’ll probably find that the costs associated with being a writer are more than expected. But the same is true for almost any physical endeavor: proper life jackets, a helmet, a good tennis racquet, a carbon fiber paddle, a set of knee and elbow pads. Whatever your sport happens to be, good gear is always cheaper than getting injured—and it’s a lot more comfortable. If you’re serious about writing and plan to spend months or years at the keyboard, every step you take to reduce repetitive stress injuries is a worthwhile investment in prolonging your writing career.
Want to have lunch at Joe’s?

Not today. They have mistakes on their menu, and I forgot my red pen.
What to do if you suspect plagiarism

(a) Suspected plagiarism in a submitted manuscript

Reviewer informs editor about suspected plagiarism

Thank reviewer and say you plan to investigate
Get full documentary evidence if not already provided

Check degree of copying

Clear plagiarism (unattributed use of large portions of text and/or data, presented as if they were by the plagiarist)
Contact corresponding author in writing, ideally enclosing signed authorship statement (or cover letter) stating that submitted work is original/the author’s own and documentary evidence of plagiarism

Minor copying of short phrases only (e.g. in discussion of research paper from non-native language speaker)
Contact author in neutral terms expressing disappointment/explaining journal’s position
Ask author to rephrase copied phrases or include as direct quotations with references
Proceed with review

Redundancy (i.e. copying from author’s own work) – see flowcharts on redundancy

No problem

Discuss with reviewer

Author responds

No response

Unsatisfactory explanation/admits guilt

Satisfactory explanation (honest error/journal instructions unclear/very junior researcher)

Attempt to contact all other authors (check Medline/Google for emails)

No response

Contact author's institution requesting your concern is passed to author's superior and/or person responsible for research governance

If no response, keep contacting every 3–6 months
If no resolution, consider contacting other authorities, e.g. ORI in US, GMC in UK

Write to author (all authors if possible) rejecting submission, explaining position and expected future behaviour

Write to author (all authors if possible) rejecting submission or requesting revision, explaining position and expected future behaviour

If no response, consider informing author's superior and/or person responsible for research governance and/or potential victim

Developed for COPE by Liz Wager of Sideview (www.lizwager.com)
© 2013 Committee on Publication Ethics
First published 2006
A non-exclusive licence to reproduce these flowcharts may be applied for by writing to: cope_administrator@publicationethics.org
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