

# Ethical Issues in Scientific Publishing

## Overview

This chapter is about the codes of conduct that have developed over the years to make sure interactions during the scientific publishing process are productive, honest, and collegial.

The topics that will be covered in this chapter are

- Authorship
- Peer review
- Dual submission
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- Conflict of interest
- Copyright

## Authorship

It is not uncommon for issues to arise over who gets listed as an author on a manuscript, in which order the authors' names appear, and who becomes the corresponding author.

According to the *Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals* ([www.icmje.org](http://www.icmje.org)), “An ‘author’ is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study.” This definition comes from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Since 1978, this committee has worked to standardize manuscript format and resolve common ethical problems such as issues surrounding authorship. Currently, more than 500 journals follow the guidelines in *Uniform Requirements*.

According to the *Uniform Requirements*, a person qualifies as an author of a manuscript only if he or she has done *all* of the following:

1. Made a *substantial contribution* to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data.
2. Participated in *drafting* the article or *revising* it critically for important intellectual content.
3. Granted *final approval* of the version to be published.

Another way to look at who should be an author is to consider an author's responsibilities:

1. An author should have generated at least a part of the intellectual content of a paper, by conceiving or designing the study, collecting reported data, or analyzing reported data.
2. An author should have taken part in writing the paper, reviewing it, or revising its intellectual content.
3. An author should be able to defend publicly in the scientific community all of the intellectual content of the paper.

Because of the many problems that arise concerning authorship, journals are becoming involved in the process by establishing their own authorship guidelines. That is, many journals are requiring that authors meet certain criteria in order to be named as an author on an article.

Journals are approaching this in various ways. For example, some journals require each author to state his or her particular contribution to an article using very specific wording. Other journals require that authors sign a form indicating that they have made a substantial contribution to the preparation of the manuscript.

So what do you do with the people who do not meet the strict criteria for authorship? The answer is to put them in the acknowledgment section. This section is where you acknowledge people who provided

- Materials for the study, such as cells, tissue samples, or patients
  - Advice
  - Assistance with data analysis or collection
  - Technical support
  - Patient care
  - Secretarial support
-

- Editorial support
- Financial support, unless this has been noted in a footnote on the title page

For more information on authorship, please see “Appendix 1: Insights on Determining Authorship.”

## **Tony’s Dilemma**

The case that follows illustrates the difficulties that can arise in the assignment of authorship, especially for junior members of the science team. Please read the case and then imagine Tony is in your research group. Please decide how you would like Tony to resolve the issue.

### ***Case Study:***

Dr. Tony Anders is a postdoctoral fellow in the Department of Experimental Biology. He was hired by Dr. Edward Holly for his (Tony’s) work involving a specific cell line. In a meeting to review the final draft of a paper describing the lab’s latest research with Tony’s cell line, Tony learns that Edward plans to add Dr. Martin Alize, another postdoctoral fellow in Tony’s lab, as co–first author of the paper.

Tony is surprised and somewhat offended. Martin *did* contribute to the research by performing a few of the experiments, but Tony did more of the work, wrote the manuscript, and expected to be first author. He does not understand why Edward made this decision, but he suspects it is because Martin has applied for a junior faculty position and needs another publication.

### ***Questions:***

What issues does this case raise? Is there a tactful way for Tony to discuss them with Edward? Is there anything Tony can or should say to Martin?

---

## The Case of the Changing Byline

A second authorship dispute illustrates how a failure to make decisions about authorship up front can escalate seemingly minor disagreements. Please read the case and consider the principles of authorship and the questions at the end.

### *Case Study:*

Dr. Annette Davis, the corresponding author of a manuscript recently accepted but not yet published by the *Journal of XYZ*, just received a letter from the journal informing her of a problem communicated to the journal by 1 of the co-authors. This co-author, Dr. Bill Baily, had complained to the editor that the paper had been submitted without his final approval *and* that he was listed as the fourth author when in fact he was supposed to have been the third author. (Because the first 3 authors are the only ones listed in the reference list in many journals, Bill wants to be 1 of these first 3.) The letter to Annette stated that the paper could not be published until the dispute over the authorship had been settled and that the journal would need written authorization from all the co-authors before proceeding.

A month later, Annette sent a letter to the journal signed by the other 3 co-authors (first, second, and third), though not Bill, indicating that they had all signed off on the paper and that Bill could be removed as a co-author.

After 3 more weeks, she received a second letter from the journal indicating that they could not remove Bill without his authorization and that the journal was again at a standstill until the matter was resolved by all the co-authors.

### *Questions:*

What issues about authorship can you identify in this situation? How should the issue have been handled in the first place? What can be done now to remedy the situation? How does being listed as fourth author affect bibliographies?

---

## Peer Review

### Responsibilities of Peer Reviewers

Peer review is an essential component of science. Without peer review, there would be no oversight of what gets into print, and there would be no assurance that the data are reliable. Therefore, *scientists have an obligation to participate in the peer review process and ensure that only reliable data get published.*

The primary responsibility of a peer reviewer is to protect against the publication of bad science and ensure the publication of good science. If a review is not fair, objective, and accurate, one of two things could happen. Either flawed data could be published or, just the reverse, valuable data might not be published. Either way, subsequent research would be seriously affected.

The review process should be helpful, constructive, and productive. Reviewers should therefore always be collegial—polite—in their comments. Reviews are never the place for someone to show anger or strong criticism. It is also helpful for authors if reviews are organized, offer solutions and advice on how to correct problems, and look at both the big and little picture. (The chapter “Navigating the Peer Review Process” deals with effective ways to respond to peer reviewers’ comments.)

### Confidentiality of Data in Manuscripts under Review

There is also a set of ethics that pertain to peer review. The following ethical guidelines are from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the parent agency of the National Institutes of Health:

All material under review is *privileged information*. It should not be used to the benefit of the reviewer unless it previously has been made public. . . . Material under review shall *not be copied and retained* or used in any manner by the reviewer unless specifically permitted by the journal or reviewing organization and the author.

In reviewing a manuscript, one must consider what the author expects—or better yet, what you expect as an author. As the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors states: “In submitting their manuscripts for review, authors entrust editors with the results of their scientific work and creative effort, on which their reputation and career may depend.”

---

**Reviewer Confidentiality Rule #1**

*Do not divulge or discuss the content of a manuscript with anyone or tell anyone that you have done a review of the manuscript.*

The issue of confidentiality is an important one. The information being reviewed is privileged—confidential. The contents of the article should not be discussed or revealed to anyone without the journal’s permission.

Now, what if the reviewer is busy or has a fellow or colleague working in his or her lab who knows the topic, or maybe some aspect of the topic, very well—maybe even better than the reviewer does? The Department of Health and Human Services says that getting help with a review is acceptable but that “the names of those with whom the information is shared should be made known to those managing the review process.”

Journal editors do not generally object to reviews being done by someone other than the originally assigned reviewer or to reviewers asking for the assistance of others— if this is *solely* to enhance the thoroughness and scope of the review. Indeed, such involvement contributes to the worth of the review. In addition, journal editors are always looking for new reviewers with valuable expertise. However, the original reviewer should always contact the journal office beforehand and let the staff know who he or she would like to involve in the review and find out if that is acceptable. That person’s name should also appear on the review. Furthermore, any consultant reviewers should be reminded of the confidentiality requirements.

**Reviewer Confidentiality Rule #2**

*Do not use findings reported in a manuscript to redirect your research in any way.*

Reviewing a manuscript is also not an opportunity to use that unpublished information to your or your colleagues’ advantage. That means that reviewers cannot let the content of the article allow them to change the direction of their research in any way, until after the article is published and is available to the research community as a whole.

---

**Reviewer Confidentiality Rule #3**

*Judge the content of an article only on the basis of published findings.*

What if you know something that has a bearing on the content of an article, but it is not common knowledge? For example, suppose it is a personal observation of yours or a colleague's but it is not publicly known and has not been published anywhere. Once again, you have to keep that information confidential. In this case, it *cannot* be divulged to the author. The Department of Health and Human Services says

The review must be objective. It shall be based solely on scientific evaluation of the material under review *within the context of published information* and should not be influenced by scientific information not publicly available.

**Reviewer Confidentiality Rule #4**

*Never reveal to the author your identity as a reviewer.*

It is also important not to reveal to an author that you have reviewed his or her manuscript. Journals and publishers count on this to reassure authors that their work received confidential and unbiased reviews. Any such breach in confidentiality is an embarrassment for you and the journal and jeopardizes the confidentiality of the review process.

[Preceding material from: Guidelines for the Conduct of Research within the Public Health Service. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services/Public Health Service, 1992 (also see Guidelines for the Conduct of Research in the Intramural Research Programs at NIH: [www.nih.gov/news/irnews/guidelines.htm](http://www.nih.gov/news/irnews/guidelines.htm)).]

**The Case of the “Borrowed” Review**

The following case illustrates some of the confidentiality issues in peer review. Please read the case and consider the principles listed above and the questions at the end.

***Case Study:***

Dr. John Smith, an expert in *Drosophila* embryology, has agreed to write a review of his specialty for the leading developmental biology journal. He has nearly finished writing the review when another embryology journal sends him a manuscript by Dr. Douglas Jones for peer review. This journal explicitly keeps the identity of reviewers confidential. To John's delight, the manuscript presents some novel findings pertaining to the subject of his review. Because John believes the readers of the review should be able to read the latest information, he decides to summarize Dr. Jones' findings in his review, even though these findings have not been published yet. John also does not know whether Dr. Jones' paper

---

will be accepted by the journal, nor does he know in what issue it would be published if it is accepted. He does know that his review is scheduled for publication early next year.

***Questions:***

How does this case violate the principles of confidentiality governing peer review? Could John contact the other embryology journal to get their permission to use Dr. Jones' report? Could he contact Dr. Jones? If he reported Dr. Jones' findings without the permission of either the journal or author in the hope that Dr. Jones' paper will be published before his review, what dilemma might he find himself in?

## **Dual Submission**

Dual submission is the unacceptable practice of submitting the same manuscript to 2 or more journals at the same time. Why do authors do it? They do it for 1 reason, and that is to avoid having to wait to get a decision from 1 journal before sending the manuscript to the next journal—a wait of as much as 2 to 3 months. It is done to speed the process and thereby ensure that the author gets his or her article into print as quickly as possible. This is an understandable temptation, but it is wrong for several reasons.

The first reason is that journals do not allow dual submission, and this is usually stated in the journals' instructions to authors. Journals do not allow dual submission because twice as many reviewers and twice as much staff time will be taken up in the peer review process. In other words, dual submission wastes a lot of people's time.

A second reason is that dual submission puts other authors who are observing all the rules at a disadvantage—first by putting the paper ahead of papers by authors who are patiently waiting for a decision on their article before sending it to another journal, and second by tying up 2 sets of reviewers, who are not then free to review other manuscripts.

It is highly unlikely that dual submission will go undetected. Often there are only a few reviewers with the right expertise to review a manuscript in a particular area, and a manuscript sent to 2 different journals may very well get sent to the same reviewer or reviewers, who will immediately detect the dual submission.

---

The possible consequences for an author who gets caught submitting the same manuscript to 2 or more journals simultaneously include the following:

- Dual submission *damages* an author's *reputation*.
- The manuscript under consideration may be *immediately rejected by both journals*.
- Journals may penalize the author by *not allowing him or her to submit any manuscripts* for a certain period of time.

## Duplicate Publication

Duplicate publication is the unacceptable practice of publishing a paper that overlaps substantially with 1 already published. The primary reason authors engage in duplicate publication is to add to their list of publications.

There are several consequences of duplicate publication. First, duplicate publication *wastes readers' time*. Readers of articles deserve material that is original unless there is a clear statement to the contrary. Second, duplicate publication *wastes space*. Duplicate publication clogs the literature with redundancy and is not a cost-effective use of resources. It also potentially denies that space to another author. Third, duplicate publication *distorts the true picture*. The duplicate set of data take on twice the importance of a single set of data. That is, there are twice as many data showing the same thing. Fourth, duplicate publication *violates the copyright law*. And finally, duplicate publication is *scientific misconduct*.

Authors who are caught publishing the same material twice face several possible consequences:

- A *notice of redundant publication* may be published without the author's explanation or approval.
- There may be *academic penalties*.
- Journals may penalize the author by *not allowing him or her to submit any manuscripts* for a certain period of time.

The first consequence is not just an embarrassment to the author. It also causes readers and other researchers to be concerned about the author's scientific integrity, and these are concerns that do not disappear quickly.

---

There are a couple of rare situations in which it may be acceptable to publish the same article in more than 1 place:

- Consensus or position papers
- Papers in journals published in different languages

Under these conditions, duplicate publication — or secondary publication, as it is more commonly called in these cases — may be beneficial. For example, a consensus or position paper prepared by a scientific or medical organization may contain information that needs to be communicated to the practitioners of an entire specialty or investigators in an entire field. Or a paper may contain information that needs to be communicated to people who speak different languages or who live in different countries. However, if secondary publication is warranted for either of these reasons, certain conditions must first be met, as stated in the *Uniform Requirements*:

1. The authors have *received approval* from the editors of both journals; the editor concerned with secondary publication must have a photocopy, reprint, or manuscript of the primary version.
  2. The *priority* of the primary publication is respected by a publication interval of at least 1 week (unless specifically negotiated otherwise by both editors).
  3. The paper for secondary publication is intended for a *different group* of readers; an abbreviated version could be sufficient.
  4. The secondary version *faithfully reflects* the data and interpretations of the primary version.
  5. The *footnote* on the title page of the secondary version informs readers, peers, and documenting agencies that the paper has been published in whole or in part and states the primary reference. A suitable footnote might read: “This article is based on a study first reported in the [title of journal, with full reference].”
  6. The title of the secondary publication should indicate that it is a secondary publication (complete republication, abridged republication, complete translation, or abridged translation) of a primary publication. Of note, the National Library of Medicine does not consider translations to be “republications” and does not cite or index translations when the original article was published in a journal that is indexed in MEDLINE.
-

## The Case of One for Two

The following case illustrates how success may trap a scientist into a difficult situation: Should the scientist violate the rules against duplicate publication or should he or she disappoint good friends and colleagues? By postponing a decision, the scientist makes the dilemma worse. Please review the case in light of the principles about duplicate publication and be prepared to discuss alternatives.

### *Case Study:*

Dr. Mary Blair is world famous for a surgical technique she developed, which is now in use everywhere. She has been asked many times to write chapters for books on surgical techniques, and each time she has added important modifications to the text (and sometimes to the technique). This year, however, 2 different editors have asked her to describe the technique. She agrees to the 2 requests but finds that her enthusiasm for writing about the procedure has diminished a great deal. Besides, she is now working on another surgical technique she believes will be even more important. Her first paper describing this new procedure has just been published, and she has already been asked to write a book chapter on it. Because of her new interests and limitations on time, she decides to submit the same chapter on the old technique to both publishers. She reasons that after all, she is the only surgeon who can describe the old technique and its pitfalls completely and that she has run out of new ways to describe it. She also knows that the editors of the 2 books, both of them career-long friends, would be very disappointed if she turned them down now, so close to the deadline, after she has already agreed to write the chapters.

### *Questions:*

Is Mary justified, in this limited circumstance, in making this decision to publish the same article twice? If yes, why? If no, why not?

## Plagiarism

Plagiarism comes from a Greek word that means “kidnapping,” and although there is no child or other person literally being taken, for the author who is plagiarized, it is almost as if his or her child has been kidnapped. The material plagiarized might be a description, an idea, a hypothesis, an observation, data, a graph, an interpretation, or a conclusion. As the U.S. National Academy of Sciences defines it: “In

---

plagiarism, an author presents as his or her own ideas, language, data, graphics, or even scientific protocols created by someone else, whether published or unpublished, without giving appropriate credit.”

(From: *American Medical Association Manual of Style*; based on: National Academy of Sciences. *Responsible Science: Ensuring the Integrity of the Research Process*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1992.)

Most people think that plagiarism is the “verbatim [word-for-word] lifting of passages without enclosing the borrowed material in quotation marks and crediting the original author.”

(From: *American Medical Association Manual of Style*; based on: *Some Notes on Plagiarism and How to Avoid It* [handout]. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.)

But plagiarism also occurs in a form known as “mosaic plagiarism.” This is when an author takes a few ideas from an original source, including some verbatim words and phrases, and then intersperses those ideas with his or her own ideas and opinions without distinguishing between the 2 and crediting the original source.

There are 2 things wrong with mosaic plagiarism. The first, of course, is that the author has taken someone else’s original ideas or description and presented them as his or her own. The other problem is that in the process of adding his or her own ideas and interpretations, he or she may change the other author’s original message. The simple solution to avoid mosaic plagiarism is to

- Restate the wording or ideas of the original author in a way that is completely true to the original, and
- Attribute the content to the original author.

This is getting into the practice of paraphrasing, which is perfectly acceptable. Very simply, paraphrasing is taking someone’s original description and restating it in your own words — but always with appropriate credit to the original source.

A last thing to be careful of is not to plagiarize yourself. Yes — that, too, is plagiarism. It is not acceptable to take a paragraph, a table, an introduction — any previously published material of yours — and present it in another manuscript as entirely new material. There may be a strong temptation to do so. After all, this eliminates having to take the time to describe something in entirely different words.

But self-plagiarism is not acceptable. For one thing, it violates copyright law (please see “Appendix 2: Copyright” for information on the basics of copyright). The only way you can re-use your previously published

---

material is to ask for permission – and be sure to credit the original source. The other consequence of self-plagiarism is that your credibility as an expert in a particular area comes into question. It suggests that your knowledge is so limited that you could not come up with more than 1 original description. Indeed, if you find yourself describing the same thing in 2 different places, one would expect that the description would be different because you should be writing for 2 different audiences reading 2 different publications. If that is not the case, then maybe you should rethink writing the second manuscript.

The consequences of plagiarism are many:

- You *damage* your credibility and your integrity.
- You *violate* copyright law.
- You could face *legal consequences*, including possible expensive fines.
- You may *not be allowed to publish* in that journal or all journals in that particular field for a certain period of time.
- You could face *academic penalties* – denial of tenure, grants, promotion, etc.

## Conflict of Interest

One of the best definitions of conflict of interest comes from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors:

Conflict of interest exists when an author (or author's institution), reviewer, or editor has financial or personal relationships that inappropriately influence (bias) his or her actions.

Conflict of interest for an author, reviewer, or journal editor can result from

- Owning stock in a company
  - Being an employee of a company
  - Being on the board of directors of a company
  - Receiving financial support from a company
  - Working for a competing company
  - Doing research on a competing product
  - Personal relationships
-

Any possible conflict of interest that could bias a person's view or be used to influence another person's view needs to be divulged when the manuscript is submitted by the author or received by the reviewer or journal editor. If you are an *author*, you need to reveal any special relationship you have with the topic that might influence the way in which you present and interpret the data. If you are a *reviewer*, you need to excuse yourself from doing the review. If you are a journal *editor*, you need to ask another editor to make the decision on the manuscript.

It is always better to play it safe and indicate any potential conflict to the journal's editor from the start. This gives the editor an opportunity to review the matter and make his or her own determination about how to handle it. Furthermore, not divulging something, even though minor, may be seen as a deliberate attempt to hide the information.

## Giving a Friend a Boost

The following case illustrates some of the conflict of interest principles described above. Please read it and decide whether Dr. Brown has a reportable conflict of interest.

### *Case Study:*

Dr. Wilma Brown has just received a manuscript for review from *Journal ABC*. She knows the manuscript was written by Dr. Jill Bartlett, who worked as a postdoctoral fellow in her laboratory a year ago. Wilma has been proud of Jill's rapid rise, which Wilma believes is at least partly a reflection of the training she gave her. Wilma welcomes another chance to advance Jill's career by reviewing her manuscript. She knows there are many scientists who could give a good review of the subject, so she is glad for the good fortune of being assigned to review it.

### *Questions:*

What are Wilma's obligations to the journal regarding review of this manuscript? Should she review Jill's manuscript? As a close colleague of Jill, could Wilma mention the review to her?

---

## Appendix 1: Insights on Determining Authorship

James Cox, MD

Professor, Division of Radiation Oncology

Former Editor in Chief, *International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics*

Authorship guidelines vary widely from country to country and from one institution to another. In the United States, it is generally accepted that the first author should be the individual who contributes most to the work and who is the primary author of the manuscript. Usually the last author is the individual who has provided the scientific and administrative framework for the development of the study and oversight of the findings. This individual is usually most responsible for an understanding of the integration of the reported findings with the literature and with emerging findings from other institutions. It is easiest to decide who will be the last or senior author when it is a laboratory where numerous postdoctoral trainees, graduate students, and junior faculty work. This is not so consistently the case in the clinical arena.

A variation on the author list above is the report by a trainee (resident or fellow) with the direct supervision and mentoring of a faculty member. In this case, the faculty member is often listed as the second author unless he or she is at the same time the senior author, in which case he or she may be the last author.

All authors should have contributed in a clearly identifiable way in generating the data, contributing to the analysis, and/or reviewing and critiquing the manuscript. The first or senior author is most responsible for identifying the contributing authors.

In the current environment where collaborative work is encouraged, it is wise to be inclusive of authors rather than exclusive lest the work of a contributing individual fail to be recognized. On the other hand, honorary authorship is not warranted; that is, listing the name of someone who has neither directly participated in the work nor contributed to the writing and reviewing of the manuscript should not be done.

Disagreements about authorship usually occur when there has been no discussion of authorship prior to the generation of a completed manuscript. If there is a disagreement about authorship, the two people most responsible for deciding the author list are the first author and the senior author.

Cooperative group guidelines serve as a good example of the variability of publication guidelines. In the Radiation Therapy Oncology Group (RTOG), the first author is the principal investigator (PI) of the trial, the second author is the statistician who has been most responsible for analyzing the results, and the other authors are the major participants who have supported the trial both intellectually and by enrolling their patients. The study chair is not on the author list in most cases unless he or she is actually the PI of the trial. By contrast, in the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project, Dr. Bernard Fisher was the PI of every trial and was the first author on the overwhelming majority of publications stemming from the work of this group over a 30+ year period. Somewhere in between are the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group and the Southwest Oncology Group, who give special recognition to the disease site chair (lung, gynecologic, genitourinary, etc.) as well as the modality chairs (surgery, radiation oncology, medical oncology, etc). These groups do not recognize the contributions of investigators from individual institutions but rather put all of their emphasis on the “scientific leadership” under whom the studies were developed.

---

In summary, in my view, only those who actually do the work deserve to be authors. The work is almost always led by a single individual, perhaps with support from a mentor or senior investigator. These individuals should appear first, second, or last in the author list. The remainder of the author list is best determined by the two or three individuals noted above, with an emphasis on including those who should be recognized for the work and excluding those who serve in administrative positions and who did not contribute directly to the investigations.

## Appendix 2: Copyright

Copyright establishes the ownership of your written material. Very simply, copyright law protects everything, from the outline and the first rough draft to the manuscript that is finally published. Importantly, the author does not need to take any special action to secure copyright.

Up to the time a manuscript is accepted for publication, the authors are the copyright holder. After a manuscript is accepted for publication, authors will generally find that a condition of publication is that they must transfer ownership of the copyright to the owner of the journal. That owner may be a publisher, a professional society, or an institution. In some cases, only the corresponding author, as the official representative of the manuscript, will be asked to sign the form that transfers copyright. Generally, though, all authors must sign because they own the copyright jointly.

Copyright holders have the following rights:

- The right to reproduce the copyrighted work
- The right to prepare derivative works based on the copyrighted work
- The right to distribute copies of the copyrighted work to the public

This means that, after the copyright is transferred to the journal owner, the authors no longer have these rights, and they must get permission from the new copyright holder to do any of these things.

If you decide you want to reproduce previously published material—your own or someone else’s—you need to obtain permission to use the material from the copyright owner—the publisher or the society. It may be a block of text from a journal article or book that exceeds a few sentences or a table or a figure in its entirety. Getting permission is simple to do. All you have to do is to send a letter or form requesting permission for republication of the material to the copyright holder specifying 3 things:

1. The *material* you want to use—that is, the figure, table, or portion of text you want to use.
2. The *title of the work* that you want to reproduce the material from, the *authors or editors* of the work, and the *page number* on which the material appears. Also include a *photocopy* of the material.
3. The *purpose* that you are using it for. If the material will be reproduced in a book, name the editors, the title of the book, and the publisher.

Once the copyright holder returns the form indicating consent to your request, you will need to include a credit line. Some publishers specify the wording of the copyright line, which you *must* use. If no wording is specified, the following works well: “Reproduced with permission from [insert full reference].”

For more information on copyright, please see “Crash Course in Copyright” at <http://copyright.lib.utexas.edu/>.

---

**Sample Request for Permission**

**[First, insert one of the following two options, depending on whether the material you wish to reprint is from a journal article or a book chapter.]**

**[Option 1]** I am writing to request permission to reprint [specify material to be reprinted] from “[article title],” by [authors], published in [journal name], volume \_\_\_\_, number \_\_\_\_, [year], pages \_\_ to \_\_,

**[Option 2]** I am writing to request permission to reprint [specify material to be reprinted] from “[chapter title],” by [authors], published in [book title] in [year],

**[Next, insert one of the following two options, depending on whether the material will be reprinted in a journal article or a book chapter.]**

**[Option 1]** in my article tentatively entitled “[article title]” that is to appear in an upcoming issue of [journal name].

Complete copyright information and credit will be given. If you have any special requirements for your credit line, please advise me. If the author’s permission is also required, please send me the appropriate address.

**[Option 2]** in my chapter tentatively entitled “[chapter title]” that is to appear in the book [book title], edited by [editors’ names], to be published by [publisher] around [approximate month/year].

I am requesting nonexclusive permission to use this material as part of my work in all languages and for all editions, revisions, or translations of this book. Complete copyright information and credit will be given. If you have any special requirements for your credit line, please advise me. If the author’s permission is also required, please send me the appropriate address.

**[End the letter with the following sentence.]**

Please sign below and return this letter to me at [your contact information, including your fax number].

**[At the very bottom of the letter, type the following for the publisher to fill in.]**

Permission granted by: \_\_\_\_\_,  
signature  
\_\_\_\_\_, on \_\_\_\_\_,  
title date

Citation to read as follows: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_.

---

## Issues in the Cases

### Issues in Tony's Dilemma

The pressure to publish starts very early in a scientist's career. Since a position as first author is especially valuable, most of the competition is for that spot in the author list. Indeed, most faculty recruiters want to know which articles in a bibliography were written by the candidate. Here, Edward is giving Martin the gift of first authorship, perhaps thinking that it is no loss to Tony, who likewise will be listed as first author. Edward has not thought about the messages he is sending his laboratory group, however. To Tony, he has said that first authorship is a gift, not a position you earn. He has sent the same message to Martin. Furthermore, he has diminished the prestige of Tony's position on the authorship list simply by having him share it with Martin.

Tony is now in a difficult position. Martin was added at Edward's request; Tony does not know whether Martin demanded to be included. So confronting Martin is likely only to create animosity. Getting Edward to change his decision will be difficult because Edward presumably gave his word to Martin.

### Issues in the Case of the Changing Byline

- The authors did not agree on authorship up front.
- One author did not approve the final paper.
- Authors cannot be taken off the list of co-authors after the article has been submitted without the approval of each, and the corresponding author must write a letter to the journal signed by all co-authors.
- Bill should have contacted Annette before contacting the journal.
- As for the shift in order, if Bill is listed as fourth author, his name would not appear on many reference lists.

### Issues in the Case of the "Borrowed" Review

John cannot use Dr. Jones' findings until they are published, for several reasons:

By reviewing the paper, John agreed to treat Dr. Jones' paper as a confidential document. He cannot contact Dr. Jones directly for permission without violating that agreement.

If he contacted the intended publisher of Dr. Jones' paper in order to secure permission, the journal would not give him permission (they cannot because Dr. Jones still holds the copyright), and furthermore the journal staff might put him on their list of unsuitable reviewers for proposing this breach of review ethics.

---

As far as simply hoping Dr. Jones will publish first, making his information available for inclusion in John's review, several serious issues arise:

- Dr. Jones' paper may not be published by the journal he first sent it to.
- There might be many delays between John's return of the paper to the journal and its publication, so John's review is quite likely to be published before Dr. Jones' paper.
- The final article may have important differences from the version John reviews because other peer reviewers and the journal editor may ask for important revisions.

If any of these things happened, at the least Dr. Jones would know that John had violated the confidentiality principles of peer review.

## Issues in the Case of One for Two

Mary's dilemma is familiar to any author who becomes identified as an expert in a certain area. Journal and book editors want reviews, and they want the acknowledged experts to write the reviews. So the expert gets request after request to write them. At first, Mary is flattered and feels obligated to prepare good reviews, taking care to present original ideas in each. But soon she grows tired of writing about the same subject over and over and begins to find ways to simplify the task. Even at that point, she accepts invitations, especially when they come from close colleagues. But as the deadlines approach, Mary realizes that she cannot fulfill all her commitments.

There are solutions other than violating the copyright and ethical restrictions on duplicate publication. Mary could write 1 good review, choose the book in which she wishes to publish the original, and then, with permission of the publishers of both books, submit the same article to the editor of the second book. The article's prior publication would be acknowledged prominently in a footnote to the title page, and written permission to "reprint" the original would be given by the first publisher to Mary and the second publisher. The second editor might be unhappy with Mary, and might in fact, at this late date, choose to drop Mary's contribution altogether. Had Mary discussed this dilemma much earlier, editor 2 would have been disappointed but at the same time would have had the opportunity to seek another author for the chapter. Another solution, too rarely taken, is to limit the number of invitations accepted. Had Mary said yes to only 1 of the 2 editors, she would not face the dilemma she faces today.

## Issues in Giving a Friend a Boost

Conflicts of interest may arise in the review process. Journals routinely exclude colleagues at the same institution as the author from reviewing a manuscript, but here the conflict involves a former student now at another institution. In this case, Wilma should be aware of the potential bias involved in reviewing Jill's paper. Wilma may feel certain, however, that she can give an unbiased review. Her review might in fact be even more critical than some other potential reviewer's. However, were others to know that she reviewed the manuscript, they would most likely think that was inappropriate. Wilma at least should contact the journal to describe her potential conflict. Likely, the journal would have asked her to return the paper without reviewing it.

---