

RIOs & JOURNAL EDITORS FRIENDS, NOT FOES

**OSU Research Integrity Summit
September 23, 2018**

Eric Mah, UCSD (Moderator)

Christina Bennett, American Physiological Society

Charon Pierson, COPE

Darren Taichman, Annals of Internal Medicine

Kristin West , Emory University

TODAY'S OBJECTIVES

1. What is the best way for RIOs, Journal Editors **to interact?**
2. How to manage, negotiate **confidentiality issues** but still share?
 - Need to know & confidentiality
 - General restrictions (policy v. regulation)
 - Timing of communication
 - Journal “tools”, options
 - Institutional options...are there any?

CASE STUDY #1: RIO KEEPING JOURNAL IN THE DARK

- Journal reviewer raises concerns with image → staff performs forensic analysis, see potential problems
 - 3 other papers scrutinized, additional problems found
- Journal contacts corresponding author
 - Author says all data lost due to computer crash
- Journal contacts all co-authors- no one has data
- Journal contacts RIO at corresponding authors institution

CASE STUDY #1: RIO KEEPING JOURNAL IN THE DARK

- RIO agrees to inquire
- RIO calls journal editor after 3 days and says that corresponding author confirmed all data were lost and inquiry is closed
 1. Was there a problem with journal's priority for contacting the institution?
 2. Was RIO's response sufficient for the journal?
 3. Since journal has no information, what should the journal do with the 3 other submitted papers?

CASE STUDY #2: PLAGIARISM AND A SILENT UNIVERSITY

- Journal A contacted by Author Sam Smith whose paper was rejected
 - Essentially identical paper found published in Journal B
- Author Jay Jones was a peer reviewer for Smith's paper rejected by Journal A
- Jones confessed to plagiarism of Smith's work
- Journal A contacted Journal B and Jones' University

CASE STUDY #2:
PLAGIARISM AND A SILENT UNIVERSITY

- Jones' University declined to tell Journal A or B what action it planned to take, if any
- Journal B retracted the paper, Journal A published an editorial describing the misconduct
 1. What should journal do when Institution will not communicate about what actions they take?
 2. Should an investigation into the plagiarist's other publications be made? If so, who is responsible to complete such an investigation?

CASE STUDY #3:
TWO INSTITUTIONS AND A JOURNAL –
WHO TELLS WHO, WHAT?

- Journal gets complaint from a reviewer
- Journal reviews figures; finds that the concerns are credible; identifies additional issues with other figures
- Journal contacts the corresponding author at current Institution B

CASE STUDY #3:
TWO INSTITUTIONS AND A JOURNAL –
WHO TELLS WHO, WHAT?

- Author immediately reports concerns to Dean of University A, where work was done
 - Copies all authors on the email except for the first author
- Ultimately, the institution opened an investigation (still ongoing) and the journal retracts the paper
 - Authors could not address all of the serious concerns identified

CASE STUDY #3:
TWO INSTITUTIONS AND A JOURNAL –
WHO TELLS WHO, WHAT?

1. Who should the Journal notify, if anyone?
2. Must the journal notify the institution that currently employs the corresponding author?
3. Should the notification be left to the institutions?
4. Should (or Can?) the Institution conducting the investigation alert the corresponding author's new institution?

BONUS SESSION GOAL:
**WHEN IS THE BEST TIME FOR JOURNALS TO
RETRACT/CORRECT PAPERS?**

CASE STUDY #4: RETRACTIONS AND CORRECTIONS GONE WILD

- Institution A found misconduct involving both first and corresponding authors from Institution A
- Institution A recommended all papers be retracted
- Corresponding Author never interviewed
 - Left Institution A prior to investigation
 - Found solely responsible
 - Current whereabouts unknown

CASE STUDY #4: RETRACTIONS AND CORRECTIONS GONE WILD

- Institution reported to ORI, but ORI's review not concluded
- Investigation Committee requested that the first author on each publication contact the journals to request retraction
 - 1 journal retracted the paper
 - 1 journal did nothing, insisted to wait until federal process completed
 - 2 journals requested that a retraction request be signed by all authors, including the corresponding author

CASE STUDY #4:
RETRACTIONS AND CORRECTIONS GONE WILD

1. What information about the investigation can be provided to co-authors, when all signatures for retraction needed?
2. Where did this unanimous agreement-standard come from?
3. What information about investigation can be provided to Journals to lead to retraction?

CASE STUDY #5: AN INSTITUTION'S UNEASE

- RIO at institution did not contact any journals with the outcome of the investigation waiting for ORI's determination and final findings
- Meanwhile, one co-author made the investigation outcome public
 - Makes public challenge for why the journal has not been retracted
- Several of the journals contacted institution A to find out what happened
 - University said privacy concerns, confidentiality issues prevent release of information

CASE STUDY #5: AN INSTITUTION'S UNEASE

1. What are best practices for institutions?
2. Should Institutions communicate with the journals when internal RM proceedings are complete?
3. Are there reasons to wait?
4. What are the expectations of the federal agency?