

ETHICS
MANUAL

BBR ETHICS MANUAL

INTRODUCTION

This document presents a set of criteria and guidelines for publication in the Brazilian Business Review and the roles of the main actors that make part of the process from the ethical point of view. It will provide practical guidance to actors that in some manner are connected with the Brazilian Business Review and help manage some situations potentially arising from publishing work, which could be in discordance with the codes of conduct.

The Brazilian Business Review follows the Creative Commons Attribution that allows re-distribution and re-use of a licensed work on the condition that the creator is appropriately credited (cc-by).

BRAZILIAN BUSINESS REVIEW COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION ETHICS

The Brazilian Business Review Committee on Publication Ethics recommends that editors reviewing such a manuscript should consider several criteria that are applied during editorial review:

1. Is the study scientifically valid and clearly presented?
2. Have the ethical problems been minimized?
3. Do the benefits outweigh the harms in this particular case?
4. If there is doubt about local law or regulations, editors should clarify this with the authors and ask them to provide a letter from the individual research ethics committee or the research ethics authority in that country about the research.

DEVELOPING A PUBLISHING ETHICS POLICY FOR YOUR JOURNAL

Almost every step in the publishing process involves important ethical principles. Having clear statements on these issues can encourage responsible publication practices.

BBR ETHICS MANUAL

COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) has designed guidelines that can be used to audit your journal in order to define which of the processes and practices require attention.

A clear description of ethical principles will help manage author expectations and will help manage situations that may arise if these statements have not been adhered to by authors. Below you will find a few of the most important ethical principles:

a) Clear guidelines on submission of the work:

- That the work has not been published before (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture, review or thesis);
- That the work is not under consideration elsewhere;
- That copyright has not been breached in seeking its publication;
- That the publication has been approved by all co-authors and responsible authorities at the institute or organization where the work has been carried out.

b) What type of content is or is not acceptable for publication?

In these cases, the author is expected to give full disclosure for transparency reasons but it could also be necessary for the author to seek approval from the original publisher.

c) Description of the peer review process

Peer review is fundamental in ensuring the integrity of the scientific publication process and can flag potential misconduct at an early stage.

The evaluation process of articles submitted to BBR – Brazilian Business Review consists of two stages. The first one is an Editor and Associate Editor's preliminary evaluation that verifies the suitability of the work in relation to the periodical's editorial line and they make the Desk Review evaluation. The second one, which is the actual review, is a double blind system, to be held by one or two ad hoc reviewers.

BBR ETHICS MANUAL

d) Inclusion of the necessary ethical statements if required

Certain Abstracting & Indexing services insist on compliance with the ethical requirements 'Conflict of Interest', 'Human and Animal Rights' and 'Informed Consent' and require authors to declare compliance in their articles.

In the Brazilian Business Review, for researches that carried out directly with human beings, ethical precepts related to the conduction, as well as the report of the research, are the sole responsibility of the authors, following the ethical recommendations contained in the Declaration of Helsinki (available at <http://www.wma.net>). Authors should fully observe the standards contained in the CNS Resolution No. 196 dated October 10th, 1996, the National Health Council (available at http://conselho.saude.gov.br/resolucoes/reso_96.htm), and complementary resolutions for special situations. Ethical procedures adopted in the research should be described in the final paragraph of the Methods section making mention to the number of approval protocol by Research Ethics Committee.

ETHICAL ISSUES AND WHAT TO DO WHEN YOU ARE ENCOUNTERING POSSIBLE MISCONDUCT?

It should be noted there are two distinct situations: serious scientific fraud or errors. Errors could be due to negligence (for example statistical errors) or honest errors, which are part of the normal course of doing research.

It is therefore important to treat potential cases with care as academic careers could be at risk. Five steps to follow when encountering possible misconduct:

- 1) Remain a neutral player and treat all potential misconduct cases confidentially;
- 2) Keep records of written communication including the allegation and the evidence of the complainant;

BBR ETHICS MANUAL

- 3) Raise the issue with the accused (co-)author in a timely manner;
- 4) Assess what exactly has happened (fact finding) and be transparent and final about decisions;
- 5) In case of potential media attention or legal questions the Editor should contact the Publishing Editor who will liaise with Corporate Communications and Legal Department.

Ethical issues:

We defined six ethical issues and procedures for responding to misconduct. Each ethical issue is followed by recommended actions as advised by COPE for Journal Editors and when available additional reading has been added.

Data fabrication/data falsification

Data fabrication: This concerns the making up of research findings.

Data falsification: Manipulating research data with the intention of giving a false impression. This includes manipulating images (e.g. micrographs, gels, radiological images), removing outliers or "inconvenient" results, changing, adding or omitting data points, etc.

With regard to image manipulation, it is allowed to technically improve images for readability. Proper technical manipulation refers to adjusting the contrast and/or brightness or color balance if it is applied to the complete digital image (and not parts of the image). Any technical manipulation by the author should be notified in the cover letter to the Journal Editor upon submission. Improper technical manipulation refers to obscuring, enhancing, deleting and/or introducing new elements into an image. Generally, if an author's figures are questionable, it is suggested to request the original data from the authors.

Recommended action by COPE for Journal Editors:

- 1) Suspected fabricated data in a submitted manuscript;
- 2) Suspected fabricated data in a published article.

BBR ETHICS MANUAL

It is rightly recommended to ask for the data and codes used in the paper, making it possible to replicate the results. It also should be available for the academic community.

Duplicate submission/publication and redundant publication

Duplicate submission/publication: This refers to the practice of submitting the same study to two journals or publishing more or less the same study in two journals. These submissions/publications can be nearly simultaneous or years later.

Redundant publication (also described as 'salami publishing'): this refers to the situation that one study is split into several parts and submitted to two or more journals. Or the findings have previously been published elsewhere without proper cross-referencing, permission or justification. "Self-plagiarism" is considered a form of redundant publication. It concerns recycling or borrowing content from previous work without citation. This practice is widespread and might be unintentional. Transparency by the author on the use of previously published work usually provides the necessary information to make an assessment on whether it is deliberate or unintentional.

Note! Translations of articles without proper permission or notification and resubmission of any previously published articles are considered duplications.

Recommended action by COPE for Journal Editors:

- 1) Suspected redundant (duplicate) publication in a submitted manuscript;
- 2) Suspected redundant (duplicate) publication in a published article.

Duplication of text and/or figures (plagiarism)

Plagiarism occurs when someone presents the work of others (data, text, or theories) as if it were his/her own without proper acknowledgment. There are different degrees of plagiarism.

BBR ETHICS MANUAL

The severity is dependent on various factors:

Extent of copied material, originality of copied material, position/context/type of material and referencing/attribution of the material used.

Every case is different and therefore decisions will vary per case. Ask yourself the following question: Does it concern an honest mistake or is there an intentional deviation from the scientific norm? Please note there are many grey areas between honest, questionable and fraudulent practices.

Because of such complex and sensible issue, we form a board of three reviewers to analyze the case.

Whilst reviewing the case consider the following factors:

- 1) Author seniority. Junior authors may be asked to paraphrase the copied text if it is believed that they are genuinely not aware that copying phrases is inappropriate. It is expected that a senior author should know better.
- 2) Cultural background could be an indication for potentially different behaviors concerning the amount of copying which could be seen as plagiarism.

The following listing is designed to make you aware of the various possibilities concerning plagiarism:

- 1) Verbatim copying of another's work and submitting it as one's own.
- 2) Verbatim copying of significant portions of text from a single source.
- 3) Mixing verbatim copied material from multiple sources ("patchwork copying"). In this case it could range from 1 or 2 paragraphs to significant portions.
- 4) Changing key words and phrases but retaining the essential content of the source as a framework.
- 5) Rephrasing of the text's original wording and/or structure and submitting it as one's own.
- 6) Mixing slightly rephrased material from multiple sources and presenting what has been published already as new.

BBR ETHICS MANUAL

7) The work is cited, but the cited portions are not clearly identified. This can be combined with copied parts of text without citation.

However for review papers the above is not directly applicable. Review papers are expected to give a summary of existing literature. Authors should use their own words with exception of properly quoted and/or cited texts and the work should include a new interpretation.

Authorship issues

COPE has written an article with advice on how to spot potential authorship problems. Most authorship problems have to do with authorship without the author's knowledge and unacknowledged authorship.

Recommended action by COPE for Journal Editors:

- 1) Corresponding author requests addition of extra author before publication;
- 2) Corresponding author requests removal of author before publication;
- 3) Request for addition of extra author after publication;
- 4) Request for removal of author after publication;
- 5) Suspected guest, ghost or gift authorship.

Undeclared conflict of interest

A conflict of interest is a situation in which financial or other personal considerations from authors or reviewers have the potential to compromise or bias professional judgment and objectivity. Authors and reviewers should declare all conflicts of interest relevant to the work under consideration (i.e. relationships, both financial and personal, that might interfere with the interpretation of the work) to avoid the potential for bias.

Recommended action by COPE for Journal Editors:

- 1) What to do if a reviewer suspects undisclosed conflict of interests in a submitted manuscript

BBR ETHICS MANUAL

- 2) What to do if you suspect a reviewer has appropriated an author's idea or data;
- 3) What to do if a reader suspects undisclosed conflict of interests in a published article.

Ethical problems

There are ethical issues that relate to patient consent or animal experimentation and the lack of ethical approval.

In the Brazilian Business Review, for researches that carried out directly with human beings, ethical precepts related to the conduction, as well as the report of the research, are the sole responsibility of the authors, following the ethical recommendations contained in the Declaration of Helsinki (available at <http://www.wma.net>). Authors should fully observe the standards contained in the CNS Resolution No. 196 dated October 10th, 1996, the National Health Council (available at http://conselho.saude.gov.br/resolucoes/reso_96.htm), and complementary resolutions for special situations. Ethical procedures adopted in the research should be described in the final paragraph of the Methods section making mention to the number of approval protocol by Research Ethics Committee.

How to correct the literature?

In some cases it might be necessary to correct the literature in order to maintain the integrity of the research literature. The COPE Retraction Guidelines describe exactly when and which option should be used.

Summary:

Erratum – Journal Editors should consider issuing an erratum if:

- a small portion of an otherwise reliable publication proves to be misleading (especially because of honest error);

BBR ETHICS MANUAL

- the author/contributor list is incorrect;

Retraction Note – Journal Editors should consider retracting a publication if:

- there is clear evidence that the findings are unreliable, either as a result of misconduct or honest error;
- the findings have previously been published elsewhere without proper cross-referencing, permission or justification;
- it constitutes plagiarism;
- it reports unethical research;

The text for retraction notes can be submitted/written by the author(s), Journal editor, Society or jointly.

Expression of Concern – Journal Editors should consider issuing an expression of concern if:

- there is inconclusive evidence of research or publication misconduct by the authors;
- there is evidence that the findings are unreliable but the authors' institution will not investigate the case;
- it is believed that an investigation into alleged misconduct related to the publication either has not been, or would not be, fair and impartial or conclusive;
- an investigation is under way but a judgment will not be available for a considerable time.



Av. Fernando Ferrari, 1358. Boa Vista,
Vitória – ES. CEP 29075-505

Tel.: 4009-4408
bbronline@bbronline.com.br

www.bbronline.com