What to do if you suspect redundant (duplicate) publication

(a) Suspected redundant publication in a submitted manuscript

Reviewer informs editor about redundant publication

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

Check degree of overlap/redundancy

Major overlap/redundancy (i.e. based on same data with identical or very similar findings and/or evidence authors have sought to hide redundancy, e.g. by changing title, author order or not citing previous papers)

Contact corresponding author in writing, ideally enclosing signed authorship statement (or cover letter) stating that submitted work has not been published elsewhere and documentary evidence of duplication

Author responds

No response

Unsatisfactory explanation/admits guilt

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

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

Consider informing author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance

Minor overlap with some element of redundancy or legitimate reanalysis (e.g. sub-group/extended follow-up/discussion aimed at different audience)

Contact author in neutral terms/expressing disappointment/explaining journal’s position
Explain that secondary papers must refer to original
Request missing reference to original and/or remove overlapping material
Proceed with review

Contact author’s institution requesting your concern is passed to author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance
Try to obtain acknowledgement of your letter

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

If no response, keep contacting institution every 3–6 months

Note: The instructions to authors should state the journal’s policy on redundant publication
Asking authors to sign a statement or tick a box may be helpful in subsequent investigations

No significant overlap

Discuss with reviewer
Proceed with review

Note: ICMJE advises that translations are acceptable but MUST reference the original
What to do if you suspect redundant (duplicate) publication

(b) Suspected redundant publication in a published article

Reader informs editor about redundant publication

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

Check degree of overlap/redundancy

Major overlap/redundancy (i.e. based on same dataset with identical findings and/or evidence that authors have sought to hide redundancy, e.g. by changing title, author order or not referring to previous papers)

Contact corresponding author in writing, ideally enclosing signed authorship statement (or cover letter) stating that submitted work has not been published elsewhere and documentary evidence of duplication

Author responds

No response

Unsatisfactory explanation/admits guilt

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

Consider publishing statement of redundant publication or retraction
Inform editor of other journal involved
Consider informing author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance

Minor overlap (‘salami publishing’ with some element of redundancy) or legitimate re-analysis (e.g. sub-group/extended follow-up/discussion aimed at different audience)

Contact author in neutral terms/expressing disappointment/explaining journal’s position
Explain that secondary papers must refer to original
Discuss publishing correction giving reference to original paper
Where editor has reason to believe failure to refer to previous paper(s) was deliberate, consider informing author’s superior or person responsible for research governance

Author responds

No response

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

Inform reader of outcome/action

Note: The instructions to authors should state the journal’s policy on redundant publication
Asking authors to sign a statement or tick a box may be helpful in subsequent investigations

Note: ICMJE advises that translations are acceptable but MUST reference the original. Editors may consider publishing a correction (i.e. the link to the original article) rather than a retraction/notice of duplicate publication in such cases

If no response, keep contacting institution every 3–6 months

No response

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

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

If no response, keep contacting institution every 3–6 months

Consider publishing statement of redundant publication or retraction
Inform editor of other journal involved

Consider informing author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance

Inform author(s) of your action
Inform reader of outcome/action

Note: The instructions to authors should state the journal’s policy on redundant publication
Asking authors to sign a statement or tick a box may be helpful in subsequent investigations

Note: ICMJE advises that translations are acceptable but MUST reference the original. Editors may consider publishing a correction (i.e. the link to the original article) rather than a retraction/notice of duplicate publication in such cases

Contact corresponding author in writing, ideally enclosing signed authorship statement (or cover letter) stating that submitted work has not been published elsewhere and documentary evidence of duplication

Author responds

No response

Unsatisfactory explanation/admits guilt

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

Consider publishing statement of redundant publication or retraction
Inform editor of other journal involved
Consider informing author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance

Minor overlap (‘salami publishing’ with some element of redundancy) or legitimate re-analysis (e.g. sub-group/extended follow-up/discussion aimed at different audience)

Contact author in neutral terms/expressing disappointment/explaining journal’s position
Explain that secondary papers must refer to original
Discuss publishing correction giving reference to original paper
Where editor has reason to believe failure to refer to previous paper(s) was deliberate, consider informing author’s superior or person responsible for research governance

Author responds

No response

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

Inform reader of outcome/action

Note: The instructions to authors should state the journal’s policy on redundant publication
Asking authors to sign a statement or tick a box may be helpful in subsequent investigations

Note: ICMJE advises that translations are acceptable but MUST reference the original. Editors may consider publishing a correction (i.e. the link to the original article) rather than a retraction/notice of duplicate publication in such cases

If no response, keep contacting institution every 3–6 months

No response

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

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

If no response, keep contacting institution every 3–6 months

Consider publishing statement of redundant publication or retraction
Inform editor of other journal involved
Consider informing author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance

Inform author(s) of your action
Inform reader of outcome/action

Note: The instructions to authors should state the journal’s policy on redundant publication
Asking authors to sign a statement or tick a box may be helpful in subsequent investigations

Note: ICMJE advises that translations are acceptable but MUST reference the original. Editors may consider publishing a correction (i.e. the link to the original article) rather than a retraction/notice of duplicate publication in such cases

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)

Minor copying of short phrases only (e.g. in discussion of research paper from non-native language speaker)
No misattribution of data

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

No problem

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

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

Author responds

No response

Unsatisfactory explanation/admits guilt

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

No response

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

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

Consider informing author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance and/or potential victim

Inform author(s) of your action

Inform reviewer of outcome/action

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

Note: The instructions to authors should include a definition of plagiarism and state the journal’s policy on it

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

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

Author responds

No response

Unsatisfactory explanation/admits guilt

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

No response

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

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

Consider informing author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance and/or potential victim

Inform author(s) of your action

Inform reviewer of outcome/action

If no response, keep contacting institution every 3–6 months
If no resolution, consider contacting other authorities, e.g. ORI in US, GMC in UK
What to do if you suspect plagiarism

(b) Suspected plagiarism in a published article

Reader informs editor about suspected plagiarism

Thank reader 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 work is original/the author's own and documentary evidence of plagiarism

Author responds

No response

Author responds

Unsatisfactory explanation/admits guilt

Contact all authors and tell them what you plan to do

Consider publishing retraction
Inform editor of other journal(s) involved or publisher of plagiarised books

Consider informing author's superior and/or person responsible for research governance at author's institution

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

Inform reader (and plagiarised author(s) if different) of journal's actions

Minor copying of short phrases only (e.g. in discussion of research paper)
No misattribution of data

Contact author in neutral terms/expressing disappointment/explaining journal's position
Discuss publishing correction giving reference to original paper(s) if this has been omitted

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

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

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

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

Note: The instructions to authors should include a definition of plagiarism and state the journal's policy on it.

Author responds

No response

Consider informing author's superior and/or person responsible for research governance at author's institution

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

Inform readers and victim(s) of outcome/action

Inform author(s) of your action

Inform readers and victim(s) of outcome/action

Note: The instructions to authors should include a definition of plagiarism and state the journal's policy on it.

Author responds

No response

Consider informing author's superior and/or person responsible for research governance at author's institution

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

Inform readers and victim(s) of outcome/action

Inform author(s) of your action
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What to do if you suspect fabricated data
(a) Suspected fabricated data in a submitted manuscript

Reviewer expresses suspicion of fabricated data

- Thank reviewer, ask for evidence (if not already provided) and state your plans to investigate
- Consider getting a 2nd opinion from another reviewer

Assemble evidence of fabrication

Contact author to explain concerns but do not make direct accusation

Author replies

- Unsatisfactory answer/admits guilt
- Satisfactory explanation

Request raw data/lab notebooks as appropriate

Inform all authors that you intend to contact institution/regulatory body

Contact author’s institution(s) requesting an investigation

Author cleared

Apologise to author, proceed with peer-review if appropriate

Author found guilty

Reject

No or unsatisfactory response

Inform reviewer of outcome

If raw data are supplied these should be assessed by a suitably qualified person, ideally in cooperation with the author’s institution

No response

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

Author replies

Contact author’s institution requesting your concern is passed to author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance, if necessary coordinating with co-authors’ institutions

No response

Contact regulatory body (e.g. GMC for UK doctors) requesting an enquiry

No response

Inform all authors that you intend to contact institution/regulatory body

Request raw data/lab notebooks as appropriate

Apologise to author, inform reviewer(s) of outcome Proceed with peer-review if appropriate

Inform reviewer of outcome

Contact regulatory body (e.g. GMC for UK doctors) requesting an enquiry
What to do if you suspect fabricated data

(b) Suspected fabricated data in a published article

Reader expresses suspicion of fabricated data

Thank reader and state your plans to investigate

Consider getting a 2nd opinion from another reviewer

Assemble evidence of fabrication

Contact author to explain your concerns
Request raw data/lab notebooks as appropriate

Author replies

No response

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

Author replies

No response

Contact author’s institution requesting your concern is passed to author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance, if necessary coordinating with co-authors’ institutions

If raw data are supplied these should be assessed by a suitably qualified person, ideally in cooperation with the author’s institution

Author(s) guilty of fabrication

Inform all authors you intend to contact institution/regulatory body

Contact author’s institution requesting an investigation

Author(s) found not guilty

Publish retraction

Author(s) guilty of fabrication

Publish retraction

Author(s) not guilty

Apologise to author(s)

Inform reader of outcome

Contact regulatory body (e.g., GMC for UK doctors) requesting an enquiry

If raw data are supplied these should be assessed by a suitably qualified person, ideally in cooperation with the author’s institution

Apologise to author
Publish correction if necessary (e.g., if an honest error has been detected)
Inform reader of outcome

Contact author’s institution requesting your concern is passed to author’s superior and/or person responsible for research governance, if necessary coordinating with co-authors’ institutions

No or unsatisfactory response

No or unsatisfactory response

No response
Changes in authorship
(a) Corresponding author requests addition of extra author before publication

Clarify reason for change in authorship

Check that all authors consent to addition of extra author

All authors agree

Get new author to complete journal's authorship declaration (if used)

Amend contributor details (role of each contributor/author) if included

Proceed with review/publication

Authors do not agree

Suspend review/publication of paper until authorship has been agreed by all authors, if necessary, via institution(s)

Note: major changes in response to reviewer comments, e.g. adding new data might justify the inclusion of a new author
Changes in authorship
(b) Corresponding author requests removal of author before publication

Clarify reason for change in authorship

Check that all authors consent to removal of author

Most important to check with the author(s) whose name(s) is/are being removed from the paper and get their agreement in writing

All authors agree

Amend author list and contributor details (role of each contributor/author)/acknowledgements as required

Proceed with review/publication

Authors do not agree

Suspend review/publication of paper until authorship has been agreed

Inform excluded author(s) that if they wish to pursue the matter they should do this with their co-authors or institutions rather than the editor

Authors do not agree
Changes in authorship
(c) Request for addition of extra author after publication

Clarify reason for change in authorship

Check that all authors consent to addition of extra author

All authors agree

Authors do not agree

Publish correction

Explain that you will not change the authorship until you have written agreement from all authors
Provide authorship guidelines but do not enter into dispute

All authors agree

Authors still cannot agree

Refer case to authors’ institution(s) and ask it/them to adjudicate

Publish correction if required by institution(s)

To prevent future problems:
(1) Before publication, get authors to sign statement that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted
(2) Publish details of each person’s contribution to the research and publication

Ask why author was omitted from original list – ideally, refer to journal guidelines or authorship declaration that should state that all authors meet appropriate criteria and that no deserving authors have been omitted
Changes in authorship
(d) Request for removal of author after publication

Clarify reason for change in authorship

- Author(s) gives acceptable reason for change
- Check that all authors agree to change (including excluded author)
- Publish correction

Author(s) alleges fraud / misconduct

- See flowchart for fabricated data
- Author(s) has difference in interpretation of data

Author(s) has difference in interpretation of data

- Suggest author(s) put views in a letter and explain you will give other authors a chance to respond and will publish both letters if suitable (i.e. correct length, not libellous)
- Author(s) writes a letter
- Contact other authors explaining what is happening

Other authors submit response
- Publish both letters

Other authors do not wish to respond
- Publish minority view letter

Author(s) does not agree to write letter (or writes something unpublishable)

If author insists on removal of name and other authors agree, then consider publishing correction

Ask why author wishes to be removed from list – refer to journal guidelines or authorship declaration which should state that all authors meet appropriate criteria. Ask if author suspects fraud/misconduct
What to do if you suspect ghost, guest or gift authorship
(see also flowcharts on Changes in authorship, as such requests may indicate the presence of a ghost or gift author)

- Review acknowledgement section and authorship declaration (if supplied)
- Send copy of journal’s authorship policy** to corresponding author and request statement that all qualify and no authors have been omitted (if not obtained previously)
- Request information (or further details) of individuals’ contributions***

**Authorship role missing (e.g. contributor list does not include anybody who analysed data or prepared first draft)
- ‘Ghost’ identified
  - Suggest missing author should be added to list

***Listed author does not meet authorship criteria
- ‘Guest’ or ‘gift’ author identified
  - Suggest guest/gift author(s) should be removed/moved to Acknowledgements section

- Satisfactory explanation of author list
  - Doubts remain/need more information
    - Try to contact authors (Google names for contacts) and ask about their role, whether any authors have been omitted, and whether they have any concerns about authorship

- Proceed with review/publication

**Note: initial action will depend on journal’s normal method of collecting author/contributor info

***Note: Marusic et al. have shown that the method of collecting such data (e.g. free text or check boxes) can influence the response. Letting authors describe their own contributions probably results in the most truthful and informative answers.
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How to spot authorship problems

Editors cannot police author or contributor listing for every submission but may sometimes have suspicions that an author list is incomplete or includes undeserving (guest or gift) authors. The COPE flowchart on ‘What to do if you suspect ghost, guest or gift authorship’ suggests actions for these situations. The following points are designed to help editors be alert for inappropriate authorship and spot warning signs which may indicate problems.

Types of authorship problems
A **ghost author** is someone who is omitted from an authorship list despite qualifying for authorship. This is not necessarily the same as a **ghost writer**, since omitted authors often perform other roles, in particular data analysis. (Gøtzsche et al. have shown that statisticians involved with study design are frequently omitted from papers reporting industry-funded trials.) If a professional writer has been involved with a publication it will depend on the authorship criteria being used whether s/he fulfils the criteria to be listed as an author. Using the ICMJE criteria for research papers, medical writers usually do not qualify as authors, but their involvement and funding source should be acknowledged.

A **guest** or **gift author** is someone who is listed as an author despite not qualifying for authorship. Guests are generally people brought in to make the list look more impressive (despite having little or no involvement with the research or publication). Gift authorship often involves mutual CV enhancement (i.e. including colleagues on papers in return for being listed on theirs).

Signs that might indicate authorship problems
- Corresponding author seems unable to respond to reviewers’ comments
- Changes are made by somebody not on the author list (check Word document properties to see who made the changes but bear in mind there may be an innocent explanation for this, e.g. using a shared computer, or a secretary making changes)
- Document properties show the manuscript was drafted by someone not on the author list or properly acknowledged (but see above)
- Impossibly prolific author e.g. of review articles / opinion pieces (check also for redundant / overlapping publication) *(this may be detected by a Medline or Google search using the author’s name)*
- Several similar review articles / editorials / opinion pieces have been published under different author names *(this may be detected by a Medline or Google search using the article title or key words)*
- Role missing from list of contributors (e.g. it appears that none of the named authors were responsible for analysing the data or drafting the paper)
- Unfeasibly long or short author list (e.g. a simple case report with a dozen authors or a randomized trial with a single author)
- Industry-funded study with no authors from sponsor company *(this may be legitimate, but may also mean deserving authors have been omitted; reviewing the protocol may help determine the role of employees -- see Gøtzsche et al. and commentary by Wager)*
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What to do if a reviewer suspects undisclosed conflict of interest (Col) in a submitted manuscript

Reviewer informs editor of author’s undisclosed Col

Thank reviewer and say you plan to investigate

Contact author(s) and express concern

Author(s) supplies relevant details

Thank author but point out seriousness of omission

Amend competing interest statement as required

Proceed with review/publication

Inform reviewer of outcome

Author(s) denies Col

Explain journal policy/Col definition clearly and obtain signed statement from author(s) about all relevant Cols

To avoid future problems:
Always get signed statement of Cols from all authors before publication (or get them to tick a box if they declare no conflict)
Ensure journal guidelines include clear definition of Col
What to do if a reader suspects undisclosed conflict of interest (Col) in a published article

Reader informs editor of author’s undisclosed Col

Thank reader and say you plan to investigate

Contact author(s) and express concern

Author(s) supplies relevant details

Author(s) denies Col

Thank author but point out seriousness of omission

Publish correction to competing interest statement as required

Inform reader of outcome

It may be helpful to provide a copy of the journal’s policy/definition of Col

Explain journal policy/Col definition clearly and obtain signed statement from author(s) about all relevant Cols (if not obtained previously)

To avoid future problems:
Always get signed statement of Cols from all authors and reviewers before publication
Ensure journal guidelines include clear definition of Col
What to do if you suspect an ethical problem with a submitted manuscript

Reviewer (or editor) raises ethical concern about manuscript

- e.g. lack of ethical approval/concern re: patient consent or protection/concern re: animal experimentation

Thank reviewer and say you plan to investigate

Author(s) supplies relevant details

- e.g. request evidence of ethical committee/IRB approval/copy of informed consent documents

Satisfactory answer

Apologise and continue review process

- Consider submitting case to COPE if it raises novel ethical issues

Unsatisfactory answer/no response

Inform author that review process is suspended until case is resolved

Forward concerns to author’s employer or person responsible for research governance at institution

Issue resolved satisfactory

Inform reviewer about outcome of case

- Unsatisfactory response

No/unsatisfactory response

Contact institution at 3–6 monthly intervals, seeking conclusion of investigation

No/unsatisfactory response

Refer to other authorities (e.g. medical registration body, UKPRI, ORI)
What to do if you suspect a reviewer has appropriated an author's ideas or data

**Author alleges reviewer misconduct**

1. Thank author and say you will investigate
2. Retrieve files (submitted MS and reviews)

**Anonymous review** (reviewer's identity is NOT disclosed to author)

1. Author accuses actual reviewer of misconduct
   - Get as much documentary evidence as possible from author and other sources, e.g., publication*, abstract, report of meeting, copy of slides, grant application: do not contact reviewer until you have assessed this
   - Review evidence (or get suitably qualified person to do this) and decide whether author's allegations are well-founded
   - Not well-founded: Discuss with author
   - Appear well-founded: Satisfactory explanation
     - Reviewer exonerated: Discuss with author
     - No reply/unsatisfactory explanation: Write to reviewer explaining concerns and requesting an explanation
       - Satisfactory explanation: Reviewer exonerated
       - No reply/unsatisfactory explanation: If no response, keep contacting institution every 3–6 months
         - If files are no longer available at journal, request copy from author

**Open review** (reviewer's identity is disclosed to author)

1. Author accuses actual reviewer of misconduct
   - Check for links between accused person and named reviewer, e.g., same department, personal relationships
   - Consider contacting actual reviewer(s) to comment on allegation and check they performed the review themselves/did not discuss the paper with others
   - Explain situation to author
     - No reply/unsatisfactory explanation: Consider removing reviewer from review database during investigation and inform reviewer of your action
     - Satisfactory explanation: Discuss with author

**Author accuses somebody who was not asked to review the article for your journal**

1. Consider contacting actual reviewer(s) to comment on allegation and check they performed the review themselves/did not discuss the paper with others
2. Explain situation to author
   - No reply/unsatisfactory explanation: Consider removing reviewer from review database during investigation and inform reviewer of your action
   - Satisfactory explanation: Discuss with author

**Author accuses somebody who was not asked to review the article for your journal**

1. Check for links between accused person and named reviewer, e.g., same department, personal relationships
2. Consider contacting actual reviewer(s) to comment on allegation and check they performed the review themselves/did not discuss the paper with others
3. Explain situation to author
   - No reply/unsatisfactory explanation: Consider removing reviewer from review database during investigation and inform reviewer of your action
   - Satisfactory explanation: Discuss with author

**NB Do not forget people who refused to review**

*Note: The instruction to reviewers should state that submitted material must be treated in confidence and may not be used in any way until it has been published*

*Note: If author produces published paper this may be handled as plagiarism (see plagiarism flow chart)*
How COPE handles complaints against editors

Complaint sent to COPE secretary

Secretary checks that complaint:
• is against a COPE member
• is within the remit of the COPE Code of Conduct
• has been through journal's own complaints procedure
• relates to actions taken after 1/1/05 (when COPE Code was published)

If so:

Evidence sent to Chair of COPE including correspondence about journal's handling of complaints

Chair of COPE informs editor of complaint

Chair consults with at least one member of COPE Council

Agree that journal has dealt satisfactorily with complaint

Agree that case requires further investigation

Refer to COPE sub-committee*

Sub-committee considers case and reports to COPE Council

Council considers case and recommends action**

Editor and complainant are informed

If not, COPE cannot consider complaint

Complainant may try other organisations, e.g. Press Complaints Commission, WAME

If the Chair of COPE belongs to the same publishing group as the subject of the complaint, the case will be handled by the Vice-Chair

Evidence sent to Chair of COPE including correspondence about journal's handling of complaints

Chair of COPE informs editor of complaint

Chair consults with at least one member of COPE Council

Agree that journal has dealt satisfactorily with complaint

Agree that case requires further investigation

Refer to COPE sub-committee*

Sub-committee considers case and reports to COPE Council

Council considers case and recommends action**

Editor and complainant are informed

*Sub-committee will comprise:
• Chair
• Three other Council members (two of whom are not editors)
Members may not work for the same publishing group as the subject of the complaint

**Actions might include:
• editor apologises to complainant
• editor publishes statement from COPE in journal
• journal/editor agrees to improve procedures