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Honesty is crucial if one wants to succeed as an author, researcher, journal publisher, or editor

As Alisher Navoiy, the national poet of Uzbekistan, said as long ago as the 15th century:

'Truthfulness is the essence of honorable people. Two themes are seen within it. Firstly, be honest not only in words but also in thoughts and deeds. Secondly, scorn the world of falsehood but speak out the truth intrepidly. Both qualities are good in themselves and together mark greatness of spirit.'

In 4WCRI’s Plenary G --The Role of Publishers in Driving Change

The first speech was from Nature’s editor, Dr. Kiemer who asked 'What is the role of Journals and publishers in driving research standard changes?' and stressed six points:

1. Raise awareness (of research integrity) 增强诚信意识;
2. Be a catalyst and facilitator of discussions; 做探讨的催化剂和引导者
3. Drive some changes; 推动一些改进
4. Ensure full reporting, effective review and measured conclusions; 确保报道的内容证据充分，评审有效和结论经得起测试
5. Provide opportunities for detailed and accurate credit for all contributions; 要求对所有投稿提供详尽,准确的信用机会
6. Respond quickly and thoroughly to criticisms of published papers. 认真迅速地应对论文发表后评论（批评）

For (2) examples as below:
研究论文都不能被认为是一锤定音。研究成果的复制和佐证的关键是科学过程。研究复杂的实体，特别是动物和人类的技术体系和复杂性都似乎容易受到实验室人员，以及编辑和期刊最强裁判，其科学有效的结果，经不起考验和重复，进一步的研究。自然出版了一系列的文章，因为经不起重复而存在令人担忧的研究成果。自然与自然生命科学研究期刊的编辑们也正采取实质性的措施来整理自己的内务，以便改善在发布的透明度和稳定性做出实质性的工作。期刊，研究实验室和机构及资助机构都对解决不可再现性的问题感兴趣。
Why is waste in research an ethical issue
---Elizabeth Wager

Ethical Impacts

- Asking the wrong question
- Weak study design
- Not publishing all research
- Poor reporting quality

- Up to 1988 UK & US books recommended babies should sleep on their front
- But since 1970 there was clear evidence that front sleeping significantly increased sudden infant death
- Earlier recognition of risk of front sleeping could have prevented >60,000 infant deaths
The second presentation in Plenary G is me. Title is Against Plagiarism: A global survey between Anglophones and non-Anglophones
My report is mainly focused on two points:

1. Landscape of Academic Ethics Policies and Research Integrity Offices in China
   1) Year (2002-) in which Chinese universities and research institutes posted an academic ethics policy online
   2) Key Government Research Management Agencies Established Offices of Research Integrity (1997-2007)
   3) Percentage of Chinese (English-language) journals using CrossCheck (2008-)
      Percentage of Chinese (Chinese-language) journals using AMLC (Academic Manuscript Literature Checking) from CNKI (2009-)
      It is a most interesting illustration of the rapid growth in awareness of these issues in China

2. Perspective of a global survey on the use of CrossCheck for detecting plagiarism in journals articles
   1) What are journal editors’ attitudes to, and tolerance of, typical plagiarism in different disciplines?
   2) What are the mainstream views and differences between editors in Western countries and non-Western countries?
   3) How do journal editors worldwide use CrossCheck/iThenticate and how do they handle the similarity report that it produces?
1. Landscape of Academic Ethics Policies and Research Integrity Offices in China

What this shows (in below Figs1-5) is that there has been a rapid change in China, thanks to a top-down approach to the issue of research integrity, cascading from the government itself, through the key research management agencies to individual universities and institutes, and thence to individual journals and journal publishers. Research integrity policies have been created and publicized and research integrity offices or committees established, and more and more journals have started to use plagiarism detection tools.
What I focused on 4WCRI’s topics will be published in the current issue of *Chinese J of Sci-Tec Periodicals*, titled “Research integrity is the world’s eternal topic”
Almost all tier-1 universities and research institutes in China have now posted an academic ethics policy online. Some of them, as well as the key government research management agencies, have also established a research integrity office (see upper right in Fig.2). The earliest adopters (from 2002 onwards) were in the areas where most of the important research institutes are located, such as Beijing and Shanghai. In addition, many Chinese-published journals have taken steps to promote awareness of the importance of research integrity. To date, five journals (see the lower right journal logo: JZUS-A, JZUS-B, JZUS-C (now new title FITEE), Science Bulletin and Cell Research) have posted online their own ethical policy.
Fig. 2. Key Government Research Management Agencies Established Offices of Research Integrity

- Chinese Academy of Sciences:  
  Moral Construction Committee (Sept. 1996)
- Chinese Academy of Engineering:  
  Moral Construction Committee (Aug. 1997)
- National Natural Science Foundation of China:  
  Oversight Committee (Nov. 1998)
- Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China:  
  Academic Integrity Committee of Social Science Council of the Ministry of Education (May, 2006)
- Ministry of Science and Technology of the People’s Republic of China:  
  Joint Committee on Scientific Integrity (Mar. 2007)
Fig. 3  Percentage of Chinese (English-language) journals using CrossCheck
Approximately 158 (53%) of ~300 English-language journals are using CrossCheck

Fig. 4  Percentage of Chinese (Chinese-language) journals using AMLC (Academic Manuscript Literature Checking) from CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure)
5593 Chinese-language journals surveyed by CNKI (out of a total of 9869) are using AMLC (software from CNKI)
Fig. 5. **Percentage of Chinese-language journals using AMLC (excluding HK, MC, TW)**, ranging values from 68%-46% (Beijing 61%, 1659/2728)
Anti-Plagiarism Policy of JZUS that includes 3 parts
Forms of Plagiarism + Policy + CrossCheck Workflow

Anti-Plagiarism Policy of JZUS-A/B&FITEE

Nine basic forms of plagiarism

- Self-(or team) plagiarism without identification and acknowledgement
- Cutting and pasting of others' work without identification and acknowledgement
- Replication of methods sections (in Biomedical journals) without clear statement of the source
- Republication of conference papers with little added value
- Review papers which largely replicate previously published content
- Plagiarism of images/tables/formulae/data without both acknowledgement and copyright permission
- Plagiarism of ideas
- Wholesale plagiarism of previously published text
- Republication in translation without acknowledgment, permission and full citation

Anti-Plagiarism Policy

The general rules that we have come up with are as follows:

The following are acceptable, provided always that (a) the quotation (if any) is typographically identified (by quotation marks or, for longer extracts, indentation), (b) the source is acknowledged in the text, and (c) a full citation to the original is given:

1. Quotation of a modest amount (under 100 words) of the author's own or others' text;
2. Paraphrase of previously published text in the author's own words;
3. Repetition of someone else's ideas;
4. Reproduction of a chart, image, table or key equation from your own or someone else's work (provided copyright permission has been obtained from the original copyright owner, and acknowledgement is included in whatever form they request);
5. In Biosciences papers it is acceptable to reproduce the description of a standard/homemade method from a previously published source, provided the source is properly acknowledged;
6. Replication of a previously published conference paper is acceptable, if 60% or more of the content is new and substantive (provided copyright permission has been obtained from the original copyright owner, and acknowledgement is included in whatever form they request).
Forms of Plagiarism

- Self- (or team) plagiarism without identification and acknowledgement
- Cutting and pasting of others’ work without identification and acknowledgement
- Replication of methods sections (in Biosciences papers) without clear statement of the source
- Republication of conference papers with little added value
- Review papers which largely replicate previously published content
- Plagiarism of images/tables/formulae/data without both acknowledgement and copyright permission
- Plagiarism of ideas
- Wholesale plagiarism of previously published text
- Republication in translation without acknowledgment, permission, and full citation
Anti-Plagiarism Policy (JZUS)

The following are acceptable, provided always that (a) the quotation (if any) is typographically identified (by quotation marks or, for longer extracts, indentation), (b) the source is acknowledged in the text, and (c) a full citation to the original is given:

1. Quotation of a modest amount (under 100 words) of the author’s own or others’ text
2. Paraphrase of previously published text in the author’s own words
3. Repetition of someone else’s ideas
4. Reproduction of a chart, image, table or key equation from your own or someone else’s work (provided copyright permission has been obtained from the original copyright owner, and acknowledgement is included in whatever form they request)
5. In Biosciences papers it is acceptable to reproduce the description of a standard/homemade method from a previously published source, provided the source is properly acknowledged
6. Reproduction of a previously published conference paper is acceptable, if 60% or more of the content is new and substantive (provided copyright permission has been obtained from the original copyright owner, and acknowledgement is included in whatever form they request)
7. Reproduction in translation not only by the reviewer/peer recommendation, but also with copyright permission obtained from the original copyright owner
CrossCheck Workflow (JZUS)

Fig. 1 CrossCheck Workflow of JZUS-A/B & FITEE

(a) The first CrossCheck during submission
(b) The second CrossCheck before publication


© Journals of Zhejiang University-SCIENCE 2015
JZUS-Crosscheck Workflow (a) The first CrossCheck during submission

1. Submission
2. Run CrossCheck to identify similar text
3. Analyse similarity report

Exclude bibliography/quotes

- No significant overlap
- Minor overlap: SMSI^2 <6% and OSI^3 <25%
- Middle overlap: SMSI 6%–10% and OSI 25%–35%
- Major overlap: SMSI≥10% or OSI≥35%

Investigate similar content:
* Article type: Research article, Review, or Others?
* Section where similarity occurs: Abstract, Introduction, Materials & Methods, Results, Discussion, or Conclusion?
* Is the original source of duplicated content fully acknowledged and cited?

Identify form(s) of plagiarism and make decision

Acceptable:
With attribution/citation of own/others’ work:
- Limited use of own or others’ original work (<100 words) clearly identified as quotation;
- Summarize the overview from the original using author’s own words;
- Paraphrase ideas condensed from the original using different sentence and vocabulary
- Previously published conference paper that has been extended with more than 60% substantive new content, with citation of the original and copyright permission;
- Duplication of description of standard method in Biosciences papers;
- Reproduction of image/table/formula with citation and copyright permission

Acceptable after revision:
- Missing attribution/citation of own/others’ work (ask author to add) (A, B, C, D, F, G);
- Original wording (<100 words) directly from other source with citation but without quotation marks or indent (ask author to add) (A, B);
- Excessive amount of original wording (>100 words) directly from source, whether or not identified and cited (ask author to summarize/paraphrase while retaining acknowledgement/citation) (A, B)

Unacceptable:
- Duplicate publication of own or team’s previously published article (A. or I);
- Cutting and pasting of others’ work without identification and acknowledgement (B);
- Republication of conference paper with little added value (published content >40%) (D);
- Review paper of high similarity (OSI>35%) (E);
- Ideas plagiarism without citation and acknowledgment (G);
- Wholesale (major) plagiarism of own or others’ previously published text (H)

Send report to author, point out issue(s) and suggest revisions

Author provides adequate explanation and revises text and adds full citation of source(s)

Send report to author, point out issue(s), and identify reason for rejection

Author has no adequate explanation and/or refuses to revise

Reject without peer review


NB: CrossCheck does not identify images, figures, tables, formulae, translations, or ideas. Editors should view the entire source article to investigate these elements
JZUS-Crosschecking Workflow  (b) The second CrossCheck before publication

Peer reviewers recommend acceptance for publication

Run CrossCheck again

To-check against the latest version of CrossCheck database

Compare with the first CrossCheck report

No significant change in overall similarity index (OSI) or single match similarity index (SMSI)

Significant increase in OSI and/or SMSI

Analyse of new matched content to identify nature of similarity

New similarity matched with latest data or missed in previous CrossCheck

Editor makes the decision on acceptability

Acceptable
(see previous flowchart)

Acceptable after revision
(see previous flowchart)

Unacceptable
(see previous flowchart)

Send report to author, point out issue(s), and suggest revision(s)

Author provides adequate explanation, revises text and adds full citation of source(s)

Accept for publication; all authors are asked to sign the copyright transfer statement

Publish

Send the report to the author, and notify journal editors and author’s institution of the plagiarism

Reject

NB: We see only a few cases of this per year
Apply for a COPE research grant

Twice a year, in June and December, COPE offers a grant of up to $5,000 to a COPE member for a research project into publication ethics.

The next deadline for applications is 1 December 2013.

Terms and Conditions for COPE research grants can be downloaded from the downloads box on the right.

To apply for a COPE research grant, download the application form (available in the downloads box on the right).

COPE has funded the following projects:

Update

The results of part of this research were presented at the CrossRef 2011 Annual Meeting, USA, 15 November 2011 (download the presentation PDF 745kb). The purpose of this survey was to investigate journal editors’ use of CrossCheck to detect plagiarism, and their attitude to potential plagiarism once discovered.


Several English papers arising from this project are listed below and can be downloaded from this site: http://www.zju.edu.cn/zjus/editorpaper.php


Y. H. (Helen) Zhang (right) and her research group (above)

COPE grant awarded for first time to recipients from China

COPE’s December 2010 research grant was awarded to Yuehong (Helen) Zhang and Xiaoyan Jia of Zhejiang University in Hangzhou, China, for the project “CrossCheck Guidance: An Analysis of Typical Cases of Plagiarism in Different Disciplines.”

cases of plagiarism based on input from other CrossCheck users.

They plan to compile a handbook listing typical cases for CrossCheck users and authors worldwide.

With this handbook, editors "can learn how to deal with different kinds of plagiarism in different circumstances."
2. Outline of A global survey on using CrossCheck for detecting plagiarism in journal articles

**Aim: we hope to learn in the survey**

1. How do journal publishers/editors worldwide use CrossCheck/iThenticate and analyze the similarity index?

2. What are journal publishers/editors’ attitude & tolerance toward typical plagiarism in different disciplines?

3. What are mainstream views and differences between editors in western countries and non-western countries?

Survey Version 1 (SV1) contains 22 questions, of which 10 were used in Survey Version 2 (SV2, marked with *) because most of SV2 recipients without Crosscheck members would not have been able to respond to all of the SV1 questions.

( After this, we also carried out another two surveys in Bio and EEE.)
A survey on the use of CrossCheck for detecting plagiarism in journal articles

Yuehong (Helen) Zhang and Xiaoyan Jia

Journal of Zhejiang University-SCIENCE (A/B/C), PR China

Abstract: The purpose of this survey was to investigate journal editors' use of CrossCheck, powered by iThenticate, to detect plagiarism, and their attitudes towards

Introduction

Although there are many dictionary definitions of plagiarism,\textsuperscript{1-3} Hames\textsuperscript{4} provides the stricture that ‘duplication of text or results from other articles or books is clearly unacceptable, either from the work of other authors or from an author’s own work (known as auto- or self-plagiarism)’. Plagiarism or unreasonable levels of copying in journal articles is a growing problem: ‘Not so many years ago, we got one or two alleged cases a year. Now we are getting one or two a month.’\textsuperscript{5} ‘How to stop plagiarism’\textsuperscript{6} is an important topic in academic publication.
Introduction

It is well known that conference proceedings play a much larger role in publishing and communication in both computer and electrical & electronics engineering (EEE) sciences than in other fields.\(^1\)\(^-\)\(^6\) However, it is unclear to what extent journal editors in these areas accept articles for publication that have been previously published as conference papers. If editors rely on CrossCheck\(^7,8\) to detect possible plagiarism, they are likely to find papers with a high similarity score simply because they have been previously published as conference papers; technically, this would be defined as self-plagiarism.

In 2011, the present authors\(^8\) carried out a global survey of authors in a range of disciplines. One of the 22 questions was: ‘Should papers previously published in conference proceedings legitimately be republished in journals?’ 60% of the respondents, across a range of different disciplines, thought that conference papers could properly be republished provided that the author included new content; on average, they indicated that new material should account for 46% of the original paper.

Republication of conference papers in journals?

Yuchong (Helen) ZHANG and Xiaoyan JIA
Zhejiang University, China

ABSTRACT. Conference proceedings are one of the most important forms of communication for computer scientists. This study investigated the policies of a large number of computer science journals with regard to the republication of papers which had already appeared in conference proceedings. Nearly one-quarter of journal editors would not republish such papers other than in special circumstances (such as a special conference issue), and almost all of the remainder would do so only after substantial updating and expansion of the original paper. Many specified the amount of content that should be new: 30% was the proportion most frequently mentioned. Thus,
Replication of the methods section in biosciences papers: is it plagiarism?

Xiaoyan Jia · Xufei Tan · Yuehong Zhang

Received: 28 December 2012 / Published online: 15 May 2013
© Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, Hungary 2013

Abstract To find out whether replication of methods section in biosciences papers is a kind of plagiarism, the authors firstly surveyed the behavior of authors when writing the methods section in their published papers. Then the descriptions of one well-established method in randomly selected papers published in eight top journals were analyzed using CrossCheck to identify the extent of duplication. Finally, suggestions on preparing the methods sections were given. The survey results show that an author may employ different approaches to writing the methods section within a paper, repeating published methods is more often than give citation only or rewrite complete using one’s own words. Authors are more likely to repeat the description of a method than simply to provide a citation. From the samples of the eight leading journals, plagiarize is very rare in such journals; Learning from Science, attachment may be a considerable choice for papers with common methods.
Detecting and (not) dealing with plagiarism in an engineering paper: beyond CrossCheck – a case study

Xin-xin ZHANG¹, Zhao-lin HUO², Yue-hong ZHANG††¹

(¹Journal of Zhejiang University-SCIENCE (A/B/C), 38 Zheda Road, Hangzhou 310027, China)
(²Guanghua College of Stomatology, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China)
†E-mail: jzus@zju.edu.cn

Received: 16 April 2013/Accepted: 31 July 2013/Published online 30 August 2013

Abstract: In papers in areas such as engineering and the physical sciences, figures, tables and formulae are the basic elements to communicate the authors’ core ideas, workings and results. As a computational text-matching tool, CrossCheck cannot work on these non-textual elements to detect plagiarism. Consequently, when comparing engineering or physical sciences papers, CrossCheck may return a low similarity index even when plagiarism has in fact taken place. A case of demonstrated plagiarism involving engineering papers with a low similarity index is discussed, and editor’s experiences and suggestions are given on how to tackle this problem. The case shows a lack
How to stop plagiarism

Duplication is easily detected by software, yet it remains a problem. Ten experts explain how to stamp it out.

HAROLD CARVER

and CrossCheck, a plagiarism-detection service from the publishing technology company CrossRef. So far, about 10% of the manuscripts have been flagged due to content similarity with other items, with a few serious cases of plagiarism. We deal with each case using the Committee on Publication Ethics Flowcharts. Very often the cases involve authors who do not speak English, who say that they were unaware they could not copy text from other authors or republish their own text.

Currently, many journals with a large number of submissions only check non-research articles for plagiarism. We believe that every journal should check all submissions, including original research. If anything, that should be the priority, as research articles present new knowledge and thus should be of the highest integrity.

JOHN LOADSMAN

Use professional translators

Authors preparing a scientific manuscript in a non-native language sometimes use 'patch writing,' surrounding their own data with words taken, usually without attribution, from the work of others. This form of plagiarism is among the most common, and dealing with it imposes a heavy workload on editors. Embarrassment — or worse — can result, as research articles present new knowledge and thus should be of the highest integrity.

YUEHONG ZHANG & IAN MCINTOSH

Blacklist repeat offenders

Managing editor, and English editor, Journal of Zhejiang University Science A/B/C

In October, the US Office of Research Integrity announced that Scott Weber, a nursing researcher at the University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, had admitted to plagiarizing more than 90% of a manuscript submitted for publication, and roughly two-thirds of another manuscript — including tables and figures. One such offence is bad enough, but 16 years ago, a journal found his paper contained portions of a previously published paper, as well. (Weber has denied any knowledge of the previous incident.)

Clearly, the current system of policing plagiarism isn't sufficient. Weber has agreed to a three-year penalty in which he will neither apply for nor receive government funds. We propose an additional measure: an international database that blacklists frequent offenders. In many European countries, US states, and China, a driver's licence comes with a point system. If you are caught breaking...
Q1. By discipline, CrossCheck users and non-users (cross-analyzed, n=219)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>CrossCheck user</th>
<th>CrossCheck non-user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry/Physics/Engineering etc.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science/Electronics etc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

User %, by discipline

- Life sci.: 50% (46/93)
- Chem/Phy/Eng.: 47% (29/62)
- Soc sci.: 33% (11/33)
- Computer/EE.: 30% (6/20)
- Other: 9% (1/11)
Q2 & Q3. By geographical location (SV1 & SV2), CrossCheck users and non-users (cross-analyzed, $n = 219$)

- **CrossCheck user ($n = 93$)**
- **CrossCheck non-user ($n = 126$)**

Geographical location:
- Sweden
- The Czech Republic
- Russia
- Poland
- Australia
- Singapore
- Malaysia
- France
- Canada
- Lithuania
- Germany
- Iran
- Korea
- India
- Netherlands
- Japan
- Brazil
- China (Hongkong; Taiwan)
- International*
- UK
- USA

#SV2: 9 non-Anglophone countries
SV1+SV2: 21 countries
Publishers of respondents' journals in SV1 (n=161)

- Elsevier: 32.6%
- Springer: 11.3%
- Oxford Univ. Press: 6.4%
- Wiley-Blackwell: 3.5%
- Nature Publishing Group: 8.5%
- Cambridge Univ. Press: 8.5%
- IEEE: 2.1%
- Elsevier: 0.7%
- N Engl. J. Med.: 0.7%
- Taylor & Francis: 1.4%
- Lancet: 1.4%

Next charts will illustrate the differences in reactions from both disciplines and languages to 5 plagiarism problems

1. Cut and paste
2. Republication of proceedings papers
3. Team plagiarism
4. Self-plagiarism
5. Heavy use of copied material in review papers
Discussion by discipline: Disciplinary differences in REJECTION rates to 5 key questions

Questions surveyed both in SV1 and SV2
Discussion by discipline: Disciplinary differences in REJECTION rates to 5 key questions

**Social Sciences** show the lowest tolerance, with 82% and 30% rejection rates, respectively to cut-paste & much copied material in review papers, but to self-plagiarism show a wide tolerance, with a rejection rate of only 12%. What is the reason? This may be related to the characteristics of social science articles, with greater expression of a personal viewpoint in the text. The writing process is a creative process, so social science editors express the lowest tolerance here. Otherwise, Further discussion of self-plagiarism may be needed in the future.

**Computer science** shows the lowest rejection rate in republication of proceedings papers, and team plagiarism, with 5% and 30%, respectively. Because this subject mainly depends on the updating of new technologies and team cooperation, there are more conference proceedings publications. Establishing a new policy is most urgent, owing to changing publishing modes and ethics.

The attitude toward the five questions in the Chemistry/Physics/Engineering and Life Sciences seem to be very similar. However, heavy use of copied material in life science review papers shows a little less tolerance.
Discussion: (a) Mainstream (majority) view between Anglophone & non-Anglophone respondents on 5 key questions

- Cut-and-paste (Q10): 58.9% (Anglophone) 55.3% (Non-Anglophone)
- Republication of papers from conference proceedings (Q16): 62.2% (Anglophone) 55.3% (Non-Anglophone)
- Team plagiarism (Q17): 91.6% (Anglophone) 90.8% (Non-Anglophone)
- Self-plagiarism (Q18): 69.2% (Anglophone) 65.8% (Non-Anglophone)
- Review paper of high similarity (Q19): 53.8% (Anglophone) 68.0% (Non-Anglophone)

N = 143 for Anglophone, N = 76 for Non-Anglophone.
(b) Small Differences
between Anglophone & non-Anglophone respondents on the 5 key questions

(b) Difference in minority opinions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Anglophone</th>
<th>Non-Anglophone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cut-and-paste (Q10)</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republication of papers from conference proceedings (Q16)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team plagiarism (Q17)</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-plagiarism (Q18)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review paper of high similarity (Q19)</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions surveyed both in SV1 and SV2

Anglophone: n=143
Non-Anglophone: n=76
Discussion between Anglophone & non-Anglophone respondents on 5 key questions

Global editors have expressed a strong mainstream view in ethical standards even though there are slight variations (severity) between different disciplines and countries, as well as between non-Anglophone editors and Anglophone editors.

These differences may be due to Cultural and Language differences arising from the wide range of social perspectives and stages of national development. As far as we know, copyright law has been well-documented for more than 300 years in western countries, whereas copyright law has been established much more recently in developing countries (for example, in China international copyright law has been in effect only since 1991). So for some authors from developing and non-Anglophone countries, there needs to be time to catch up with both the “historical differences” and “language difference” to lower the incidence of plagiarism.

A universal principle(policy) and practical approaches to prevent plagiarism and duplicate publication should be established.
In 2015, Springer will publish my book as one of Series books (QQASSC)

Book title: Against Plagiarism: A Guide for Editors and Authors

Author: Yuehong (Helen) Zhang

Contents….

Part 1 – General plagiarism issues
  What is plagiarism?
  Differences between Anglophone and non-Anglophone journals
  Publication in more than one language
  How not to deal with it: a case study

Part 2 – Discipline-specific plagiarism issues
  Biosciences: Replication of Methods sections
  Computing and Electrical & Electronic Engineering: republication of conference papers

Part 3 – What to do about it
  Promoting awareness of publication ethics
  Avoiding plagiarism as an author
  Detecting potential plagiarism
  Dealing with plagiarism as an editor

Concluding remarks
Concluding remarks in this book

1. The whole world should pay attention to research integrity

2. Create a culture of transparency in science and publication

3. Take the honesty as the best policy for researchers and authors

4. Make responsibility the foundation of scientific research and publication

5. Sanctions are necessary in scientific and publishing areas

6. We can never completely eradicate plagiarism or misconduct, but we have to make it morally and culturally unacceptable!
Where is there dignity unless there is honesty?'
- By Cicero, the famous ancient Roman philosopher (106-45 BC)

‘Make the purpose sincere’【Chengyi 诚意】
‘Cultivate personal virtue’【Xiushen 修身】
- From the famous phrases of Confucian philosophy, Confucius, 551-479 BC)

Thank you!
张月红 Yuehong (Helen) Zhang
jzus@zju.edu.cn
http://www.zju.edu.cn