



MAKING SCIENCE MATTER

CSE 2011
ANNUAL MEETING



29 APRIL – 3 MAY 2011
HILTON BALTIMORE, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

What Can Editors Do to Deter and Detect Scientific Misconduct

Christine Laine, MD, MPH
Editor-in-Chief, Annals of Internal Medicine



MAKING SCIENCE MATTER

CSE 2011
ANNUAL MEETING



29 APRIL – 3 MAY 2011
HILTON BALTIMORE, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

What editors can do to deter scientific misconduct

- Clearly define the types of behaviors that the journal considers to be misconduct
- Tell the authors what the journal does if they suspect misconduct
 - notify funding source?
 - cease consideration of the manuscript?
 - alert author's institution?
 - ask for the data?
- Follow through when misconduct cases arise



MAKING SCIENCE MATTER



CSE 2011
ANNUAL MEETING



29 APRIL – 3 MAY 2011
HILTON BALTIMORE, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

What editors can do to detect scientific misconduct

- **Knowledgeable peer reviewers**

- May be aware of previous or concurrent publications, submissions
- Better equipped to detect “red flags” in the presented evidence
- Know when findings are “too good to be true”



MAKING SCIENCE MATTER

CSE 2011
ANNUAL MEETING



29 APRIL – 3 MAY 2011
HILTON BALTIMORE, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

“The editors might want to know that a similar paper by the same authors is currently in press at journal X...”

“These findings appear to good to be true. My experience using the assay shows much greater sample to sample variation than shown in Table3. These data seem unusual to me...”


MAKING SCIENCE MATTER

CSE 2011
ANNUAL MEETING



29 APRIL – 3 MAY 2011

HILTON BALTIMORE, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND



I want to
study Mars

Copy entire
group of authors
on all
communication





MAKING SCIENCE MATTER



CSE 2011
ANNUAL MEETING



29 APRIL – 3 MAY 2011
HILTON BALTIMORE, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Authorship

“ I was surprised to get your notice about manuscript receipt. I was unaware that this paper had been written. Dr. X never showed it to me before submitting it.”

Data Fabrication

“ I was surprise to receive your communication indicating that the stratified analysis we provided in response to the initial reviews was satisfactory. These variables were not available to us. I think Dr. X made up data in this analysis and would like my name taken off the paper.”



MAKING SCIENCE MATTER

CSE 2011
ANNUAL MEETING



29 APRIL – 3 MAY 2011
HILTON BALTIMORE, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Other problematic issues

“ I think you should know that although Dr. X signed the statement saying that we had access to all of the data, we did not. In fact, I repeatedly requested data from our sponsor because I was concerned with the results of the adverse effect analysis but was unable to get it.”

“Although the cover letter says the Xxxxx IRB gav eteh study exemption from review. We didn't realize that this type of study required IRB approval and never submitted it to IRB and did not obtain patient consent.”



MAKING SCIENCE MATTER

CSE 2011
ANNUAL MEETING



29 APRIL – 3 MAY 2011
HILTON BALTIMORE, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Facilitate “Post Publication” Peer Review

- Letters to the editor
- Rapid responses
- Facilitate communication between readers and authors
- Take readers’ concerns that raise issues of misconduct seriously, refer concerns to institutions and funders when appropriate



"You are completely free to carry out whatever research you want, so long as you come to these conclusions."

