How are journals handling third party inquiries of possible duplicate publications?

Malički Mario, Utrobičić Ana, Marušić Ana



University of Split School of Medicine

Background

Duplicate publication (DP) is a publication that overlaps substantially with one already published without proper cross-referencing of its source

COPE, **CSE**, **ICMJE** recommend **retraction** of DPs

Aim: To determine how many DPs are retracted, how journals and PubMed handle DP, how visible are corrections on journals websites, and how cited are DP

Methods

Sample: all articles with "duplicate publication [pt]" in PubMed; search 16 January 2013 – 1011 citations

NLM assigns DP tag to both the original and the duplicate article and does so with or without a formal notification from authors or journal editors

Data extraction: PubMed2XL 2.0 (XML to Excel)



Results (1011 citations)

555 possible DPs

177 had notices

Contacted NLM

Contacted editors (**250 DP cases**) - 16 e-mails missing

May 2017 – reminders sent September and October

181 (72%) response rate

Not a case of DP	61 (34)
Will publish notice/follow COPE guidelines (6)	44 (24)
Will investigate	28 (16)
Asked advice	12 (7)
Will not publish the notice	11 (6)
Did not specify the course of action	10 (6)
Notified about already existing notice	8 (4)
The other journal should investigate (date)	5 (3)
Retracted without replying	2 (1)

Awareness

- 1 aware of the DP tagging in MEDLINE
- 15 specifed they were not:
- 165 did not specify

"I am also embarrassed to admit that as an editor-inchief (of two more journals) I was not aware of the NLM practice of tagging highly similar publications as duplicate publications. Perhaps this information was given to the publishers (in my case Wiley and Elsevier) but never reached me. It would be good if my colleagues in my same position were informed."





PubMed ▼

Advanced

Display Settings:

✓ Abstract

Send to: 🗸

Mutat Res. 2011 May 18;722(1):84-8. doi: 10.1016/j.mrgentox.2011.03.011. Epub 2011 Mar 29.

Toxicity and SOS response to ELF magnetic field and nalidixic acid in E. coli cells.

Belyaev I.

Department of Genetics, Microbiology and Toxicology, Stockholm University, S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden. Igor.Belyaer@gmt.su.se

Abstract

genotoxic and carcinogenic effects of ELF have also been discussed and tested. In this study, we analyzed the effect of ELF on chromatin conformation in E. coli GE499 cells by the anomalous viscosity time dependence (AVTD) technique. Possible genotoxic ELF effects at the specific combination of static and ELF magnetic fields, that has been proven to have effects on chromatin conformation, were investigated by clonogenic assay, cell growth kinetics, and analysis of SOS-response using inducible recA-lacZ fusion and the β-galactosidase assay. Genotoxic agent nalidixic acid (NAL) was used as positive control and in combination with ELF. Nalidixic acid at 3-30μg/ml decreased the AVTD peaks and induced cytotoxic effect. In contrast to NAL, ELF increased AVTD, stimulated cell growth, and increased cloning efficiency. These effects depended on frequency within the frequency range of 7-11Hz. While NAL induced SOS response, ELF exposure did not induce the recA-lacZ fusion. Exposure to ELF did not modify the genotoxic effects of NAL either. All together, the data show that ELF, under specific conditions of exposure, acted as nontoxic but cell growth stimulating agent.

Extremely low frequency (ELF) magnetic fields have previously been shown to affect conformation of chromatin and cell proliferation. Possible

2011 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

PMID: 21453783 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

Publication Types, MeSH Terms, Substances



Publication Types
Duplicate Publication

Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't

Will not publish the notice (12)

It was a common practice then to publish proceedings and later the paper	3
Cannot investigate the issue in detail as it was long time ago	2
This occurred in time of the previous editor	1
It's a language translation only missing that statement	1
The publisher was doing it intentionally in two sister journals	1
As it is marked as duplicate there is no need to retract it	1
The editors republished it in a special issue	1
The authors apologised and the NLM had been informed	1

What is your reason for inquiring on this matter?

What action are you asking me to take?

As this is a rather large undertaking, we will not send you updates on a case by case basis. But we do appreciate your interest and we are doing our best to correct the literature

Since both of these articles are published within the Informa (Taylor and Francis; Informa Healthcare) umbrella, we will be able to resolve this **internally**.

Data will be lost:

We searched online but we could not find the full manuscript on Int J Surg Investig, since this journal has stopped being published for years now. Since the publication in AR, occurred after the publication on the other journal, we may have to retract the paper. However, in that way, the manuscript should disappear from the international literature since the second journal does not exist any more. Please let me have your opinion and advice on that.

Results (359 DP)

194 (54%) addressed by **notices**

Titles of published notices differed greatly in their format, of which the most common was a general notification (n=115, 59%) that did not include the article title or reference (e.g. **correction, erratum, notice of redundant publication**)

34 (9%) retracted

Total (row %)	359
Author's actions:	159 (44)
Submission to multiple journals ("shotgunning")	109 (32)
Study fragmentation ("salami slicing")	33 (9)
Submission without co-author approval	12 (3)
Plagiarism	3 (1)
Pharma sent database to two different teams for write-up	1 (o)
Lost communication with the journal following prolonged article processing	1 (o)
Publisher's actions:	200 (56)
Article published twice in different volumes	107 (30)
Double publication in sister journals or agreement between the journals without citing the original	64 (18)
Article published twice in the same volume	21 (6)
Wrong indexation sent to MEDLINE	4 (1)
Oversight of authors declaration of secondary submission/redaction error	4 (1)

Results (cont.)

Median time from original article to DP 3 months (95% CI 2-3) Median time from DP to the notice 8 months (95% CI 6-10)

No differences between the total citation count, and average citation per year of **DP** and their corresponding **original** articles (Wilcoxon test, P=0.1255 and P=0.4383 respectively), nor any reduction in citation counts following the publication of the notice (P=0.8351)

Md=6 (95% CI 5-7) Range: **o-498**

Conclusions

46 % of duplicate publications identified in PubMed have not been corrected by journals

Only 9% have been retracted

Editors should take the integrity of the published record seriously and take a proactive role in alerting the publishing community of redundant publications

Acknowledgments

We thank Esteve Foundation for organizing a Discussion Group on Editorial Research, in Barcelona (Catalonia, Spain), 12-13 December 2012, which gave us the idea for the study.

We thank Linda Ivas for helping us with article and notice retrieval, and the staff of the NLM Bibliographic Services Division, Index Section, for their clarification of the NLM indexing processes, careful review of MEDLINE citations related to duplicate publications, and appropriate edits.

The study was presented in part at the Seventh International Congress on Peer Review and Biomedical Publication, Chicago, IL, 8-10 September 2013 and at the 12th World Congress of Bioethics, Mexico City, Mexico, 25-28 June 2014, and on the 4th Conference on RI in Rio 2015.

Thank You!



Contact details:

Department of Research in Biomedicine and Health University of Split, School of Medicine

Šoltanska 2, 21000 Split, Croatia

tel. +385 (0)21 557 - 820

fax. +385 (0)21 557 - 820

e-mail:

mario.malicki@mefst.hr