



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# Publishing Ethics: Academic Research

## Contents

Publishing Ethics: Academic Research .....	3
Introduction .....	3
Research Integrity .....	3
Editorial Process .....	4
Peer Review .....	5
Co-reviewing .....	5
Authorship and Contributorship .....	5
Affiliations.....	6
Plagiarism .....	6
Duplicate and Redundant Publication .....	7
Research with Humans or Animals .....	7
Competing Interests and Funding .....	8
Libel, Defamation and Freedom of Expression .....	8
Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern .....	8
Image Manipulation, Falsification and Fabrication .....	9
Fraudulent Research and Research Misconduct .....	9
Versions and Adaptations .....	9
Transparency .....	9
Data and Supporting Evidence .....	9
Integrity of Record .....	10
Ethical Business Practices .....	11
Fair Access .....	11
Censorship .....	11
Marketing Communication .....	11
Advertising .....	11
PR / Media .....	12
Metrics, Usage and Reporting .....	12
Useful contacts .....	13

# Publishing Ethics: Academic Research

## Introduction

At Cambridge University Press, the integrity of our academic content and publishing process is paramount. This document outlines the best practice principles that we apply to our books and journals. We hope these guidelines will be useful to many different groups, including authors, peer reviewers, editors within and outside of Cambridge University Press, societies, publishing partners and funders.

Cambridge University Press is a member of the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#); a global not-for-profit organisation which aims to support publishers and editors to achieve high standards in publishing ethics. Although COPE primarily provides guidelines and resources for journal editors, these can also be useful to books editors – so we reference them throughout this document. We also follow standards and best practice guidelines set by other relevant industry associations. Any external guidelines we follow are referred to in the relevant sections below.

To find our policies for researchers submitting early research outputs or working papers to our preprint platform Cambridge Open Engage, please see the [Cambridge Open Engage website](#).

## Research Integrity

We uphold the same high standards as our University, and expect research published by Cambridge University Press to abide by the principles within the [University's Research Integrity Statement](#).

These principles cover:

- honesty in all aspects of research;
- scrupulous care, thoroughness and excellence in research practice;
- transparency and open communication;
- care and respect for all participants in and subjects of research.
- accountability both for one's own research integrity and that of others when behaviour falls short of our standards.

In addition to the general principles above, we expect our journal and book editorial teams to provide specific guidelines and policies for authors on research integrity and ethics appropriate to their subject matter and discipline.

Anyone who believes that research published by Cambridge University Press has not been carried out in line with these Academic Research Publishing Ethics Guidelines, or the above principles, should raise their concern with the relevant editor or email [publishingethics@cambridge.org](mailto:publishingethics@cambridge.org). Concerns will be addressed by following COPE guidelines where possible and/or by escalating the matter to our Publishing Ethics Committee if necessary.

The Publishing Ethics Committee (PEC) is a Press-wide body, reporting to the Press Board, responsible for monitoring, developing, and advising on cross-Press best practice in publishing ethics. The Committee is not decision-making, although it may direct queries and provide recommendations to appropriate decision-making levels (for example, recommend that an issue warrants discussion by the Press Board). Mandy Hill, Managing Director of Academic, is the Chair of the PEC. Membership includes representation from all three product groups (Academic, Education, ELT), the University, and Cambridge University Press' Legal and Communications teams.

## Editorial Process

We are committed to editorial independence, and strive in all cases to prevent this principle from being compromised through competing interests, fear, or any other corporate, business, financial or political influence. Our editorial processes reflect this commitment to editorial independence.

We do not discriminate against authors, editors or peer reviewers based on personal characteristics or identity. We are committed to embedding diversity, removing barriers to inclusion, and promoting equity at every stage of our publishing process. We actively seek and encourage submissions from scholars of diverse backgrounds, including race and ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, nationality, religion, and disability.

Our academic publishing programme is overseen by the [Syndicate Academic Publishing Committee](#) (SAPC), consisting of academics from the University of Cambridge who independently advise on and approve all our contracts for publication. The role of the SAPC differs for book and journal contracts:

- Proposals submitted for our book publishing programme are initially reviewed by inhouse editors, who may also consult relevant external book series editors or subject specialists. If the proposal is suitable for consideration by Cambridge University Press, the proposal, along with sample content, will be sent to a minimum of two external and independent peer reviewers. The peer reviewers' assessments are used to inform the editor's decision as to whether or not to recommend publication to the SAPC. In the case of series books, the series editor subsequently makes the final recommendation to the SAPC on whether or not to award the author(s) a publishing contract. Our editors are free to solicit additional reviews and guidance postcontract to inform the development of the manuscript.
- Editorial decisions on manuscripts submitted to our journals are made by external academic editors and based on independent peer review reports. The SAPC is required to approve Cambridge University Press taking on the publishing of an established journal or the creation of a new journal. The SAPC approves the appointment of individual editors and editorial board members to our Syndicate journals. The SAPC may also advise on policy changes, ethics or other matters affecting the conduct of our journals' business, but SAPC responsibilities do not include decisions to publish individual articles

We encourage all journals to provide a public policy and process for considering appeals of editorial decisions. Please contact individual journals for details about this process. We consider appeals on editorial decisions for books, but only when new information relevant to the editorial decision has been made available, or if there is reason to believe we did not follow our [Code of Ethics](#) or these Academic Research Publishing Ethics Guidelines. If you have concerns and wish to appeal or file a complaint, please contact [publishingethics@cambridge.org](mailto:publishingethics@cambridge.org), or the relevant journal contact as outlined in that journal's appeals process.

We do not tolerate abusive behaviour or correspondence towards our staff and others involved in the publishing process on our behalf. If anyone involved in this process engages in such behaviour we have the right to take action to protect others from this abuse. This may include, for example, withdrawal of a manuscript from consideration, or challenging clearly abusive peer review comments.

## Peer Review

Peer review is critical to maintaining the standards of our publications. We:

- provide appropriate systems, training and support to facilitate rigorous, fair and effective peer review for all our publications;
- encourage our editors and peer reviewers to familiarise themselves with and act in accordance with relevant best practice guidelines on peer review. For journal editors and peer reviewers, please refer to [COPE's Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](#). Our books editors and peer reviewers may find the [Association of American University Presses' Best Practices for Peer Review](#) more appropriate;
- expect those who oversee the peer review process to be able to recognise [warning signs of fraudulent or manipulated peer review](#), and to raise any concerns by emailing [publishingethics@cambridge.org](mailto:publishingethics@cambridge.org). People who oversee the peer review process may be internal to Cambridge University Press or contracted by us directly or indirectly;
- support our editors and peer reviewers in investigating and acting on any suspected cases of manipulated or fraudulent peer review;
- protect the confidentiality of participants in the peer review process where anonymity forms part of that publication's peer review process. We also expect our publishing partners, authors and peer reviewers to uphold any relevant confidentiality arrangements for each book or journal and to provide necessary information to support this.

## Co-reviewing

In journals that allow co-reviewing, an invited reviewer can work with a more junior colleague to review a manuscript for the purpose of reviewer training. This allows the co-reviewer to gain experience with the review process and become a viable reviewer for a journal.

An invited reviewer can have a co-reviewer on a manuscript as long as the journal's editorial office is made aware of this and approves the co-review. The invited reviewer will need to reach out to the journal's editorial office about the co-reviewer when they accept the review. The co-reviewer must also declare any relevant competing interests.

The co-reviewer must be specifically identified during the completion of the review, either in the 'Confidential Comments to the Editor' section or, if a journal has a specific question about co-review, in the reviewer report form. This allows the co-reviewer to be credited for the review and to be added to a journal's reviewer pool.

We do not formally offer co-reviewing for our books and Elements programme; please consult the relevant books editor if you wish to do so.

## Authorship and Contributorship

We acknowledge that different disciplines and publication formats have different norms for who is listed as an author. Where no other guidance is specified, we recommend applying the following principles.<sup>1</sup>

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; and/or
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and/or
3. Final approval of the version to be published; and
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

The corresponding author's specific responsibilities include:

- Manuscript correction and proofreading. Handling the revisions and re-submission of revised manuscripts up to the acceptance of the manuscripts.
- Agreeing to and signing the Author Publishing Agreement on behalf of relevant co-authors and/or arranging for any third-party copyright owners' signature;
- Arranging for payment of an APC (article processing charge) where one is required. The affiliation of the corresponding author is used to determine eligibility for discounted or waived APCs under Open Access Agreements.
- Acting on behalf of all co-authors in responding to queries from all sources post-publication, including questions relating to publishing ethics, reuse of content, or the availability of data, materials, resources etc.

We encourage authors to list anyone who does not meet the criteria for authorship in an Acknowledgments section in their publication with permission, for example to recognise the contributions of anyone who provided research or writing assistance.

COPE also provides extensive resources on authorship and authorship disputes, and we encourage anyone involved in editorial decisions to familiarise themselves with these resources. We support our editors in dealing with any authorship disputes, including escalating or seeking advice on cases with COPE. We integrate with established and emerging industry standards to increase transparency in authorship (for example, [ORCID](#)). We support initiatives that enable transparency in authorship and contributorship such as CRediT taxonomy.

## Affiliations

Any article affiliations should represent the institution(s) at which the research presented was conducted and/or supported and/or approved. For non-research content, any affiliations should represent the institution(s) with which each author is currently affiliated.

## Plagiarism

Cambridge University Press adheres to the [University's definition of plagiarism](#). Plagiarism is defined as 'using someone else's ideas, words, data, or other material produced by them without acknowledgement'.

<sup>1</sup> Outlined by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, available at: [www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html](http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html)

Plagiarism can occur in respect to all types of sources and media, including:

- text, illustrations, musical quotations, extended mathematical derivations, computer code, etc.;
- material downloaded from websites or drawn from manuscripts or other media;
- published and unpublished material, including lectures, presentations and grey literature.

We do not tolerate plagiarism in any of our publications, and we reserve the right to check all submissions through appropriate plagiarism checking tools. Submissions containing suspected plagiarism, in whole or part, will be rejected. If plagiarism is discovered postpublication, we will follow our guidance outlined in the Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern section of these guidelines. We expect our readers, reviewers and editors to raise any suspicions of plagiarism, either by contacting the relevant editor or by emailing [publishingethics@cambridge.org](mailto:publishingethics@cambridge.org).

## Duplicate and Redundant Publication

Duplicate or redundant publication, or 'self-plagiarism', occurs when a work, or substantial parts of a work, is published more than once by the author(s) of the work without appropriate cross-referencing or justification for the overlap. This can be in the same or a different language.<sup>2</sup>

We do not support substantial overlap between publications, unless:

- it is felt that editorially this will strengthen the academic discourse; and
- we have clear approval from the original publication; and
- we include citation of the original source.

We expect our readers, reviewers and editors to raise any suspicions of duplicate or redundant publication, either by contacting the relevant editor or by emailing [publishingethics@cambridge.org](mailto:publishingethics@cambridge.org).

When authors submit manuscripts to our journals, these manuscripts should not be under consideration, accepted for publication or in press within a different journal, book or similar entity, unless a journal is explicit that it does not have an exclusive submission policy. However, deposition of a preprint on the author's personal website, in an institutional repository, or in a preprint archive shall not be viewed as prior or duplicate publication. Authors should follow our [Preprint Policy](#) regarding preprint archives and maintaining the version of record.

Any manuscript based on a thesis should be a reworking of the material in the thesis and written to conform to the journal's style guide or relevant book guidance. When quoting from the thesis or reusing figures, authors should avoid self-plagiarism by citing and referencing any extracts copied or adapted from the thesis appropriately. If a thesis was published by a publisher and is publicly accessible, permission may be required from the thesis publisher before submitting to a journal. The relevant editor should be informed that the manuscript draws on a thesis in the cover letter.

<sup>2</sup> Based on COPE's definition of redundant publication, available at: <https://publicationethics.org/category/keywords/redundant-publication>

## Research with Humans or Animals

Research involving humans or animals should be approved by relevant ethics committee(s) and should conform to international ethical and legal standards for research. We also expect authors to respect human participants' right to privacy, and to gain any necessary consent to publish before submitting to us. For information on whether authors are required to submit or include evidence regarding the above, please consult individual journal submission guidelines or contact the relevant book or journal editor.

## Competing Interests and Funding

We try to ensure that any Cambridge University Press publication is free from undue influence. Authors submitting a book or journal manuscript to Cambridge University Press, employees, the SAPC, editors and reviewers of Cambridge University Press publications, are required to declare any potential competing interests that could interfere with the objectivity or integrity of a publication. Competing interests are situations that could be perceived to exert an undue influence on the presentation, review or publication of a piece of work. These may be financial, non-financial, professional, contractual or personal in nature. We also expect that anyone who suspects an undisclosed competing interests regarding a work published or under consideration by Cambridge University Press should inform the relevant editor or email [publishingethics@cambridge.org](mailto:publishingethics@cambridge.org).

Many of our publications require the inclusion of a funding declaration in addition to a competing interest declaration. Please check with the relevant journal or book editor regarding declaration requirements.

## Libel, Defamation and Freedom of Expression

Freedom of expression is critical to us as academic publishers, but we do not support publishing false statements that harm the reputation of individuals, groups, or organisations. Our legal team can advise on pre-publication libel reviews, and will also address allegations of libel in any of our publications.

## Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern

Journal editors will consider retractions, corrections or expressions of concern in line with [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#). If an author is found to have made an error, the journal will issue a corrigendum. If the journal is found to have made an error, they will issue an erratum. Retractions are usually reserved for articles that are so seriously flawed that their findings or conclusions should not be relied upon, or that contain substantial plagiarism or life-endangering content. Journals that publish Accepted Manuscripts may make minor changes such as those which would likely occur during copyediting, typesetting or proofreading, but any substantive corrections will be carried out in line with [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#).

In exceptional cases, we may remove an article from online publication where we believe it is necessary to comply with our legal obligations. This includes, without limitation, where we have concerns that the article is defamatory, violates personal privacy or confidentiality laws, is the subject of a court order, or might pose a serious health risk to the general

public. In these circumstances, we may decide to remove the article and publish a notice that clearly states why the full article has been removed.

In the case of books, if someone raises a legal, ethical or security concern about a Cambridge University Press publication, we would inform the author(s) and editor(s) involved. Our next step would be to investigate the concern and, if appropriate, address it through dialogue or negotiation with any third parties involved or by referring it to a relevant institution for investigation. If the concern relates to the integrity or accuracy of the content itself, we would consider issuing a correction, or a retraction and withdrawal from sale. Where any content is retracted, we would do so in a way that still preserves the integrity of the academic record and of other affiliated works (for example, other volumes in a series). This includes maintaining any associated metadata and, if legally possible, the abstract.

We also participate in [Crossmark](#); a multi-publisher initiative to provide a standard way for readers to locate the current version of a piece of content, view any changes that have occurred, and access additional information about that publication record.

## Image Manipulation, Falsification and Fabrication

Where research data are collected or presented as images, modifying these images can sometimes misrepresent the results obtained or their significance. We recognise that there can be legitimate reasons for modifying images, but we expect authors to avoid modifying images where this leads to the falsification, fabrication, or misrepresentation of their results.

## Fraudulent Research and Research Misconduct

Where we are made aware of fraudulent research or research misconduct by a Cambridge University Press author, our first concern is the integrity of content we have published. We work with the relevant editor(s), COPE, and other appropriate institutions or organisations, to investigate. Any publication found to include fraudulent results will be retracted, or an appropriate correction or expression of concern will be issued. Please see the [Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern](#) section of these guidelines for more information.

## Versions and Adaptations

Our publications are distributed in many different global cultural, environmental and economic contexts. We may therefore issue different versions of some of our products in order to cater to these contexts. We neither modify existing, published content nor originate new materials to meet political or ideological requirements where we judge these to compromise the quality, effectiveness or factual accuracy of the materials or to conflict with our [Code of Ethics](#).

We grant licences in volume and subsidiary rights to third-parties which permit the reproduction, reuse or adaptation of our content in different contexts, languages and territories. Where we license volume rights, we and our authors retain the right to withhold approval for publication if we have concerns about the integrity and accuracy of the licensed edition.

## Transparency

We strive to follow [COPE's Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing](#) and encourage our publishing partners to uphold these same principles.

## Data and Supporting Evidence

We support transparency and openness around data, code, and other materials associated with research. We expect authors to maintain accurate records of supporting evidence necessary to allow others to understand, verify, and replicate new findings, and to supply or provide access to this supporting evidence, on reasonable request. Where appropriate and where allowed by their employer, funding body or others who might have an interest, we encourage authors to:

- deposit evidence in a suitable repository or storage location, for sharing and further use by others; and
- describe where the evidence may be found in a Data Availability Statement which authors should include in their publication.

Many of our publications also permit authors to submit and publish supplementary materials that are not essential for inclusion or that cannot be accommodated in the main text, but that would be of benefit to the reader. Unless otherwise stated, it should be assumed that data, code, and other materials or supplementary files will not be peer-reviewed.

Cambridge University Press aims to provide authors with the ability to connect supporting evidence with their manuscripts, either on our own platform or through third party services. Cambridge University Press is also a signatory of Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) Guidelines. Please contact individual journals for information on their transparency requirements.

## Integrity of Record

We maintain a record of the existence of everything we publish with information (metadata) describing each publication. If our content is deemed not to comply with the laws of a sovereign nation, we make every effort to ensure the metadata remain accessible within that jurisdiction. Where we are obliged to alter the publication record in any way, such as in the case of research misconduct leading to retraction of a publication, we preserve the academic record as far as possible. See the [Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern](#) of these guidelines for information about how we do this.

We apply these same principles to our marketing, and do not modify or manipulate the representation of the academic record in our marketing activities.

When any product (chapter, article, book or journal) is purchased or subscribed to, we supply it only in its totality to the customer, who is not entitled to alter its content in any way that is inconsistent with the licensing terms under which it was published. Any sale of disaggregated products is subject to the contracts with the copyright holders of the original products.

# Ethical Business Practices

See our [Code of Ethics](#) for further details.

## Fair Access

We have an expansive [developing country programme](#) to allow free or low-cost access to our digital content for researchers in developing countries. We also participate in many global access initiatives to ensure that academics from [eligible low and middle-income countries](#) are able to publish in our Open Access journals. We also review and consider requests for waivers from academics who have insufficient funds to pay an Article Processing Charge in our Open Access journals.

## Censorship

We will never be complicit in censorship. Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge which, as a world-leading research and teaching institution, is fully committed to the principle and promotion of [freedom of speech and expression](#). As a global publisher, our goal is to disseminate knowledge to the widest possible audience, and to serve the academic community in all countries around the world. As a member of COPE we support [COPE's Statement on Censorship](#), and we follow the [Association of University Presses' Facing Censorship: Statement of Guiding Principles](#).

## Marketing Communication

Social media and email communication are powerful tools for disseminating and engaging with our publications, for reaching new readers and for keeping content alive. However, such onward communication should never be at the expense of the integrity of the content or of the academic record. All colleagues with responsibility for our social media channels are expected to familiarise themselves with relevant Cambridge University Press social media policies, best practice in media use, and to follow the [Advertising Standards Authority's Guidance on the Marketing of Publications](#) (or equivalent bodies applicable to our global offices). Colleagues are also expected to apply these policies and this guidance when using external influencers during a social media campaign.

## Advertising

We allow for limited, appropriate and sometimes targeted advertising on our online academic content platform, Cambridge Core, and within some of our print publications. Where present, advertising must:

- be independent from editorial decisions on what we publish;
- be clearly distinct from content.

For further information on our due diligence and data protection policies see our [Code of Ethics](#). We reserve the right to reject or remove any advertising where we have concerns it contravenes these Academic Research Publishing Ethics Guidelines or our Code of Ethics. We also advertise our products and services to customers. We do so in accordance with our [Privacy Policy](#), data protection regulations, the [Advertising Standards Authority's Guidance on the Marketing of Publications](#), and our internal Compliance procedures.

## PR / Media

We recommend Academic colleagues who are involved in media or publicity familiarise themselves with and follow the [International Public Relations Association's Code of Conduct](#), and observe these standards in any press releases or other media communications. Where we solicit or encourage media activities concerning one of our authors, editors or publishing partners, we strive to keep them informed.

## Metrics, Usage and Reporting

We endeavour to ensure that our reporting of content usage remains compliant with the industry standard and the [COUNTER Code of Practice](#). We seek to implement new releases of COUNTER at the earliest opportunity in order to allow our customers and publishing partners to compare usage of Cambridge University Press resources with data received from other publishers and vendors. We may omit usage that infringes our Terms of Use, or which is known to be fraudulent or malicious (e.g. originating from Denial of Service attacks).

We partner with a number of third parties, including commercial services, to provide our users with metrics to illustrate the impact and reception of our content. We support the work of third parties such as [Altmetric](#) and [Crossref](#), and in some cases actively facilitate the work of such organisations (through the provision of data, access or fees). We do not seek to control or influence these third parties and we are not responsible for the metrics and rankings they produce.

Cambridge University Press is also a signatory of the [San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment](#) (DORA). We are committed to promoting best practice in the assessment and impact reporting of scholarly research.

## Useful contacts

For all enquiries relating to the integrity of Cambridge University Press content or [COPE Core Practice areas](#), please contact [publishingethics@cambridge.org](mailto:publishingethics@cambridge.org). All queries will be handled sensitively and as confidentially as possible within the scope of any necessary subsequent investigation.

We recognise that there may be occasions when you may wish to remain as anonymous as possible. As such, Cambridge University Press provides access to an external and confidential Whistleblowing Hotline for anyone to raise concerns (whether employed at Cambridge University Press or not), including concerns relating to publishing ethics.

For all commercial licensing enquiries across books and journals, as well as bulk and customised/branded book special sales, journal advertising, reprints and supplementary issues, contact [specialsales@cambridge.org](mailto:specialsales@cambridge.org)

For enquiries regarding advertising in any of our Academic products or platforms, including journal issues, contact [advertising@cambridge.org](mailto:advertising@cambridge.org)

For enquiries regarding third-parties licenses to translate and reprint whole books under the licensee's own imprint, contact [foreignrights@cambridge.org](mailto:foreignrights@cambridge.org)

For enquiries regarding third party licenses to reproduce and re-use limited parts of Cambridge University Press works in other contexts, see [www.cambridge.org/about-us/rights-permissions/permissions](http://www.cambridge.org/about-us/rights-permissions/permissions)

For information about our Open Research and Open Access policies and practices, see [www.cambridge.org/openaccess](http://www.cambridge.org/openaccess). For any enquiries, contact [openaccess@cambridge.org](mailto:openaccess@cambridge.org)

To report counterfeiting, copyright infringement or suspected piracy, contact [piracy@cambridge.org](mailto:piracy@cambridge.org)

For enquiries regarding file release and the IP Programme (including information on the Digital Contract System), contact [IP@cambridge.org](mailto:IP@cambridge.org)

For enquiries regarding our guidelines for early research outputs or working papers that are posted on our preprint platform Cambridge Open Engage, please see our [Cambridge Open Engage website](#) or contact [cambridgeopenengage@cambridge.org](mailto:cambridgeopenengage@cambridge.org)

Cambridge University Press | Version 4.0 Last updated September 2021. This document will be subject to periodic review.

