The International Tinnitus Journal, since its inception, has followed a policy of peer review of manuscripts that attempts to identify and avoid duplication of data and information in different publications. The editorial board of ITJ joins with fellow editors of otolaryngology specialty journals in support of such a policy, as reprinted here:

It is essential that authors involved in biomedical publication be aware of basic guidelines for the ethical publication of their scientific work. The undersigned editors have taken a consortium approach to a concern facing several major journals that relates to duplicate publication. We aim to maintain the integrity of our scientific journals. Reports that claim original information must contain original information. We believe the priority placed on this tenet is appropriately reflective of its importance to patient care.

Authors are ethically obligated to be sure that data are presented accurately and in a fair and unbiased way. The supporting data for any scientific investigation should be maintained in authors’ office files for a minimum of 5 to 7 years after publication. (This is dependent on the study and the governing agency. Some institutions require less time, particularly for retrospective data.) Scientific data should never be altered or deleted. In this era of modern computer science, authors must also be careful that photographs and other illustrations when enhanced or otherwise “touched up” do not mislead readers or distort information. Digital enhancement of pictures that might be interpreted as intending to adjust or enhance findings or that could otherwise potentially mislead the reader is considered a major ethical breach.

Scientific data may not be published twice without clear notification to the editor-in-chief, reviewing editor, editorial staff, and the readership of the journal that these data have been published previously. Duplicate submission or redundant publication of a similar data set is considered unethical. Duplicate submission occurs when an author submits a manuscript simultaneously to 2 or more journals. This is inappropriate unless the journal editors have decided in advance that redundant publication would be in the best interest of public health. Redundant publication is publication of an article that overlaps substantially with one already published in print or electronic media. The overlap may be in data, content, or both, but commentary as written still seems to emphasize data.

The fundamental issue with redundant publication is that it violates the trust placed by readers of a journal that content is original unless there is a clear statement to the contrary. It is the senior or corresponding author’s responsibility to vet all manuscript data and identify redundant content in advance of submission. When submitting a manuscript, the author should fully disclose to the editor any duplicate submissions or previous publications that could potentially be considered redundant. It is not the responsibility of the editor or manuscript referees to check every reference or search the literature for undisclosed redundancy; the due diligence is the responsibility of the lead author. Also, “preliminary reporting” can violate journal policies if the author leaks data or original research to the media, industry, or government before publication. This should not necessarily jeopardize publication but should be discussed up front with the editor and a mutually acceptable approach agreed on in advance.

Publication of duplicate or redundant data or content in journals of different disciplines or different languages is a violation of this principle. A rehash of an old data set into a new publication is similarly redundant. If ever an author has questions on the interpretation of redundant or duplicate publication, it is his or her responsibility to bring the questions to the attention of the editor-in-chief prior to the review or publication of the manuscript. Full disclosure will prevent violation of this principle.

other actions may also be independently undertaken by the respective editors, including but not limited to notification of the dean, department chair, or chair of the scientific integrity committee at the author’s institution.

This editorial expresses the latest policy of the undersigned editors and clarifies and amends the policy previously set forth in May 2005. This editorial is being published simultaneously in each of the represented journals to emphasize the importance of this principle and to maximize its accessibility to the community of authors who publish in these journals. These principles were developed and supported by the undersigned but are not meant to be restrictive to these journals. We invite other editors of journals in our field to participate in this policy.
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