Ethics and Plagiarism

AAHEP8 -- Amsterdam 2015
Erick Weinberg -- APS

APS GUIDELINES FOR PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

Publication and Authorship Practices

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the concept, design, execution or interpretation of the research study. All those who have made significant contributions should be offered the opportunity to be listed as authors. Other individuals who have contributed to the study should be acknowledged, but not identified as authors. The sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

Plagiarism constitutes unethical scientific behavior and is never acceptable. Proper acknowledgement of the work of others used in a research project must always be given. Further, it is the obligation of each author to provide prompt retractions or corrections of errors in published works.

PRD Editorial Policies and Practices

Authors may not present data and other results obtained by others as if they were their own. Nor may authors incorporate without attribution text from another work (by themselves or others), even when summarizing past results or background material. If a direct quotation is appropriate, the quotation should be clearly indicated as such and the original source should be properly cited. Papers that have been found to be in violation of this rule will be rejected. In such cases, resubmission of the manuscript, even with the plagiarized text removed, is not ordinarily allowed. However, the editors may allow exceptions to this policy if warranted by special circumstances.

PRD Acknowledgement of Receipt

The editors acknowledge receipt of this manuscript on ****** and are considering it as a Regular Article in Physical Review D. When sending correspondence regarding this manuscript please refer to the code number *****.

We understand your submission of this manuscript to certify the following:

- The paper represents original work of the listed authors.

- The manuscript as presented accurately reflects the scientific results.

- All of the authors made significant contributions to the concept,
   design, execution, or interpretation of the research study.

- All those who made significant contributions were offered the
   opportunity to be listed as authors.

- All of the listed authors are aware of and agree to the submission of this manuscript.

- The manuscript has not been published, and is not now and will not be under
consideration by another journal while it is considered here.

- The authors have provided information to the editors about relevant unpublished manuscripts, including whether any version of this manuscript was previously considered by an APS journal.

- The authors accept the established procedures for selecting manuscripts for publication.

Plagiarism of Text

--- Copying text for "better English"

--- Copying extensive background material

I am very saddened and surprised by the email I just received. The research I submitted for publication is entirely original, and I can easily demonstrate this. Quoting from other published material cannot be taken as plagiarism. Plagiarism is appropriating somebody else's results and claiming them as original, and this is clearly not what I did.

--- Copying from self --- to save time
                              --- to produce more publications

1 February 2003

Comment

Editorial Comment on "Axion-dilation black holes with $SL(2,Z)$ symmetry through APT-FGP model" by S. C. Joshi and B. S. Rajput

The article *Axion-dilation black holes with SL(2,Z) symmetry through APT-FGP model* by S. C. Joshi and B. S. Rajput, published in *Europhysics Letters*, **57** (2002) 639, should be considered withdrawn from publication.

This article contains no new results, but instead plagiarizes from the article *Superpotential from black holes* (*Phys. Rev. D*, **54** (1996) R4709) by Renata Kallosh. Apart from some well-known introductory review material (ending two sentences below eq. (4)) and the first half of the *Discussion*, the text of the paper has been copied literally from Professor Kallosh's article. *Europhysics Letters* apologises to Professor Kallosh and regrets that this has not been noticed during the refereeing process.

H. Müller-Krumbhaar
(Editor-in-Chief)

1 March 2002

Axion-dilation black holes with $SL(2,Z)$ symmetry through APT-FGP model

S. C. Joshi(*) and B. S. Rajput(**)

Department of Physics, Kumaun University - Nainital-263002, Uttaranchal, India

Abstract. – Keeping in view the partial breaking of the supersymmetry of dyons in $N = 4$ supersymmetric theories, which is due to the presence of a central charge in the algebra, and the mass of the BPS dyon in supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories, we have analyzed the ratios of charges of supersymmetric black holes with 1/4 of unbroken $N = 4$ supersymmetry and demonstrated that in spontaneous breaking of the $N = 4$ global supersymmetry to $N = 2$, the parameters of electric and magnetic Fayet-Iliopoulos terms can be considered proportional to the electric and magnetic charges of the dyonic black holes.

Supersymmetric gauge theories of monopoles and dyons have been much explored [1–12] partly because of the phenomenological interest, and recent results [9–11] have emerged about their strong-coupling behaviour. One could have guessed that black holes of the $N = 2$ theory with one-half of supersymmetry unbroken may be somehow relevant to models with spontaneous breaking of the $N = 2$ supersymmetry to $N = 1$ [13]. The models of spontaneously broken $N = 2$ to $N = 1$ global supersymmetries and those of $N = 4$ to $N = 2$ lead to the possibility that the parameters of electric and magnetic Fayet-Iliopoulos terms can be considered proportional to the electric and magnetic charges of the dyonic black hole. The choice of a superpotential in such models will be related to the central charge of the graviphoton, *i.e.* to the black-hole mass as a function of moduli and conserved charges of the black hole.

Keeping in view the Prasad-Sommerfield limit [14] and Gauss's law, the expressions for

Plagiarism of ideas

Harder to establish, but:

Paper 1, v1. ----15 Feb 2001, 20:46 GMT
"the level ... is not quantized"

Paper 2, ---- 26 Feb 2001 20:46 GMT
"the level ... is quantized"

Paper 1, v2., ----27 Feb 2001, 08:53 GMT
"the level ... is quantized"

Both papers were published: Paper 2 in PRL
Paper 1 in PLB

Authorship issues

"Authors" with no knowledge of being authors

---- (unknown author) + (leading relativist 1) + (leading relativist 2) :
"There are no black holes"

---- (new Ph.D.) + (thesis advisor)
"I",   "my thesis"

"Authors" with no knowledge

 ---- Institute or lab director as author

---- Institute or lab director as author

Duplicate submission

Paper submitted to CQG May12, xxxx
Revised version submitted to PRD May 25, xxxx
Same version submitted to CQG May 26, xxxx

There is no attempt here to publish the same paper in two different journals. My hope has been that this paper, which I know is correct, would find one journal willing to publish it.