

Ethical Aspects Prioritized by Revista Brasileira de Cancerologia

<https://doi.org/10.32635/2176-9745.RBC.2023v69n3.4371>

Aspectos Éticos Priorizados pela Revista Brasileira de Cancerologia

Aspectos Éticos Priorizados por la Revista Brasileira de Cancerologia

Andreia Pires Dantas¹; Mario Jorge Sobreira-da-Silva²

The “*Revista Brasileira de Cancerologia* (RBC)” values the integrity in research, encouraging the publication of open articles developed with honesty, rigor, transparency, further to attention and respect to everyone involved. The ethical conduct is promoted actively, ensuring the authors a safe platform to share their studies and questions.

Pursuant to the recommendations of the *Committee on Publication Ethics* (Cope)¹ on ethical aspects of the editorial process and publication of scientific articles, the team of RBC treats authors and institutions well, fairly and politely, working in partnership with editors regarding the integrity of the investigation and through the entire process beginning with the publication up to a potential response to alleged misconduct. Therefore, the articles published by RBC are submitted to a strict ethical and integrity review. Had the manuscript been shared under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license the copyright is kept and ensures the RBC the right of the first publication.

RBC revises the manuscripts whenever the texts affect substantially the meaning or interpretation of the data without, however, interfering in the results or overall conclusion of the article, a quite relevant practice of scientific journals. In addition, encourages the publication of a note of the editor to warn readers in case of specific concerns about an article published.

Further to the corrections, RBC favors retractions of manuscripts due to several reasons, including duplicate publication, plagiarism, unethical investigation practices or when it is evident that the results or conclusions are unreliable due to misconduct², in compliance with Cope³ Guidelines.

Evidently, RBC does not condone plagiarism in its most different ways and will question the authors about the originality of the manuscript further to quoting the reference, should parts of other articles happen to be utilized⁴. If plagiarism is confirmed, RBC will reject the article and for that reason, all the articles are submitted to iThenticate, a software which evaluates the degree of similarity and the potential existence of plagiarism available to editors associated to “*Associação Brasileira de Editores Científicos* (Abec)”. In addition, articles with high level of selfplagiarism⁵ are not accepted by RBC.

As a federal government-funded journal, RBC does not reproduce or publish advertising in the articles or on its website and is dedicated to disclosing scientific knowledge to improve the services offered by the National Health System (SUS) and other similar systems.

Always within strict ethical principles, RBC continues to grow with quality of its publications, and national and international acceptance. It is expected that the publication is indexed in another databases, in addition to the existing ones, expanding the disclosure of scientific evidences produced ethically to generate new products, new protocols and new practices targeted to prevention and cancer control globally and nationally.

REFERENCES

1. Committee on Publication Ethics. Ethics toolkit for a successful editorial office: a cope guide [Internet]. [acesso em 2023 ago 22]. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.24318/AkFpEBd1>.
2. Bordewijk EM, Li W, van Eekelen R, et al. Methods to assess research misconduct in health-related research: A scoping review. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2021;136:189-202. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.05.012>
3. Committee on Publication Ethics. Guidelines: retraction guidelines. [Internet]. [acesso em 2023 ago 22]. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.4>

¹Instituto Nacional de Câncer (INCA), Coordenação de Ensino (Coens), Revista Brasileira de Cancerologia (RBC). Rio de Janeiro (RJ), Brazil. E-mail: andreia.dantas@inca.gov.br. Orcid iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5965-5015>

²INCA, Coens. Rio de Janeiro (RJ), Brazil. E-mail: mario.silva@inca.gov.br. Orcid iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0477-8595>



4. Wager E. How should editors respond to plagiarism? COPE Discussion Document [Internet]. 2011. [acesso em 2023 ago 22]. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.24318/EHhRmBWV>
5. Committee on Publication Ethics. Text Recycling Guidelines [Internet]. [acesso em 2023 ago 22]. Disponível em: https://publicationethics.org/sites/default/files/Web_A29298_COPE_Text_Recycling.pdf

Recebido em 22/8/2023

Aprovado em 22/8/2023