10.10.2011

## Fwd: Re 02: question of epj c procedure

Von: Tord Riemann < tordriemann@googlemail.com>

An: tord <Tord.Riemann@desy.de>

Datum: 10.10.2011 10:59

----- Forwarded message ------

From: Tord Riemann < tordriemann@googlemail.com >

Date: Tue, Sep 13, 2011 at 3:41 PM

Subject: Fwd: Re 02: question of epj c procedure

To: tord < Tord.Riemann@desy.de >

----- Forwarded message ------

From: Tord Riemann < tordriemann@googlemail.com>

Date: Mon, Sep 12, 2011 at 5:27 PM

Subject: Fwd: Re: question ofr epj c procedure To: Sabine Riemann < sabine.riemann@desy.de>

----- Weitergeleitete Nachricht -----

Von: "Eur. Phys. J. C" < epjc@sif.it>

Datum: 12.09.2011 16:33

Betreff: Re: question ofr epj c procedure

An: "Tord Riemann" < tordriemann@googlemail.com>

## Dear Tord Riemann,

when there is the suspect of a case of misconduct, the case is carefully examined by the Editors in Chief taking the necessary time and steps to assess the case. The corresponding author may be contacted and requested to provide with an explanation.

If the misconduct is proved, the author is informed with a letter about the measures that will be taken. Also to the head of the institution of the author is informed about the case. If papers published in other journals are involved in the case, the other publishers are also informed.

According to the entity of the case, different measures may be taken. For example, the author may be banned in participating in the journal's publications for a determined period (e.g. 5 years). In case of established and significant fraud the paper can be retracted: this has not yet happened with EPJ C, but it has already happened for other EPJ journals.

As I mentioned in my previous message, in case you have any concerns regarding a particular case, if no other arguments speak against it you should officially contact the Editors in Chief (georg.weiglein@desy.de, bethke@mppmu.mpg.de) so that the case can examined.

Kind regards, Angela Di Giuseppe

## Tord Riemann wrote:

- > Thank you.
- > I understand from your answer that you have no standard procedure for such
- > I mean not the 'proof' but the reaction in case of evidence.
- > Am I right?
- > Best regards, tord riemann