

2025

Research Publishing Ethics Guidelines for **Books and Elements**



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Contents

Publishing policy and best practice information 1

Core editorial policies 1

Authorship and contributorship 6

Research ethics 7

Competing interests and funding 9

Data and supporting evidence 10

Misconduct 11

Post-publication changes 14

Versions and adoptions 15

Libel, defamation and freedom of expression 15

Resources for authors, editors and peer reviewers of research content 18



Publishing policy and best practice information

At Cambridge University Press, the integrity of our academic content and publishing process is paramount. These guidelines outline the best practice principles that we apply to our Academic content. 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. 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.

Core editorial policies

Publishing principles

Our own Code of Ethics also sets out our belief that it is important that research is available and widely used and that we stand against censorship or restrictions imposed on our publications. For these reasons we will:

- resist censorship requests to restrict access to, or modify or redact sections from, any content we publish
- support and empower those in positions of editorial decision making to foster intellectual curiosity and debate
- encourage authors to submit and publish rigorous scholarship with us, without fear or coercion.

Where these commitments are challenged, we will pursue remedies which adhere to the key principles below:

- Our responsibility for the transparency and preservation of the scholarly record.
- Preserving editorial independence, which is the separation of editorial decision making from commercial or ownership interests.
- Upholding the values we share with our University on Academic freedom and freedom of speech
- Maintaining the standards set out in these guidelines and in our University's approach to Research Integrity.

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 editorial teams to provide specific guidelines and policies for authors on research integrity and ethics appropriate to their subject matter and discipline. Please refer to the Journal Policies page of the relevant journal for further details.

Anyone who believes that research published by Cambridge University Press has not been carried out in line with these Research Publishing Ethics Guidelines, or the above principles, should raise their concern with the relevant editor or email publishingethics@cambridge.org. Concerns will be addressed by following COPE guidelines where possible and/or by following our own internal escalation procedure if necessary.

Editorial independence

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. We believe editorial decisions on individual manuscripts should be based on scholarly merit and on potential importance to the relevant research community.

Academic freedom

We are committed to academic freedom. This is a fundamental principle for us as a university press. As a department of the University of Cambridge we are aligned to its position on [freedom of speech](#).

Our core purpose is to support academic discourse through the quality, breadth and diversity of our publishing. Everything we publish is validated through a rigorous peer review process including oversight by the [Academic Publishing Committee](#).

A central part of our mission is a commitment to pluralism in academic inquiry, including where this means engaging with viewpoints which are contested or controversial. We support respectful scholarly analysis and discourse, and we do not publish work that directly or intentionally incites violence, racism or other forms of discrimination and hatred.

Editorial process

Our academic publishing programme is overseen by the [Syndicate Academic Publishing Committee \(SAPC\)](#), consisting of academics from the University of Cambridge who independently approve all contracts for new books.

Book proposals

Proposals submitted for our book publishing programme are initially reviewed by commissioning 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 draft manuscript (if available) or the proposal, along with any available sample content, will usually be sent to a minimum of two external and independent peer reviewers. The peer review reports are used to inform the commissioning editor's decision as to whether to recommend publication to the SAPC.

In the case of books in series, the commissioning editor shares the peer review reports with the series editor(s), who make a formal recommendation on whether to accept the project into their series. The commissioning editor includes this in their final recommendation to the SAPC on whether to offer the author(s) a publishing contract. Our series editors are free to solicit additional reviews and guidance post-contact to inform the development of the manuscript.

Elements series

Proposals to inaugurate a new Elements series are initially reviewed by commissioning editors. If the proposal is suitable for consideration, it will be sent to a minimum of six external and independent peer reviewers. The proposal, peer review reports and series editor responses are then shared with the SAPC to approve establishment of the series and to empower the series editors to recommend contracts for Elements to be subsequently published within the series.

Element proposals

Elements can only be published within an existing series. Contracts are offered on the basis of the series editor(s)' approval of a short outline proposal. Publication is conditional on the full manuscript being read by a minimum of two peer reviewers appointed by the series editors. On the basis of the peer review reports, the series editors may advise that the Element be rejected, accepted or accepted with major or minor revisions.

We consider appeals on editorial decisions for books and Elements, but only when new information relevant to the editorial decision has been made available, or if there is a reason to believe we did not follow our [Code of Ethics](#) or Research Publishing Ethics Guidelines. If you have concerns and wish to appeal or file a complaint, please contact publishingethics@cambridge.org

Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI)

We do not discriminate against authors, editors or peer reviewers based on personal characteristics or identity. We are committed to promoting equality, embedding diversity, and removing barriers to inclusion at every stage of our publishing process. We actively seek and encourage submissions from scholars of diverse backgrounds, including race and ethnicity, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, nationality, religion, and disability. Editorial decisions on individual manuscripts should be based on scholarly merit, and should not be affected by the origins of the manuscript, including the nationality, political beliefs, religion, or identity of the authors.

We recognise the right for people to be treated with respect and dignity and we do not tolerate any form of harassment, 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 advice 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. Commissioning editors and peer reviewers should refer to the [Association of American University Press' Best Practices for Peer Review](#) and [Cambridge's guide to peer reviewing book proposals](#);
- 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. 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 and to provide necessary information to support this.

Artificial intelligence (AI) use during peer review and editorial decision making

Unless otherwise specified or agreed, no part of a manuscript should be shared with a public generative artificial intelligence (AI) tool including where manuscript information is contained within the reviewer's own review report. Where any AI tools

are used in the editorial process, any editorial decision will be made by a human. Where use of AI leads to suspected misconduct, this will be assessed and handled in accordance with our misconduct policies.

Confidentiality

We expect reviewers to uphold the confidentiality of the review process. Unless otherwise specified by or agreed with the series or commissioning editor, this means the reviewer must not share the content for review with any other person, public platform, or AI tool. Any breach of confidentiality will be considered peer review misconduct, and may be reported to the reviewer's institution.

Co-reviewing

We do not formally offer co-reviewing for our books and Elements programmes. Please consult the relevant commissioning editor if you wish to co-review.

Editing of peer-reviews

Unless entered into a written agreement otherwise, reviews are the intellectual property of reviewers. We encourage all those involved in the editorial process to familiarise themselves with the [COPE Guidelines on Editing of Peer Reviews](#). Where breaches of the following policy are suspected, authors/reviewers should raise their concerns through the appeals/complaints process for that publication, or to publishingethics@cambridge.org.

Manuscript reviews or excerpts therefrom may be shared with authors; however, we honour any requests from reviewers that their review not be shared. We maintain reviewer anonymity unless a reviewer specifically requests otherwise. Any reviews or excerpts shared with authors may be lightly edited, especially to ensure anonymity. Reviewers may request to see their review report as sent to the author.

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.

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 our [Post-publication changes policy](#) 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, Element 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.

Authorship and contributorship

We acknowledge that different disciplines and publication formats have different norms for who is listed as an author. We expect all authors on any content submitted to Cambridge to be in agreement that the authors listed would all be considered authors according to disciplinary norms, and that no authors who would reasonably be considered an author have been excluded. We also expect all listed authors to take responsibility for the integrity of the work and to be accountable for it. In the event of a dispute or change request (including author order or designation) at any stage of the publishing process, we will be guided by the relevant COPE flowchart, guidance, or case precedents in deciding the appropriate action(s). If these changes raise concerns about the broader integrity of the work further investigation may follow.

Authorship

Where no other criteria are specified, authorship should be based on the below principles.¹

- Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; and/or
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and/or
- Final approval of the version to be published; and
- 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.

Due to intersections with the contractual process, authorship approaches such as anonymous or pseudonymous authorship, consortia authorship, equal first authorship and appendix authorship must first be discussed with the relevant commissioning editor.

¹Outlined 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

Contributorship

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.

Disputes

We support our editors in dealing with any authorship disputes, including escalating or seeking advice on cases with COPE or referring to institutions. COPE also provides extensive resources on authorship and authorship disputes, and we encourage anyone involved in editorial decisions to familiarise themselves with these resources.

Author name changes

Cambridge is committed to inclusive and equitable policies and practices and to working with authors who wish to update their name on Cambridge publications. For book publications, name changes can be enacted at any point before delivery of the manuscript, or on release of new editions. Please note that at this time we cannot retroactively change names on existing published editions.

Authors should contact name.change@cambridge.org to request more information or a name change.

AI contributions to research content

- [AI use must be declared and clearly explained](#) in publications such as research papers, just as we expect scholars to do with other software, tools and methodologies.
- AI does not meet the [Cambridge requirements for authorship](#), given the need for accountability. AI and LLM tools may not be listed as an author on any scholarly work published by Cambridge.
- [Authors are accountable](#) for the accuracy, integrity and originality of their research papers, including for any use of AI.
- Any use of AI must not breach [Cambridge's plagiarism policy](#). Scholarly works must be the author's own, and not present others' ideas, data, words or other material without adequate citation and transparent referencing.

Affiliations

Any 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.

Research ethics

Ethical approval

Research involving human participants, tissue or data should be approved by relevant institutional ethics committee(s) and should conform to international ethical and legal standards for research.

The name of the ethics committee that approved the research, the ethics committee approval number and the types of consent obtained should be included in the manuscript. In cases where the need for formal ethics committee approval was waived, the name of the ethics committee that granted the waiver should be included in the manuscript.

Consent to publish

Authors should obtain consent (including from parents/legal guardians where applicable) to publish from individual participants if their manuscript includes any data that might identify them. For example, this includes photographs, videos, individual clinical data, quotes, demographic details and any other details that might identify the participant.

Consent to participate

In the conduct of their research, authors should prospectively obtain consent from the individuals involved to participate in their research and/or for their tissues (for example, biopsy material), or data to be used. The need for consent and method of obtaining consent may be determined by the authors' institutional ethics committee or other equivalent and relevant guidance or body. Details of consent to participate should be described in the manuscript, and evidence of consent or consent procedures may be requested by the editor.

Where consent for participation was not obtained (for example, in cases where the participants were not capable of providing consent), the editor may ask to see evidence that the need for consent was waived by an ethics committee.

Animal research

Research reporting animal research should follow the [ARRIVE reporting guidelines](#). Research involving vertebrates and regulated invertebrates should comply with relevant national and international animal welfare guidelines and where possible, be approved by an ethics committee. The name of the ethics committee and the ethics committee approval number should be provided at submission along with details of the national and international guidelines that were followed.

Animal euthanasia methods should comply with the [American Veterinary Medical Association Guidelines for the Euthanasia of Animals](#) or relevant and appropriate equivalent.

Clinical trial registration

As a condition of consideration for publication, registration of clinical trials in a public trials registry is required. A clinical trial is defined by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (in accordance with the definition of the World Health Organization) as any research project that prospectively assigns human participants or groups of humans to one or more health-related interventions to evaluate the effects on health outcomes.² Trials must be registered before the start of patient enrolment. The registry must be accessible to the public at no charge. It must be open to all prospective registrants and managed by a not-for-profit organization.

There must be a mechanism to ensure the validity of the registration data, and the registry should be electronically searchable. An acceptable registry must include at minimum a unique trial number, trial registration date, secondary identification information if assigned by sponsors or others, funding source(s), primary and secondary sponsor(s), responsible contact person, research contact person, official scientific title of the study, research ethics review, the medical condition being studied, intervention(s), key inclusion and exclusion criteria, study type, anticipated trial start date, target sample size, recruitment status, primary outcome, and key secondary outcomes. Registration information must be provided at the time of submission. Trial registry name, registration identification number, and the URL for the registry should be included in the manuscript.

Reporting guidelines

Authors should follow the [Enhancing QUALity and Transparency Of health Research \(EQUATOR\) guidelines](#) when reporting health-related research, and provide any specific additional information (e.g. [CONSORT](#) flowcharts) accordingly.

Human remains and photographs of human remains

The same duty of care and respect for human dignity apply to research involving archaeological human remains as for research on contemporary human data. Researchers are expected to have obtained appropriate permissions and consent, and complied with relevant national and international legal requirements and regulations in the conduct of their research.

Specimens

In accordance with the [Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity](#), we expect authors publishing research involving the collection of biological specimens, samples or fossils to employ policies to ensure that legal permits from the country of origin have been obtained and are available for review. All such samples must be collected in an ethical and equitable way, and in accordance with relevant applicable laws.

²Outlined by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, available at: www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/publishing-and-editorial-issues/clinical-trial-registration.html

Dual use research of concern

Dual use research of concern is defined as “research intended to provide a clear benefit, but which could be misapplied to cause harm” ([World Health Organization, 2020](#)), with a threat to public health, animals, plants, the environment, or safety. If your study could be classified under dual use research of concern, please contact your editor.

Competing interests and funding

Authors submitting a book or Element 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 (may include paid employment, consultancy, honoraria, grants and patents), non-financial, professional, ideological, political, religious, contractual or personal in nature. We also expect that anyone who suspects an undisclosed competing interest regarding a work published or under consideration by Cambridge University Press should inform the relevant editor or email publishingethics@cambridge.org.

Many of our publications require the inclusion of a funding declaration in addition to a competing interest declaration. We expect this declaration to be included in the manuscript itself where relevant. Please check with the relevant commissioning editor regarding declaration requirements.

Data and supporting evidence

We advocate for transparency and openness around data, code, and other materials associated with research, and we are a signatory of the [Transparency and Openness Promotion \(TOP\) Guidelines](#). 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. Where published alongside the main publication, we consider these supplementary files to be part of the Version of Record and subject to the same preservation and transparency principles as outlined in the Integrity of Record section.

Misconduct

The principles of research integrity - honesty, transparency, accountability, care and respect - are encompassed by our core editorial policies described above. We follow our University's definition of research misconduct, as follows:

'Fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or deception in proposing, carrying out or reporting results of research and deliberate, dangerous or negligent deviations from accepted practice in carrying out research. It includes failure to follow agreed protocol if this failure results in unreasonable risk or harm to humans, other sentient beings or the environment, and facilitating of misconduct in research by collusion in, or concealment of, such actions by others. It includes any plan or conspiracy or attempt to do any of these things. Misconduct in this context does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretation or judgement in evaluating research methods or results, or misconduct (including gross misconduct) unrelated to the research process.'

Cambridge University Press and its publishing partners take all forms of misconduct seriously and are committed to protecting the integrity of the scholarly record. This commitment includes the use of tools and services, both in-house and third-party, to detect or investigate misconduct.

Our approach to reported misconduct

In cases where concerns about misconduct or potential errors in our published content are raised, we are guided by the COPE recommendations.

When managing a case of suspected misconduct relating to a journal, our initial step would be to inform the author(s) and editor(s) involved. Our next step would be to help the journal editor to investigate the concern, including sharing information necessary to conduct the investigation with relevant third parties, or referring the case to a relevant institution for investigation. Any such information sharing would be conducted in line with relevant privacy and data processing laws, applicable Terms of Use, and ethical guidance such as that provided by COPE.³ Investigation may also include the use of various tools and services, in-house and external, to

³'Sharing of information among editors-in-chief regarding possible misconduct', Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), available at: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.7>

detect or investigate misconduct (for example, plagiarism or image manipulation detection tools).

If the investigation concludes there is a concern of direct relevance to the integrity or accuracy of the content itself, we would consider issuing a correction, retraction or withdrawal from sale informed by [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#). We may also alert the relevant institution(s), funder(s), or other bodies accountable for the research to the misconduct. 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. Please see our [Post-publication changes policy](#) for more information.

Our policies on commonly encountered forms of misconduct

Unethical conduct of research/research misconduct

It is misconduct to carry out research in humans or human tissue or data without informed consent from the individuals involved and/or without consideration for their safety, dignity or rights to privacy. It is also misconduct if such research is carried out without obtaining the required approvals and permissions or without compliance with national laws.

Publications suspected of reporting unethical research in humans or human tissue or data, or research which does not comply with our policies on human remains may be retracted.

Similarly, research which does not comply with our policies in effect at the time on the ethical and humane conduct of research in animals or on research involving the collection of biological specimens, samples or fossils may be retracted.

Unethical reporting and dissemination of research/publication misconduct

Data and image falsification and fabrication

The modification of any data or images in a way that misrepresents the findings (known as data falsification) or the fabrication of images, data or results (known as data fabrication) is clear misconduct and may lead to a retraction of the publication affected.

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'.

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 post-publication, we will follow our guidance outlined in our [Post-publication changes policy](#). We expect our readers, reviewers and editors to raise any suspicions of plagiarism either by contacting the relevant commissioning editor or by emailing publishingethics@cambridge.org.

Text recycling

Text recycling, also known as self-plagiarism, is when an author re-uses sections of text from their own previous publications without proper attribution. This is distinct from redundant or duplicate publication which refers to larger scale repeated publication of text or data with at least one author in common.

When assessing the acceptability of text recycling in a given manuscript, these factors will be considered:

- How much text is recycled
- Where in the article the text recycling occurs
- Whether the source of the recycled text has been acknowledged
- The clarity to readers of any content re-use
- Whether the article is a research or non-research article
- Whether there is a breach of copyright.

Where text recycling is deemed unacceptable, a submitted manuscript may be rejected. A published work may require retraction or a post-publication change as described in our [Post-publication changes policy](#).

Redundant publication

Duplicate or redundant publication 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.⁴

When authors submit chapter, book or Element manuscripts to us, these manuscripts should not have been accepted for publication or in press at another publisher. At the time of submission, authors should also disclose details of any closely related books they have previously published, even if in a different language.⁵

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.

⁴Based on COPE's definition of redundant publication, available at: <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/flowchart/redundant-duplicate-publication-published-article>

⁵Based on the WAME's Recommendations on Publication Ethics Policies for Medical Journals, available at: <https://wame.org/recommendations-on-publication-ethics-policies-for-medical-journals>

We expect our readers, reviewers and editors to raise any suspicions of duplicate or redundant publication, either by contacting the relevant commissioning editor or by emailing publishingethics@cambridge.org. If redundant publication is discovered post-publication, we will follow our guidance outlined in our [Post-publication changes policy](#).

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 [Green Open Access Policy for books](#) regarding early versions of monographs and maintaining the version of record.

Undeclared competing interests

Failure to declare a potential competing interest may be misconduct. In some circumstances, this may lead to the rejection of a submission or retraction of a publication.

Other types of misconduct and fraud

The following are examples of forms of misconduct which, in addition to data and image fabrication and falsification, may be regarded as fraud.

- Knowingly providing false or fraudulent affiliation information
- Offering authorship of a publication for sale, or buying authorship of a publication
- Attempting to manipulate peer review to influence its outcome.

If suspected, these behaviours may lead to rejection or retraction of any publication(s) affected, and notification of any affected parties or institutions responsible for the research or researcher.

Post-publication changes

If someone raises a legal, ethical or security concern about a Cambridge University Press publication, we follow the processes described in the [Misconduct](#) section of these guidelines. Commissioning editors will consider retractions or corrections in line with [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#) and our [Integrity of Record](#) policy.

Corrections

Commissioning editors will consider issuing corrections in line with [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#). Every effort is made to transparently describe any change either in the book itself or in ancillary material.

Retractions

A retraction is the rescinding of an editorial decision to publish. Retractions are usually reserved for publications that are so seriously flawed that their findings or conclusions should not be relied upon, or that contain substantial plagiarism or life-endangering content.

The decision to issue a retraction for a publication will be made in accordance with the [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#), and will follow an investigation. Retractions are editorial decisions and will usually be made by the commissioning editor.

Removals and withdrawals

In exceptional cases, we may remove a book or Element from further circulation and/or sale where we believe it is necessary to comply with our legal obligations. This includes, without limitation, where we have concerns that the content 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, the product's status as removed or withdrawn will be clearly shown online and we will retain the maximum metadata possible.

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.

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 will address allegations of libel in any of our publications.

Business ethics

Please see Cambridge University Press' [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.

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 communications

Social media, email and other digital channels such as blogs, video and audio 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. We engage in marketing communication in accordance with our Global Social Media policy and adhere to relevant industry standards for marketing of publications, such as the [Advertising Standards Authority's Guidance on the Marketing of Publications](#). We also apply these policies and guidance when using external influencers during social media campaigns.

Advertising

We allow for suitable, limited advertising on our online academic platforms, 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 Research Publishing Ethics Guidelines or our [Code of Ethics](#). We also advertise our own Cambridge 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.

Sponsorship

Some of our publishing activities may be sponsored by other organisations. This includes, for example, sponsored supplements or sponsorship for Open Access publishing. Any sponsorship arrangements will be assessed in accordance with the following principles:

- Transparency and rigour in all dealings
- Strict maintenance of an independent editorial process
- Proportionality of benefits

We do not solicit or accept sponsorship from entities:

- Whose operations conflict with the Code of Ethics of the University of Cambridge, Cambridge University Press & Assessment, or other relevant policies
- Which applicable laws prevent us from interacting with
- With whom an association might damage the reputation of Cambridge University Press or the University of Cambridge.

Offers of sponsorship are subject to contract and may undergo an internal approval process by Cambridge University Press, in addition to approval by the relevant editorial contact.

PR / Media

Our Academic colleagues who are involved in media or publicity 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.

Resources for authors, editors and peer reviewers of research content

Reporting concerns

For all enquiries relating to the integrity of Cambridge University Press content or [COPE Core Practice areas](#), please contact publishingethics@cambridge.org. When concerns are raised with our Publishing Ethics team by a whistleblower concerning Cambridge University Press content, we follow the relevant COPE guidance in our response. We endeavour to handle all queries sensitively and as confidentially as possible within the scope of any necessary subsequent investigation. This includes respecting a whistleblower's stated preference for anonymity as far as possible.

If guarantees of anonymity are required and this is possible in your country, whistleblowers may choose to raise concerns via our [Speak Up! Portal](#). This portal is available to anyone who wishes to raise a concern (whether employed at Cambridge University Press or not), including concerns relating to publishing ethics. The confidential portal can be accessed 24/7, 365 days a year and allows for reporting in your own language.

Useful contacts

Nature of enquiry	Contact details
Information about our open research and open access policies and practices	See www.cambridge.org/openaccess or email openaccess@cambridge.org
Guidelines for early research outputs or working papers that are posted on our preprint platform Cambridge Open Engage	See our Cambridge Open Engage website or email cambridgeopenengage@cambridge.org
Commercial licensing enquiries across books, Elements and journals, as well as bulk and customised/branded book special sales, journal advertising, reprints and supplementary issues	Email special_sales@cambridge.org
Advertising in any of our Academic products or platforms, including journal issues	Email advertising@cambridge.org
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 For translation and reprinting, email rights@cambridge.org
Reporting counterfeiting, copyright infringement or suspected piracy	Email piracy@cambridge.org