

► thing was wrong and notified people at [wulfeniajournal.com](http://wulfeniajournal.com), who immediately published this: "To all scientists about [www.wulfeniajournal.at](http://www.wulfeniajournal.at): *Wulfenia* journal has not a website, and it is published as hard copy. *Wulfenia* journal does not publish online and [www.wulfeniajournal.at](http://www.wulfeniajournal.at) is a fake site. All <http://sciencesarchive.com>, [www.sciencerecord.com](http://www.sciencerecord.com) and [www.wulfeniajournal.at](http://www.wulfeniajournal.at) are for one person that he/she is a hustler".

Case closed? Not so fast. Some time later, Matt Hodgkinson from the *Journalology* blog – also Associate Editor with *PLoS ONE* – received this email from Roland Eberwein, the real editor-in-chief of *Wulfenia*: "The site [www.wulfeniajournal.com](http://www.wulfeniajournal.com) is a criminal site too! You can find 'Wulfenia' at [www.landesmuseum.ktn.gv.at/210226w\\_DE.htm?seite=15](http://www.landesmuseum.ktn.gv.at/210226w_DE.htm?seite=15)." The latter has a warning up, stating, "The websites [www.wulfeniajournal.at](http://www.wulfeniajournal.at), [\[www.multidisciplinarywulfenia.org\]\(http://www.multidisciplinarywulfenia.org\) are not the official websites of the journal "Wulfenia: Mitteilungen des Kärntner Botanikzentrums" published by the Regional Museum of Carinthia. These websites criminally usurp the identity of the official journal. They fraudulently use false information, a false editorial board and false publication requirements to encourage authors to submit articles and to transfer page fees to a bank account in Yerevan \(Armenia\)." The warning message also states that the Regional Museum of Carinthia cannot be held liable for any article submitted to the fake journal.](http://www.wulfeniajournal.com</a>,</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

Any attempts by both, the Austrian and Swiss journals, to put the whammy on the criminal activities have so far been restrained because the websites were set up outside of the jurisdiction of local cyber-crime prosecution units.

So, before walking innocently into a fraudster's trap, keep in mind the advice of Matt Hodgkinson: "Be sure who you are dealing with. Watch for poor spelling, editors with no academic record and claims to be based in one country but requesting money to be sent to another." And all of this, of course, before pressing the money transfer button. -KG-

#### New UK brain bank network

## Brains United

Neuroscience has been given a real push lately. First, the European Commission granted the Human Brain Project one billion euros, now the US has followed suit and gotten underway the Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies, BRAIN, initiative – a similarly ambitious project.

But also on a much smaller scale, neuroscientists are treated very well at the moment. In late March, the UK-based Medical Research Council announced that they, in collaboration with five leading charities – the MS Society, Parkinson's UK, Alzheimer's Society, Alzheimer's Research UK and Autistica – had just launched a new online database. The UK Brain Banks Network virtually unites human brain samples, scattered over ten brain banks in the UK, located amongst others in Edinburgh, London and Sheffield. Previously, researchers had to contact every single brain bank to find out whether the needed samples and appropriate control samples were in stock – a frustrating and time-consuming process that kept some researchers from working with human tissue at all. Now, "for the first time searchable data on the entire collection of tissue samples (is) available free of charge to researchers working in academia or industry", reveals James Ironside, Director of the UK Brain Banks Network, in a press release.

All you need to do is to register with the database, providing details on reason for application, information on place of work and the email address of your head of department. Then you can start searching for your sample of interest, based on cause of death, age range, gender, brain pH range, post-mortem delay or type of tissue. "The database is the result of four years of painstaking planning and data analysis by very dedicated people. It will enable quick and easy access for researchers who are already working on neurological or psychiatric disease (perhaps in animal models or cells) ►►

#### Letter to the editor

## “Exorcising Ghosts”

We applaud Marcus and Oransky for considering some of the many challenges involved in determining authorship and for identifying relevant criteria (*LT* 2-2013). We wish to expand on their comments. Annette Flanagan agrees that 'substantial contribution' has not been adequately defined (*AMA Manual of Style*, 10<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Oxford; 2007:125-300). She hypothesizes that failure to define the term might be intentional to allow wider application of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors criteria for authorship. For those seeking further clarification, she defines 'substantial contribution' as "an important intellectual contribution, without which the work, or an important part of the work, could not have been completed or the manuscript could not have been written and submitted for publication."

As founders of the Global Alliance of Publication Professionals (GAPP; [www.gappteam.org](http://www.gappteam.org)), we have decades of practical experience with authorship challenges. Fortunately, professional medical writers (i.e., NOT to be confused with ghostwriters!) have to comply with a number of guidelines (e.g., Good Publication Practice) or legally binding contracts (e.g., Corporate Integrity Agreements) to ensure that authors do indeed meet authorship criteria. For industry-sponsored research, formal authorship agreements, which include authorship criteria, must be signed *before* the authors start developing the manuscript. Professional medical writers must maintain audit trails to document the 'substantial contributions' made by each author. Guest authorship can be detected, verified and stopped. Some disputes, particularly in terms of authorship order, can be avoided by using authorship algorithms, such as the freely-available online Author Order tool developed by Australian scientists (*Nature*, 2007;448(7152):508). We hope that increased awareness of Flanagan's definition of 'substantial contribution', as well as the use of authorship agreements and tools, will help prevent excessive co-authorship and exorcise the ghosts from scientific publication.

Cindy W. Hamilton, Virginia Commonwealth University School of Pharmacy, USA  
 Karen Woolley, University of Queensland, Australia, ProScribe Medical Communications  
 Art Gertel, Beardsworth Consulting Group, Inc.  
 Adam Jacobs, Dianthus Medical Limited  
 Gene Snyder, Navicom Consulting LLC

