

## Practical Makes Perfect

Since the multidisciplinary quarterly journal *Science and Engineering Ethics* was first published in January 1995, its authors have regularly addressed topics of interest to science editors. For example, the very first issue contained an article titled “(Not) Giving Credit Where Credit Is Due: Citation of Data Sets”. A key characteristic of the journal is that “with contributors writing from a range of disciplines, often aimed at practical interventions to improve scientific practice . . . the journal has kept open channels of communication and avoided becoming an in-group of professionals writing for each other” (from a review in *Nature*). Thus, although the journal is an academic journal that focuses on ethics, it is not for academic ethicists only. Indeed, the focus is perfectly suited to science editors, who are, and always have been, in a position to see unique aspects of the practice of science and to suggest “practical interventions to improve scientific practice”—the work of the Vancouver group (International Committee of Medical Journal Editors) is a prime example.

In keeping with the effort to explore all aspects of scientific practice as opposed to the discipline of professional ethics, articles are frequently accompanied by several commentaries with widely different views; this format is similar to that of *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. In addition, in 2001, the journal instituted a recurring feature consisting of case studies and commentaries generated by an educational program on research ethics for graduate students undertaken by the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics with funding from the National Science Foundation.

One admirable feature of the journal is that the editorship is shared by a European (Raymond Spier, School of Biological Sciences, University of Surrey) and a North American (Stephanie J Bird, a neuroscientist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology). Furthermore, the editorial board includes persons in Russia, Germany, Poland, Italy, and Romania and such notable Anglos as John Ziman, Sheila Jasanoff, and Daryl Chubin.

Information on the journal and tables of contents with brief abstracts are available at [www.opragen.co.uk/SEE/](http://www.opragen.co.uk/SEE/). Listed below

are articles and theme issues of interest to science editors. Note how consistently since Volume 1 in 1995 articles relevant to science editors have been published.

Thomsen M, Resnik D. The effectiveness of the erratum in avoiding error propagation in physics. *Sci Eng Ethics* 1995;1(3):231-40.

Kiang N. How are scientific corrections made? *Sci Eng Ethics* 1995;1(4):347-56.

Krimsky S, Rothenberg LS, Stott P, Kyle G. Financial interests of authors in scientific journals: a pilot study of 14 publications. *Sci Eng Ethics* 1996;2(4):395-410.

Issue dedicated to the topic of peer review. *Sci Eng Ethics* 1997;3(1).

Hillman H. Parafraud in biology. *Sci Eng Ethics* 1997;3(2):121-36.

Issue dedicated to authorship, with six commentaries, including one by Drummond Rennie. *Sci Eng Ethics* 1997;3(3).

Jefferson T. Redundant publication in biomedical sciences: scientific misconduct or necessity? *Sci Eng Ethics* 1998;4(2):135-40.

Issue dedicated to information on response to scientific misconduct in and statements from countries other than United States and United Kingdom. *Sci Eng Ethics* 2000;6(1).

Sommer TJ. Suppression of scientific research: bahramdipity and nulltiple scientific discoveries. *Sci Eng Ethics* 2001;7(1):77-104. [The term “bahramdipity” is defined as the cruel suppression of a serendipitous discovery and “nulltiple” a suppressed, unpublished discovery.]

Ziman J. Getting scientists to think about what they are doing. *Sci Eng Ethics* 2001;7(2):165-76.

Davis RM, Müllner M. Editorial independence at medical journals owned by professional associations: a survey of editors. *Sci Eng Ethics* 2001;7(2):513-28.