



Reference documents:

Education Act no. 1/2011

The Charter of the George Emil Palade University of Medicine, Pharmacy, Science and Technology of Târgu Mureș

Law no. 206/204 on good conduct in scientific research, technological development and innovation

Regulation of the Ethics Commission

www.sistemantiplagiat.ro

ANTIPLAGIARISM REGULATION OF THE GEORGE EMIL PALADE UNIVERSITY OF MEDICINE, PHARMACY, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY OF TÂRGU MUREȘ

*Plagiarism and Collusion – George Emil Palade University of Medicine, Pharmacy,
Science, and Technology of Târgu Mures*

Regulation Code: UMFST-REG-81

Edition 01

Drafted by: Prof. Leonard Azamfirei, PhD.

Date: 15. Oct. 2015

Checked by: The Administrative Board

Date: 19. Oct. 2015

Approved by: Senate

Date: 18. Jan. 2016

Date of enforcement:	18. Jan. 2016
Date of withdrawal:	



Art. 1. The regulation indicates the manner and principles of operation of the antiplagiarism procedure, as well as the manner of use by the university or by its entities (faculties, departments, divisions, etc.) of the antiplagiarism service. The following structures have the right to use the antiplagiarism system: the rector's office, the scientific vice-rector's office, the didactic vice-rector's office, IOSUD, the deans' offices of the three faculties, each of the three journals (AMM, JCCM, RRML), and the Ethics Commission. Each of these entities will nominate a person (from the teaching staff) with responsibilities in this regard and this person will be granted the right to use the system.

Art. 2. The antiplagiarism regulation is applied to all the works elaborated within the university, and the positive result of this control, namely the lack of any suspicion of plagiarism, represents the condition for approving the work's presentation or its publication.

Art. 3. The following documents are subject to antiplagiarism evaluation:

- a) All doctoral theses defended within UMFST G.E. Palade Tg. Mures
- b) All master's dissertations defended within UMFST G.E. Palade Tg. Mures
- c) Selectively, by survey or where there are any suspicions, the bachelor's theses. At least 10% of all submitted bachelor's theses will be assessed separately for each study program. At the beginning of the bachelor's exam, the deans will present a summary report on these evaluations.
- d) All scientific papers published in journals under the auspices of the university (regular issues or supplements), whether they are to be published in full or in summary.
- e) The documents requested for examination by the Ethics Commission, the competition commissions or the commissions for the pre-evaluation of the files submitted for teaching positions' competitions or those specifically requested by the UMFST G.E. Palade Tg. Mures management.

Art. 4. For the documents provided at art. 3, points a, b, c, the text of the paper, in its final version, as approved for presentation, must be submitted to the appropriate department, both in printed format and in electronic format (PDF) with at least 21 days before the deadline set for the paper's presentation.

Art. 5. The text of the paper in printed format must be identical to the one in electronic format. The check regarding the identity of the texts is performed by the responsible person from the University



who receives the paper from the student / the PhD. student (the vice dean responsible within the dean's office for the antiplagiarism procedure, chief-editors of journals, academic secretaries, Doctoral schools or vice-rectorates).

Art. 6. In case there are differences between the printed text and the electronic version, the paper will not be admitted to the antiplagiarism procedure and will be returned to the author.

Art. 7. For the articles / abstracts sent for publication within UMFST G.E. Palade Tg. Mures journals, the antiplagiarism scan will be done by the editors, immediately after the paper is received by the publishing house, prior to the peer review process.

Art. 8. The system user from each department will enter the text of the paper for plagiarism check. The text of the paper must be subject to analysis on the antiplagiarism check platform within 7 days of submission.

Art. 9. A Similarity Report is generated for each checked work and this is made available in Summary and Complete format on the online evaluation platform.

Art. 10. The system user must examine the Complete Similarity Report from the point of view of the introduction within the work of some unauthorized loans. The limits admitted for similarity coefficients are:

a. the similarity coefficient 1 (all paragraphs discovered by the system in other cited documents) does not exceed 5%,

b. the similarity coefficient 2 (paragraphs longer than 25 words) does not exceed 5%.

Art. 11. Based on the analysis of the Complete Similarity Report, the system user will prepare, within 48 hours, the “Minutes of the work’s originality check” (Annex no. 01).

Art. 12. If, after the examination of the Similarity Report, indicated in art. 10, the paper does not raise any suspicion, the system user will sign the “Minutes of the work’s originality check” (Annex no. 01) and will introduce the paper in the System Database, and thus the paper will be admitted for its presentation/ publication.

Art. 13. If, after the examination of the Complete Similarity Report according to the criteria indicated in art. 10, the system user considers that the work requires an additional evaluation due to the presence of unauthorized loans, he/she will send the Complete Similarity Report together with the



“Minutes of the work’s originality check” (Annex no. 01) to the scientific vice-rector, IOSUD director or dean, as the case may be, and he/she will inform the coordinator (scientific advisor, senior author) if any suspicion arises in case of a student, a PhD. student or another teacher.

Art. 14. Based on the Complete Similarity Report, the coordinator of the paper will prepare his opinion (according to the model in Annex no. 02) where he/she analyzes whether the paper contains or does not contain unauthorized loans (plagiarized) or whether the loans contained in the paper that were marked as being quoted do not raise any suspicion from the point of view of the originality of the paper elaborated by the student / the PhD. student or any other author.

Art. 15. The coordinator must check in particular the following aspects:

- a. If the paper contains large chunks of text (at least 50 words) identified by the system as similar,
- b. If there are too many potential loans from a single source,
- c. If there is a coincidence between the theme of the analyzed paper and the potential sources of loans,
- d. If the paper contains drafting features that indicate the presence of "automatic" loans.

Art. 16. The coordinator's opinion must be issued within 2 weeks from the date of paper's submission.

Art. 17. In case the coordinator's states on his own responsibility in the opinion the fact that the work, despite the conditions indicated in art. 10, does not contain inadmissible loans, the system user will attach to the opinion the Complete Similarity Report and will include the work in the System Database. Such a work is considered to be qualified in view of its presentation / publication.

Art. 18. If it appears that the paper does not contain any evidence of plagiarism by its author, but only a large number of citations, indicating a low degree of originality - the paper will not be admitted for its purpose and will not be included in the System Database. The author, after a prior consultation with his coordinator, will make changes to the paper, and the paper will be submitted once again to the entire antiplagiarism procedure.

Art. 19. In case the antiplagiarism evaluation is made by / at the request of the Ethics Commission, the interpretation of the Similarity Report falls within its attributions. In specific cases, the



management of UMFST G.E. Palade Tg. Mures may decide on special evaluation commissions.

Art. 20. In the situation where, the mentioned opinion indicates that the work represents a plagiarism, this will not be admitted in order to be presented/ published, nor will it be included in the System Database. As regards the author / authors of the paper, the scientific vice-rector will notify within 7 days the UMFST G.E. Palade Tg. Mures Ethics Commission which will start the specific evaluation procedure.

Art. 21. All works evaluated by the antiplagiarism system and which have been admitted for presentation/ publication shall be added by the system users in the Database of the Sistemantiplagiat.ro platform within 48 hours from the completion of the anti-plagiarism procedure.

The Senate of the George Emil Palade University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Târgu Mureș approved the present regulation on January 18, 2016, the date of its enforcement.

Annexes

Annex 01: UMFST-REG-81-F01–Ed.01 Minutes of the work’s originality check

Annex 02: UMFST-REG-81-F02–Ed.01 The Opinion of the Scientific Advisor Regarding the Approval of the Paper Presentation.



Annex 01: UMFST-REG-81-F01–Ed.01

MINUTES OF THE WORK’S ORIGINALITY CHECK

Author:
Title:
Scientific Advisor:
Faculty:
Work type:

PhD. thesis	Bachelor thesis
Dissertation	Another type:

The evaluation of the **Complete Similarity Report** indicates the followings:

- The work does not contain unauthorized loans
- The work may contain unauthorized loans*

System User’s comments on unauthorized loans:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Date
System user signature

* in this case, the Complete Similarity Report must be printed and sent to the advisor together with the request for the opinion regarding the approval of the paper presentation according to the attached model - annex no. 2 to the Antiplagiarism Regulation

I hereby confirm the receipt of the minutes of the work’s originality check and the Complete Similarity Report

.....
Scientific Advisor Signature



The Opinion of the Scientific Advisor

Regarding the Approval of the Paper Presentation

I hereby declare that I have read and understand the Complete Similarity Report generated by the Antiplagiarism System for the paper:

Author:

Title:.....
.....
.....

After analyzing the report, we found the following:

- the loans that were detected in the paper are justified (quoted) and do not show any signs of plagiarism. Therefore, I consider that the paper was written independently and I approve its presentation.
- the loans that were detected in the paper do not show signs of plagiarism, but their very large number raises suspicions in terms of the value of the content and this is correlated with the lack of originality of its author. Therefore, I believe that the paper needs to be rewritten, limiting the number of loans.
- The loans that were detected in the paper are not justified and show signs of plagiarism. **Therefore, I do not approve the paper for presentation and I send the notification to the Rector of the University in order to analyze the situation according to the University internal procedures.**
- Intentional alterations of the text appear in the paper, which indicate an attempt to conceal the unauthorized loans. **Therefore, I do not approve the paper for presentation and I send the notification to the Rector of the University in order to analyze the situation according to the University internal procedures.**

Supporting arguments:

.....
.....
.....
.....

Date

Scientific Advisor Signature