

IEEE policy requires all submissions to its journals and conference proceedings to be screened through a plagiarism detection process, IEEE offers CrossCheck to all publication volunteers, at no cost.

CrossCheck compares submitted articles against a database of millions of published scholarly papers, and billions of web pages, and provides a detailed report that highlights any similarity to previously published content within the submission.

While CrossCheck does an excellent job of detecting similarities, it is still necessary for volunteers and staff to review the results and determine if the similarities are legitimate, or if they require an even closer review.

CrossCheck can save valuable reviewer time by **detecting problem submissions before the review process**. It also prevents plagiarism from appearing in the publication and in Xplore.

CrossCheck is available to IEEE publications volunteers through:

- ScholarOne Manuscripts
- Full service vendors who have integrated CrossCheck
- IEEE CrossCheck Portal

#### Step One: UPLOADING SUBMISSIONS

Publications volunteers are encouraged to upload **all new manuscripts**, and any revised manuscripts that are substantially rewritten. Some vendors automate the upload process, while other vendors (and the IEEE CrossCheck Portal) require the publications volunteer to upload submissions manually.

#### Step Two: EMAIL ALERTS

IEEE recommends a **30% similarity** threshold to identify submissions that should be reviewed for possible problems. Submissions that exceed 30% similarity will generate an email alert from CrossCheck (or the vendor's submission system) and will be sent to the publications volunteer and the IPR Office.

#### Step Three: VIEWING REPORTS

**An alert alone should not be used to determine if a submission is problematic or not.** Publications volunteers should access the full similarity report of any alert to review what material was detected to be similar. Vendors provide access to the full reports through their manuscript submission systems. Publications volunteers using the IEEE CrossCheck Portal can access full reports by clicking the similarity score on the Results Page for their publication.

#### Step Four: INTERPRETING RESULTS

It's important to keep in mind that the percentage level of each similarity report can contain several individual sources (sometimes as many as 20 or more). Each individual source has its own similarity percentage that is combined into the report's full similarity percentage. For example, a paper with a similarity report of 20% may have 20 individual sources, each with only 1% of similar text, which can represent commonly used phrases.

#### Things to consider when reviewing CrossCheck Reports

- Is the similarity to the authors' own work?
- Is the similarity to work that has been properly cited in the submission?

## Navigating the Similarity Reports

Publications volunteers may find the **Document Viewer report** an easier way to **see an overview** of the similarity found in a manuscript, since it retains the formatting of the manuscript. Publications volunteers may find the **Text Only report** easier to use when **examining the individual sources** to determine the type of similarity, and whether it is properly reused. Switching between the two screens is easily done by clicking the “Text Only Report” link (**F**) at the bottom right of the Document Viewer page, or clicking the “Document Viewer” link (**J**) at the top right of the Text Only report page.

### CROSSCHECK SIMILARITY REPORT—DOCUMENT VIEWER

23-Jan-2014 03:47PM 3545 words • 106 matches • 21 sources 06169104.pdf 66%

**A** **B** **C** **D** **E** **F**

**Match Overview**

Rank	Source	Words	Similarity
1	Internet 1181 words crawled on 20-Apr-2012 www.psall.com	1181	33%
2	Publications 407 words Bhuvaneshwari, K. Saha and Geetha, P. "Tumor, Edema and Atrophy Segmentation of Brain MRI Images Using Wavelet Transform and Fuzzy Logic", International Review on Computers & Software, 2013.	407	11%
3	Publications 271 words Saha, G. Thamarai and Das, S. "A Technique to Tumor Detection from Brain MRI Images Using FCM and Neural Network", International Review on Computers & Software, 2013.	271	8%
4	Publications 152 words Anguraj, K. and Padma, S. "A Precise Facial Paralysis Degree Evaluation with Severity Classification Using Image Processing and Neural Network", International Review on Computers & Software, 2013.	152	4%
5	CrossCheck 67 words Jayachandran, A. and R. Dhanasekaran, "Automatic detection of brain tumor in magnetic resonance images using multi-texton histogram and support vector machine", International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology, 2013.	67	2%
6	CrossCheck 48 words J.C. Rajasekhar, "Statistical approach to segmentation of single channel cerebral MR images", IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 1999.	48	1%
7	Publications 48 words Khobragade, Vaishali P. and Vinayaba, A. "Classification of Microarray Gene Expression Data Using Hybrid Dot Product", International Review on Computers & Software, 2013.	48	1%
8	Internet 34 words crawled on 08-Jul-2010 nrip-web.in.ac.cn	34	1%
9	Publications 29 words Gopinath, G. and Dhanasekaran, R. "Segmentation of Cerebrospinal Fluid and Internal Brain Tissue in Brain MRI Images Using Fuzzy Logic", International Review on Computers & Software, 2013.	29	1%
10	Internet 21 words Saha, G. Thamarai and Das, S. "A Technique to Tumor Detection from Brain MRI Images Using FCM and Neural Network", International Review on Computers & Software, 2013.	21	1%

**A:** Highlighted manuscript showing all similar text color coded and numbered to the matching sources

**B:** List of all matching sources

**C:** Total percentage of similarity

**D:** Individual matching sources including the percentage of similarity to the total manuscript

**E:** Highlighted area corresponding to the individual source

**F:** Link to “Text Only Report” view of report

### CROSSCHECK SIMILARITY REPORT—TEXT ONLY REPORT

Jump to: [Li paper] - 75% 06169104.pdf 66% Similarity Index

**G** **H** **I** **J**

**Match Overview**

Rank	Source	Words	Similarity
1	Internet 1181 words / 33% - Internet from 20-Apr-2012 www.psall.com	1181	33%
2	Publications 407 words / 11% - Publications Bhuvaneshwari, K. Saha and Geetha, P. "Tumor, Edema and Atrophy Segmentation of Brain MRI Images Using Wavelet Transform and Fuzzy Logic", International Review on Computers & Software, 2013.	407	11%
3	Publications 271 words / 8% - Publications Saha, G. Thamarai and Das, S. "A Technique to Tumor Detection from Brain MRI Images Using FCM and Neural Network", International Review on Computers & Software, 2013.	271	8%
4	Publications 152 words / 4% - Publications Anguraj, K. and Padma, S. "A Precise Facial Paralysis Degree Evaluation with Severity Classification Using Image Processing and Neural Network", International Review on Computers & Software, 2013.	152	4%
5	CrossCheck 67 words / 2% - CrossCheck Jayachandran, A. and R. Dhanasekaran, "Automatic detection of brain tumor in magnetic resonance images using multi-texton histogram and support vector machine", International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology, 2013.	67	2%
6	CrossCheck 48 words / 1% - CrossCheck J.C. Rajasekhar, "Statistical approach to segmentation of single channel cerebral MR images", IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 1999.	48	1%
7	Publications 48 words / 1% - Publications Khobragade, Vaishali P. and Vinayaba, A. "Classification of Microarray Gene Expression Data Using Hybrid Soft Computing Approach", International Journal of Computer Science Issues IJCSI, 2012.	48	1%

**G:** Highlighted manuscript showing all similar text color coded and numbered to the matching source

**H:** List of all matching sources

**I:** Individual matching sources including the percentage of similarity to the total manuscript, as well as direct links to the source material found online

**J:** Link to “Document Viewer” report

## Actions to Take if Problems Are Found in a Submission

Publications volunteers should use their best judgment when deciding what is the most appropriate action to take if a manuscript has inappropriately reused content.

### MULTIPLE SUBMISSION

Authors must submit original work that:

- has not appeared elsewhere for publication
- is not under review for another refereed publication
- cites previous work
- indicates how it differs from the previously published work

Authors must also **inform the publications volunteer** when submitting any previously published work.

**Publications volunteers should have their own measure of how much of an author's previous work should be included in a new submission.** It is common in technical publishing for material to be presented at various stages of its evolution. The IEEE recognizes the importance of this evolutionary publication process as a significant means

of scientific communication and fully supports this publishing standard. At the same time the **IEEE requires that this evolutionary process be fully referenced.**

### PLAGIARISM

IEEE separates plagiarism into five levels:

- Level One: 50-100% copied
- Level Two: 20-50% copied
- Level Three: < 20% copied
- Level Four: Improper paraphrasing
- Level Five: Credited but unclear delineation

IEEE defines plagiarism as “the use of someone else's prior ideas, processes, results, or words without explicitly acknowledging the original author and source.”

Plagiarism in any form is unacceptable and is considered a serious breach of professional conduct, with potentially severe ethical and legal consequences.

The IPR Office suggests that publications volunteers may choose to **editorially reject** submissions with minor amounts of plagiarized material (e.g., less than 20%) without needing to pursue formal plagiarism cases. When a decision to reject occurs, publications volunteers should alert the IPR Office to let them know the author's name and the details of the incident so that it can be recorded for any repeat incidents by the same author.

If a publications volunteer believes the author's misused content was a simple mistake, and the manuscript has merit, then it would be acceptable to inform the author of the reported similarity and have the author **revise the paper accordingly and resubmit it.**

If a publications volunteer believes the plagiarism was intentional and serious enough that a formal case is warranted, then the incident should be pursued. Please send a copy of the paper and all relevant information to the IPR Office at the address below:

**Publications volunteers who have any questions, or wish to discuss CrossCheck results and possible actions to take, should contact the IPR Office.**

[copyrights@ieee.org](mailto:copyrights@ieee.org)  
<http://www.ieee.org/ipr>