Checklist reference check form  
Report and analysis

**Table A**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| General Information | |
| Name PhD candidate: | [filled in by PhD candidate] |
| Title of the thesis: | [filled in by PhD candidate] |
| Date of the ceremony: | [filled in by PhD candidate – if known] |
| Language of the thesis: | [filled in by PhD candidate] |
| Name doctoral supervisor: | [filled in by PhD candidate] |

**Table B**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference check details | |
| Technical scan is executed by: | [filled in by Graduate School staff] |
| Date of the check: | [filled in by Graduate School staff] |
| Applied System: | Turnitin |
| Scan output (link): | [filled in by Graduate School staff] |
| Findings: | [filled in by doctoral supervisor] |
| Signature doctoral supervisor: |  |

**Analysis of reference check report**

**To be carried out by the doctoral supervisor on the basis of the items listed below**

* Percentage of overlap with other sources and number of sources with which there is some overlap
* Reasons for the overlap with the most frequently cited sources (including the PhD student’s own articles)
* Citation style and consistency, level of precision with regard to quoted text, and level of compliance with citation standards used in the relevant field
* Consistency between the in-text citations and the bibliography appended to the thesis
* References to books
* Amount of text cited without attribution

*Appendices 2 and 3 provide more information on the thesis analysis to be performed by the PhD supervisor.*

Annex 2  
Example cross checking workflow

Source: Against Plagiarism; A Guide for Editors and Authors. A concise guide useful to all scientists and academicians, from authors to referees and editors, page 129, figure 10.2

Zhang, Y.H., Springer, 2016  
http://www.springer.com/cn/book/9783319241586

Appendix 3  
How to recognise different typologies of plagiarism

EUR regards the following types of references and citations as problematic, and uses the same definitions and typologies of plagiarism proposed by Weber-Wulff & Wohnsdorf (2006), Weber-Wulff’s Plagiarism Detection Software Test 2013 ([http://plagiat.htw-berlin.de/software-en/test2013/report-2013/](https://outlookweb.eur.nl/owa/redir.aspx?SURL=7HplNvfO7i8BYDkV3N_EIASNKO-LOdObv1NOyptSEsplhMlcUDHTCGgAdAB0AHAAOgAvAC8AcABsAGEAZwBpAGEAdAAuAGgAdAB3AC0AYgBlAHIAbABpAG4ALgBkAGUALwBzAG8AZgB0AHcAYQByAGUALQBlAG4ALwB0AGUAcwB0ADIAMAAxADMALwByAGUAcABvAHIAdAAtADIAMAAxADMALwA.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fplagiat.htw-berlin.de%2fsoftware-en%2ftest2013%2freport-2013%2f)) and Weber-Wulff: False Feathers (2014).

The main typologies of plagiarism are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The main typologies of plagiarism | |
| Copy-and-paste plagiarism | Easily spotted borrowing of a full passage, or a part thereof, without identification and acknowledgement. |
| Disguised plagiarism | Borrowing of a full passage, or a part thereof, in which a few words or aspects of the writing style have been changed, without attribution. |
| Translations | Borrowing of a full passage, or a part thereof, translated into the target language, without attribution. |
| Mosaic plagiarism | Multiple borrowings of brief passages from other works in which the order of the words and the original text structure have been changed, without attribution. |
| ‘Marionette’ peference | Reference to a passage from a text, with attribution, which leaves out a part of the text that changes the meaning of the passage or provides more nuance. |

EUR adheres to professional standards used by the Council of Science Editors (among other organisations) in their workflows for journal editors (see Appendix 2 for a sample workflow).[[1]](#footnote-1) Please find below a list of regulations arising from the CSE code:

What is allowed?

1. Quotations of fewer than 100 words from the author’s own work or someone else’s work
2. Paraphrases
3. Repetition and/or summary of an idea
4. Reproduction of a table or image, unless copyright-protected
5. In biomedical sciences: duplication of standard methods
6. A rewritten or revised version of a conference paper, provided that it has been extended with over 60 percent new or revised content.

What is not allowed?

1. Copying an entire passage from a publication or article
2. Plagiarism scores exceeding 10 percent, which cannot be attributed to faulty referencing
3. Review papers that display more than 35 percent of the literal text in the core text

1. <http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)