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Experiments Involving Animals or Humans. Authors using humans, animals, fetal tissue, embryos, or embryonic cells in their experiments should refer to APS’s policies on those subjects. Links to these policies can be found at http://www.the-aps.org/publications/Authorinfo.
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If the infraction is less severe, the Editor, upon the advice of the Publications Chair, sends the author a letter of reprimand and reminds the author of APS publication policies; if the manuscript has been published, the Editor may require the author to publish an apology in the journal to correct the record. If, through the author’s actions, APS has violated the copyright of another journal, the Publications Chair writes a letter of apology to the other journal.

In serious cases of fraud that result in retraction of the article, a retraction notice will be published in the journal and will be linked to the article in the online version. The online version will also be marked “retracted” with the retraction date.
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