The Statement of Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice

According to SCOPUS ideology the prevention of publication malpractice is the responsibility of every author, editor, publisher and institution. We also follow this system of views and in accordance with SCOPUS requirements (SCOPUS) and Committee on Publication Ethics recommendations (COPE) we publish clear and consistent Statement of Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice.

Publication decisions

The editor is responsible for deciding which of the papers submitted to the journal should be published. The editor’s decision to accept or reject a paper for publication is based on the paper’s importance, originality, clarity and its relevance to the remit of the journal. The editor may confer with the editorial board members or reviewers in making this decision. The editor actively seeks the views of authors, readers, reviewers and the editorial board members about the ways of improving the journal’s processes. The effects of the journal policy on author and reviewer behavior are assessed, and the editor revises policy to encourage responsible behavior.

Confidentiality

The editor, the editorial board members, and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted paper to anyone other than the authors of the paper, reviewers, potential reviewers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted paper will not be used in the own research of the editor or the editorial board members without the express written consent of the author. The authors should disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication. The editor manages the conflicts of interest of authors, reviewers and editorial board members.

DUTIES OF REVIEWERS

Contribution to editorial decisions

Peer review assists the editor and the editorial board members in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper. The editor adopt peer review methods best suited to the journal and revise peer review practices periodically to see if improvement is possible. Reviewers are encouraged to comment on ethical questions, on the originality of the paper and to be alert to redundant publication and plagiarism. The editor acknowledges the contribution of reviewers to the journal.

Confidentiality

Information regarding papers submitted by authors should be kept confidential. The papers submitted to the journal remain confidential while under review as well. Information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

Standards of objectivity
The editor monitors the performance of peer reviewers and takes necessary steps to ensure this is of high standard. Reviews should be conducted objectively, fair, unbiased and timely. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. The papers should be reviewed by suitably qualified reviewers. Readers should be informed about steps taken to ensure that submissions from the editorial board members receive an objective and unbiased evaluation.

Acknowledgement of sources

The reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. The reviewers should also call to the editor’s attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the paper under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

DUTIES OF AUTHORS

Reporting standards

The authors should submit their original research and use citations for any already reported materials. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable. The guidance to authors on everything that is expected of them is published and this guidance is regularly updated.

Data access and retention

The editor takes all reasonable steps to ensure the quality of the published papers. Decisions about the journal house style are based on relevant evidence of factors that raise the quality of reporting (e.g. structured abstracts). Authors may be asked to provide the raw data related with their paper for editorial review and should retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

Originality and plagiarism

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Errors, inaccurate or misleading statements must be corrected promptly and with due prominence. The editor encourages and is willing to consider cogent criticisms of the papers published in the journal. The authors of the criticized papers are given the opportunity to respond.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

The authors should not submit for consideration in the journal previously published papers. The authors should not in general publish papers describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or conference. Submitting the same paper to more than one journal or conference constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Authorship of the paper

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.