

# **PUBLISHING ETHICS**

## **1. Publishing ethics**

— No discrimination of conference participants on grounds of gender, sexual orientation, religious or political beliefs, ethnic or geographical origin shall be tolerated.

— Each member of the Editorial Board and each expert-reviewer have an obligation to reveal all and any cases of misconduct or unethical behaviour they come across or find out about and bring them to attention of the editor and publisher. Whoever informs the editor or publisher of unethical behaviour should provide sufficient evidence and facts for an investigation to be initiated.

— If cases of misconduct have been revealed and convincingly proven, the editor or publisher shall have a right to place a formal embargo on the author's further publications in the Conference Proceeding or on a peer-reviewer/member of the Editorial Board's further involvement in reviewing and expert evaluations; also, the employers of these persons have to be informed of the incident along with professional associations and/or groups to which they are members.

## **2. Issues concerning publication**

— All the articles have to be original and submitted for publication for the first time ever. We never accept articles already published elsewhere except for reprinting materials which have relevant scientific value but which were published in periodicals that have already become bibliographic rarities. We allow to publish translations of own articles previously published in another language if the translation rights do not belong to another publisher.

— All the articles submitted to the editors are checked for improper borrowings. If plagiarism, unreliable or falsified scientific data are found in an article it is rejected.

— A published article will be retracted if the following is revealed:

- earlier duplicate publications, with over 70% of the text copied into the new article. To avoid this, do not submit one article to several journals;
- flawed, doctored or fake data;
- errors that undermine the article's scientific value;
- an undisclosed conflict of interests or other infringements of publishing ethics.

— Every article submitted to the editors for publication should contain a reference list along with information on financial support, if any, provided for the research and for the resulting paper.

## **3. Authors' rights and responsibilities**

— All co-authors should be familiar with the final text of the article and agree to the publication.

— All co-authors should always make a substantial contribution to the research. No 'nominal' authorship is allowed, i.e., when someone is included in the list of the authors without actually having taken any part in the research or writing of the article.

— If significant mistakes or inaccuracies are found in the article at the stage of its reviewing or after its publication, the author immediately notifies the editors of the journal.

— Reviewing should be confidential (double-blind peer review). We do not allow any provisional arrangements between the author and the reviewers.

— Each and every author has a right to partake in peer-reviewing. Within a calendar month of the date of the article submission, he/she has a right to inquire about the editor's decision: whether his/her article is accepted, rejected or considered as needing revision. Based on the outcomes of the review process, the author is informed of the reviewers' opinion and comments.

—The author has a right to receive notifications at all stages of work with his/her article.

— If the author does not accept the editor's decision, he/she has a right to submit a reasonable appellation against such decision. Each case is passed on to and considered by the Editorial Board with participation of an expert who has not dealt with the article before. This new expert is commissioned a new peer-review of the article. He/she is not provided with the reports of previous reviewers.

#### **4. Responsibilities of reviewers**

— A peer-reviewer's inferences and opinions have to be well-grounded; no value judgments are allowed without reliance upon facts or logic.

— The experts have to opine professionally and with tolerance on any scientifically proven conclusions of an author even if their entire study or any of its parts may seem to be in disagreement with the reviewer's ethical principles.

— A reviewer must not have any conflict of interests in respect of the article under review, its author/s and/or its sponsors. Where conflicts of interest may arise (official subordination of the author and reviewer, scientific supervision, co-authors, etc.), the reviewer must refuse to participate in the review, notifying the editors of the conflict of interest.

— A reviewer must specify any published materials pertaining to the subject-matter of the article under review that have not been cited in it, if he/she is aware of such publications.

— Reviewing of articles should be confidential (double-blind peer review).

— The reviewer should not disclose information obtained during the review or use it to his/her advantage.

#### **5. Editors' rights and responsibilities**

— An Editor-in-Chief has the sole and exclusive authority to accept/reject articles for publication, for which they bear full responsibility. Such decisions are taken at an Editorial Board meeting after consideration and public discussion of the statements of an expert-reviewer; if any author submits an appellation against the decision, then one more expert-review of the article under consideration has to be prepared and discussed at the meeting.

— The editors must have no conflict of interests in respect of the articles and other materials they consider for publication.

— The only relevant criterion for accepting an article for publication is its scientific, and not any other value. At the same time, it should demonstrate a clear and explicit statement of its subject-matter, along with good literary style.

— The editors do not make substantive changes in the text without the consent of the author.

— The editors ensure respect for the copyright and the authors' right to a name.

— If any mistakes or fallacies are revealed, the editors should facilitate the publication of corrections or retractions.

— The editors must ensure that the names of peer-reviewers remain strictly confidential and are not disclosed to authors under any conceivable circumstances.

— The Editor-in-Chief bears full responsibility for everything that comes out on the pages of the conference proceedings but he/she can publish material, with the concept or with certain arguments of which he/she does not agree, while recognizing the scientific or discussion value of this material. The editors must strive to meet the needs of both the readers and the authors, constantly improve their publication, ensure the highest possible quality of published materials, commit to and safeguard freedom of expression and speech, adhere to the rules and norms of publishing ethics.