RESPONSIBLE APPROACH FOR PUBLICATION OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH: INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR EDITORS

**A brief summary**

• Editors are responsible for everything they publish and should acknowledge this responsibility;

• Editors take fair and unbiased decisions independent from commercial consideration and ensure honest and effective peer review process;

• Editors apply editorial policies that encourage maximum transparency and the maximum completeness and accuracy of the publications.

• Editors to protect the authenticity of the published materials through revisions and denials (opinion articles) when necessary, and without ignoring the cases of alleged misconduct in research and publishing their results;

• Editors struggle with misconduct when reviewing and editing;

• Editors critically assess the ethical conduct of research on human beings and animals;

• Independent reviewers and authors will be informed about all requirements to the requirements;

• Editors have adequate policies to resolve editorial conflicts of interest.

**Introduction**

Acting as custodians and managers of scientific knowledge, the editors should encourage authors to strive for the highest standards of publication ethics, as well as themselves to follow them. In addition, the editors are in a unique position, giving them the opportunity through their editorial policy to indirectly foster responsible conduct of research. For maximum effect in the scientific community, ideally all editors should adhere to universal standards and accepted practices. While between different fields of science, there are important differences, and not all guidelines may be applicable in each scientific community, there are important common editorial policies, processes, and principles that editors should follow in order to ensure the accuracy of publications about the research.

These recommendations are the starting point and is aimed at editors of journals. While books and monographs in many areas are important research materials, and recommendations for editors of books go beyond these recommendations. It is hoped that in the future, and recommendations for them will be added to this document.

Editors should regard themselves as part of a wider professional editorial community, to be aware of modern methods and rules in their area and to ensure competence and awareness of their editorial staff in matters of their professional activities.

A good editor must adhere to a far greater number of principles than is contained in this document. Principles, policies, and processes proposed in this document aims, first and foremost, on integrity in research and publications.

**Editorial principles**

**1. Responsibility for the content of the journal**

Editors shall be responsible for all published materials and apply procedures and policies to ensure high quality and reliability of the published materials.

**2. Editorial independence and integrity**

An important part of the responsibility for making fair and objective decisions is the principle of editorial independence and integrity.

**2.1 the Independence of decision-making from commercial considerations**

Editors make decisions only on the basis of the scientific qualities of the articles and take full responsibility for their decisions. The adopted procedures are intended to separate commercial activities within a journal from editorial processes and decisions. Editors should take an active interest in the pricing policy of publishers and fight for the wide availability of published materials.

Sponsored supplements should be subjected to the same rigorous quality control and peer review as any other material in the journal. Decisions regarding such materials should be taken just as any other journal. The fact of the sponsorship and role of the sponsor must be clearly communicated to the readers.

The advertisement must meet the policy of the journal, to be clearly distinguishable from other content and should not have any connection with the scientific content of the journal.

**2.2 the Relationship of editors to publishers or owners of the journal**

Publishers can't fire the editor for any reason related to the content of the journal, with the exception of cases of gross editorial negligence, or if an independent investigation shows that the editor's decision to publish the material was taken contrary to the scientific mission of the journal.

**2.3 performance of the journal and decision-making**

The editors do not attempt improperly to influence the rating of the journal by an artificial increase in any performance journal. For example, inappropriate is the requirement to add links to the articles published in the journal – these links should appear only on the basis of purely scientific considerations. In General, editors should ensure that reviewing of the materials was exclusively on scientific grounds, and that the authors are not pressured for citations of specific publications for non-scientific reasons.

**3. Drafting privacy policy**

**3.1 authors ' Material**

If the journal uses a system whereby independent reviewers are selected by editors (instead of publishing materials for review as Preprint version), the editors ensure the confidentiality of authors ' material and inform about the necessity to maintain confidentiality of the reviewers. As a rule, editors do not share the resulting articles with the editors of other journals, except the consent of the authors or alleged misconduct (see below). Editors, as a rule, are not required to provide material to lawyers for court proceedings. Editors no one reported the status of the material in the journal, except for the authors. System submission of materials for publication via the Internet should work so that the probability of unauthorized access were excluded.

In the investigation of misconduct may require the disclosure of material to third parties (for example, the Supervisory Board of the institution or other editors).

**3.2 Reviewers**

The editors are committed to maintain the confidentiality of reviewers with the exception of cases when the system of peer review is open. However, if reviewers wish to disclose their names, they should be allowed to do.

In the case of alleged misconduct of the reviewer may require the disclosure of the name of the reviewer to a third party.

**Overall editorial policy**

**4. Encouraging maximum transparency, completeness and integrity of publications**

To improve scientific knowledge it is important to understand why it was done or that scientific paper, how and by whom it was planned and carried out and what it adds to existing knowledge. To achieve this understanding is extremely important for maximum transparency and complete and honest presentation of the research.

**4.1 the Authorship and responsibility**

Journals should have clear policy on authorship that complies with the standards in a certain area. They provide authors with guidance, contains the requirements for them, and if the region adopted different approaches to the definition of authorship, declare which one they adhere to.

The multidisciplinary or joint study, readers should be clear on who did what and who is responsible for the implementation and reliability of a particular aspect of the study. Each piece of work must be at least one author who is responsible for its authenticity. For example, the role of the individual participants of the project can be described in "user Contributions". It is expected that all authors make a significant contribution to the material and are familiar with all its contents; ideally, this should be stated in the statement of authorship, submitted to the journal.

When the list of authors for good reasons changes are made, do not cause any objections from authors, editors must demand that all authors (including those whose names are excluded from the list of sponsors) expressed consent in written form. Disputes concerning authorship for both published and unpublished works (that is, disagreement as to who should or should not be the author of arising before or after publication) cannot be resolved by the editors and are considered in research institutions or in other relevant independent bodies. In such cases, the editors are acting in accordance with the results of conflict resolution, for example by correcting authorship in published papers.

The logs should be publicly declared policy on how handled articles written by their editors or editorial Board members.

**4.2. Conflicts of interest and role of the funding source**

The editors should be policy requiring that all authors declared any relevant financial and non-financial conflicts of interest and were included in the article mention, at least, those of them that could affect the perception of the content by the reader. You need to declare the source of funding for research and publish it; also it is specified and published, the role of the funding source in the formation of the concept of work, its conduct, data analysis and preparation of the publication. Editors should clearly inform the authors if there are potential conflicts of interest of their work cannot be published in certain sections of the journal (e.g. written-to-order articles or reviews).

**4.3 Full and honest reporting and adherence to the rules of provision of data**

One of the most important responsibilities of editors is to maintain a high standard in the scientific literature. Although the standards of different journals vary in their work, the editors ensure that all published work has made a significant new contribution to their field. Editors prevent the emergence of so-called "salami publications" (that is, publications about the individual small pieces of research), avoid duplicate or redundant publications, except where indicated and acceptable to all (for example, publication in different languages with cross-references) and encourage authors to present their work in the context of previous works (i.e., explain why this work was necessary/ done, what is the contribution of this work, or why it took to duplicate previous work and that readers have to).

Journals use policy that encourages full and fair description of the material, for example, by requiring authors to submit protocols or study plans in areas where it is accepted and, whenever possible, to present evidence that the article adhered to certain guidelines. Although these guidelines were developed to improve the quality of scientific articles, compliance also helps editors, reviewers and readers to better assess the actual conduct of the study.

Digital image files, and tables must conform to the appropriate standards in a particular area. Image should not be improperly altered from the original or present the results of a misleading way.

Editors also can use the appropriate software to check for image manipulation, plagiarism, duplicate or redundant publication. In the case of plagiarism or fraudulent image manipulation, the problem should be considered together with the authors and relevant institutions (see paragraph on procedures to handle misconduct: 5.2)

**5. Reaction to criticism and problems**

The response to published research by other researchers is an important part of scholarly debate in most fields and should generally be encouraged. In some areas, journalists can "strengthen" such a debate by publishing readers ' feedback. Criticism can be part of scientific debate, but it may draw attention to the lack of integrity of the study or publication.

**5.1 ensuring the accuracy of the published data – amendment**

When readers, authors and editors detects indisputable errors in the published work, which will not make the work invalid, required as soon as possible to amend (or correct typos). Online version of the article can be fixed with a date of correction and a link to the printed erratum. If the error renders the work or substantial parts of it invalid, the article should be withdrawn with the reason (e.g., a bona fide error).

**5.2 ensuring the accuracy of the published data – suspected misconduct in research or publication**

If the readers, reviewers, or other individuals raised the issue in respect of performance, reliability or publication of scientific work, editors, first and foremost, contact the authors (ideally all authors) and give them the opportunity to answer the charges. If their response is unsatisfactory, the editors refer the case to the research institution (see below). In rare cases, often in the field of Biomedicine, if the problem is very serious and the published work is likely to affect clinical practice or public health, the editors inform the readers about such suspicions, for example by providing "expressions of doubt" in the course of the investigation. On completion of investigation, the editors should take appropriate measures, accompanied by a comment explaining the findings of the investigation. Editors should also respond to data received from organizations for the protection of integrity of national studies that indicate misconduct in respect of the materials published in their journal. Editors can decide to withdraw if there is the belief that misconduct had occurred, even if the investigation by the institution or national body does not recommend this.

Editors should respond to all allegations or suspicions of misconduct in respect of the study or publication emanating from readers, reviewers or other editors. Editors are often the first to get information about such issues and should act even in the case that the material has not yet been accepted for publication or its publication has not yet been denied. In addition to a special responsibility for publications in their journal, the editors have a collective responsibility for the published scientific knowledge and should act in any cases of potentially unlawful conduct. Cases of possible plagiarism or duplicate/ redundant publication can be assessed by the editors themselves. However, in most other cases, editors request an investigation by the institution or other appropriate bodies (after receiving clarification from the authors, if this explanation was not satisfactory).

Recalled materials must continue to be in online access to the presence of a visible mark on their recall of all online versions, including the PDF, for the benefit of future readers.

**5.3 Encourage scholarly debate**

All journals should find the best mechanism by which readers can discuss the materials, to criticize them and to participate in the debate (in many fields this is done via a print or online correspondence section). Authors can contribute to the debate, having received permission to respond to comments and criticisms, where appropriate. Such scientific debate on the published work must occur in a timely manner. Editors should clearly distinguish between criticism pointing to the lack of results of research and criticism, involving the possibility of misconduct. Criticism of the second kind should not just be published, and should trigger an investigation, even if the publication took place a long period of time.

Editorial policies relevant only to journals that publish research on humans or animals

**6. Critical evaluation and requirements of high standards of ethical conduct of research**

Especially in biomedical research, as well as in social Sciences and Humanities, ethical conduct of research is fundamental to the protection of humans and animals. From the author of the required procedures for the monitoring of ethical issues and obtaining the necessary approvals and compliance with relevant legislation. Editors must be particularly vigilant regarding problems in this area.

**6.1 Approval of ethics committees and ethical research**

As a rule, editors should require the approval of the study from the ethics Committee (or Supervisory Board of companies) and to ensure that it was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki for medical research on humans, and also must remain vigilant regarding the ethics of research. This may mean that the material is sent to independent reviewers with some experience in this area, the Committee on ethics of the journal, if it exists, or that editors require further evidence or evidence from authors or their institutions.

The material can be denied for ethical reasons, even if the study received approval from the ethics Committee.

**6.2 Consent (for participation in the study)**

If the research is conducted on humans, editors should ensure that the report on the procedure for obtaining consent. In most cases, the required standard is consent made in writing. If the procedures for obtaining consent are in any doubt, or the study was conducted on receptive groups, or there are doubts about the ethical nature of the meeting, editors should ask to see a consent form and then ask the authors, exactly how consent was obtained.

**6.3 Consent (to the publication)**

In the case of a single event, series of events or the presence of images of people, editors should require the authors obtain explicit consent for publication (which differs from the consent to participate in the study). Thus it is necessary to inform the participants, in what journal will publish your work, to make clear that, although the deletion of data that identifies a person, will be undertaken all reasonable steps that complete anonymity cannot be achieved and, ideally, the person giving consent for publication, should be familiar with the published material.

A signed consent form is stored in a medical card of the patient, and is not sent to the log (to maximize data protection and confidentiality, see paragraph 6.4). May be exceptional cases in which obtaining consent is impossible, for example, when a person died. Then you must carefully analyze the possible damages and to show courtesy to obtain consent from relatives. In extremely rare cases, a publication in the field of public health without consent may be justified if consent, despite all efforts, it is impossible to obtain, and the value of the publication exceeds the possible damage.

**6.4 data Protection and privacy**

The editors critically assess any potential breaches of data protection and confidentiality of the patient. This includes the requirement duly provided consent for the actual study, the consent for publication, when such is applicable (see paragraph 6.3), and having editorial policies that meet the requirements regarding privacy of the patient.

**6.5 Compliance with applicable law and best practice guides regarding the ethics of conducting research**

The editors require from the authors to observe the relevant national and international legislation and guidelines on best practice in cases where they are applicable, for example, when conducting research on animals. Editors should encourage the registration of clinical trials.

**Editorial processes**

**7. Ensuring fair and due process of peer review**

One of the most important responsibilities of editors is organizing and using peer review in an honest and prudent manner. The editors describe the adopted procedure, an independent review of the information materials for authors, indicating also which parts of the journal are subjected to peer review.

**7.1 the Decision to carry out a review**

Editors may reject a paper without peer-reviews, if it is found to be of poor quality or unsuitable for the readers. This decision is made fairly and impartially. Criteria for such decision should be clearly defined. The decision not to send the material to an independent peer review may be based only on the scientific content of the material and cannot depend on the identity of the authors or from their places of work.

**7.2 Interaction with independent reviewers**

Editors use the services of independent reviewers for materials being considered for publication by selecting people with sufficient expertise and avoiding those with conflicts of interest. The editors provide timely reviews.

Independent reviewers are reported, what are the requirements for them, and also provided information about any changes in editorial policy. In particular, independent reviewers need assessment studies and questions the ethics of publication (i.e., whether, in their opinion, the study was conducted ethically, if they have suspicions of plagiarism, forgery, falsification, or redundant publication). Editors should formally request the independent reviewers on conflicts of interest and require independent reviewers to promptly inform them about any such conflict of interest so that they can decide whether unbiased review. Certain conflicts of interest may result in disqualification of the independent reviewer. Editors should ask peer reviewers the confidentiality of the submitted materials, and to require independent reviewers to report, if during the review they seek help from colleagues or in the implementation of the review play the role of mentor to young colleagues. Ideally, editors should have a mechanism to control the quality and timeliness of peer review and feedback from reviewers.

**7.3 Misconduct of the reviewer**

Editors should take seriously the misconduct of the reviewer and consider any report of breach of confidentiality, failure to report conflicts of interest (financial and non-financial), inappropriate use of confidential material, or delay in independent review in the interests of competitors. In the case of serious violations on the part of the reviewer, such as plagiarism, the editor should report them to the institution in which he works

**7.4 Interaction with authors**

Editors should explain to the authors that the role of the independent reviewer may vary depending on the journal. Some editors consider reviewers as consultants and can refrain from observing (or even request) their recommendations regarding acceptance or rejection of the publication. Correspondence editors, as a rule, is conducted with the responsible author, which ensures the participation of sponsors at all stages. Communicating with all authors during the submission of the material and at the stage of final adoption, it may be useful to ensure that all authors are aware and approve the publication. As a rule, the editors make a decision based on all the comments of independent reviewers in General. However, in exceptional cases, it may require removal of parts of the review, if it is, for example, contains libelous or insulting remarks. It is important, however, that such editorial analysis was not aimed at "suppressing" inconvenient to comment.

If in the later stage of the process is finding more reviewers, it should always be a reasonable reason, clearly inform the authors.

The final editorial decision and the reasons for its adoption are clearly communicated to authors and reviewers. If the material is rejected, editors, ideally, should consider the objections of the authors according to the adopted procedure. Thus, to reverse its decision editors don't agree.

**8. The adoption of editorial decisions**

Editors occupy powerful position, taking decisions on acceptance or rejection of the publications that make special demands on the integrity and objectivity of the process and its relevance to the scientific vision of the particular journal.

**8.1 Processing of materials editors and journal**

All editorial processes should be described in the information materials for authors. In particular, they must specify the requirements for authors, types of published materials and materials processing journal. All editors should be familiar with the journal's policy, his point of view and theme. Final responsibility for all decisions of the responsible editor in chief.

**8.2 Conflicts of interest editor**

Editors should not make decisions in respect of materials for which they have a conflict of interest, for example if they work or have worked in the same institution and collaborated with the authors, if they own a stake in a particular company or have a personal relationship with the authors. Journals should have a procedure for handling such materials and procedure materials submitted by editors or editorial Board members to ensure objective and independent review of such materials. This procedure is described in the information materials for authors. Conflicts of interest the editor should be delivered, ideally, in public.
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