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**Ethics editors**

Introduction

Editors should encourage authors to adhere to the highest standards of publication ethics. In addition, editors can contribute indirectly to the responsible conduct of research, implementing their policies in the process of editing. To achieve maximum effect within the research community, ideally all editors should adhere to universal standards and best practices. While there are important differences between different areas of research relevant to each research community, there are important General processes and principles of editorial policy that editors should follow.

Editors should consider themselves as part of a wider professional editorial community, to keep themselves informed about relevant events, and provide his office the opportunity of training and regular briefings on relevant issues.

Editorial principles

1. Accountability and responsibility for journal content

Editors should take responsibility for everything they publish and should have procedures and regulations to ensure the quality of the material that they publish.

2. Editorial independence and integrity

An important part of the responsibility, aimed at ensuring fair and unbiased decisions is the upholding of the principle of editorial independence and integrity.

2.1 Separating decision-making from commercial considerations

Editors must make decisions about publishing alone and take full responsibility for their decisions. You should separate the commercial activities of the journal from editorial processes and decisions. Editors should take an active part in the pricing policy of the publisher and aim for the wide availability of material which they publish.

The advertisement shall undergo the same rigorous quality control and peer review as any other material intended for publication in the journal. Decisions on such materials must be done in the same way as any other content of the magazine. Sponsorship and role of the sponsor must be clearly declared to readers.

Ads must be verified to determine that they follow the guidelines of the journal shall be clearly distinguishable from other content and should not in any way to be associated with the scientific part of the content.

The scientific and technical journal "Electronic engineering. Series 3. Microelectronics" is independent from the sponsor and not advertise and ads.

2.2 Relationship of the editors, publisher or owner

Editors should ideally have a written contract that defines the terms and conditions of their appointment to the journal publisher or owner. The principle of editorial independence should be clearly stated in this agreement. Publishers and owners of the magazine should not play a role in decision-making on the content in the commercial or political reasons. Publishers should not dismiss the editor for any content of the journal, if there was serious misconduct or editorial independent investigation concluded that the editor's decision to publish the material was taken against the academic mission of the magazine.

2.3 The rating of the magazine and decision-making

Editors should not attempt improperly to influence the rating of your journal, artificially increasing the links to the magazine. For example, it is impractical to require that references to articles of this magazine, was included without true scientific reasons. In General, editors should ensure that documents are reviewed on purely scientific grounds and that the authors do not feel pressure to bring a specific publication, without guidance of scientific reasons.

3. Drafting privacy policy

3.1 Authors ' Material

If the journal operates a system where the reviewers are chosen by editors (instead of placing the articles prior to publication subject to comment), editors must protect the confidentiality of authors ' material and remind reviewers to do the same. In General, editors should not share submitted papers with editors of other journals, without permission of the authors or in cases of alleged wrongful conduct (see below). Editors, as a rule, are not required to provide material to lawyers for court cases. Editors should not give any indication of the status of the journal to anyone other than the authors. Submission of articles via the Web app needs to be running in such a way that prevent unauthorized access.

In the case of misconduct and the initiation of the investigation, may be necessary for the disclosure of material to third parties (e.g., an institutional investigation Committee or other editors). Additionally, the technical journal "Electronic engineering. Series 3. Microelectronics" provides database auditors and regulatory authorities, and upon request of the Higher attestation Commission of the Russian Federation (VAK RF).

3.2 Reviewers

Editors should not reveal the identities of the reviewers, except when running an open peer reviews system, however, if reviewers wish to disclose their names, this should be allowed.

If confirmed by the misconduct of suspects of reviewers, it may be necessary to disclose the name of the reviewer to a third party.

4. To encourage maximum transparency and complete and honest reporting

To increase knowledge in scientific fields, it is important to understand why this work was done as it was planned and carried out and by whom, and what it adds to current knowledge. To achieve this understanding, maximum transparency and complete and honest reporting is crucial.

4.1 The Authorship and responsibility

Journals should have a clear policy on authorship that meets the standards within the relevant field. They should give instructions in the information for authors what is expected from the author and, if different, of the Convention of authorship, they should indicate what they are.

For multidisciplinary and collaborative research, should be obvious to the readers of who did what and who takes responsibility for the conduct and validity of each aspect of the study. Each piece of work must have at least one author who takes responsibility for their actions. For example, individual contributions and responsibilities can be listed in a special section. It is assumed that all authors contributed significantly to the work and should be familiar with all its contents, and ideally, it should be declared in the author's statement, submitted to the journal [1].

When there are undeniable changes in authorship in force of the relevant reasons, the editors should require all authors (including those whose names are removed from the author list) were agreed in writing. Disputes over authorship (that is, disagreements about who should or should not be an author before or after publication) cannot be resolved by the editors to adjudication but should be resolved at the institutional level or through other relevant independent bodies for both published and unpublished documents. Editors should then act on the basis of judicial decisions, for example by correcting authorship in published papers.

Journals should have a publicly declared policy on processing the papers submitted by editors or editorial Board members (see paragraph 8.2 editorial conflicts of interest).

4.2 Conflicts of interest and role of the funding source

Editors must have guidelines which require that all authors declared any relevant financial and non-financial conflicts of interest, at least those which can affect the perception of the reader of the article, and would be placed the Declaration in the publication. Sources of research funding must be declared and published, and the role of sources of financing in the concept, conduct, analysis and reporting of the study must be specified and published.

Editors should make clear in their information for authors, or in some sections of the magazine that certain conflicts of interest preclude authorship.

4.3 Full and honest reporting and accountability

Among the most important responsibilities of editors is to maintain high standards in the scientific literature. Although standards differ among journals, editors should work to ensure that all published papers make a substantial new contribution to their field. Editors should discourage so-called "salami publications" (that is, the publication of a minimal unit of research that can be published), to avoid duplication or redundant publication, unless the publication is acceptable to all (e.g., publication in another language with cross-references) and encourage authors to place their work in context of previous work (i.e., the article should indicate why this work was necessary and why it was made that this work adds to scientific knowledge or why it required the repetition of previous work and the reasons why the readers should take it).

Journals should adopt policies that encourage full and honest reporting, for example, by requiring authors in fields where it is standard to submit protocols or research plans, and, if they exist, to provide evidence of compliance with relevant guidelines for reporting. Adherence to the principles of accountability, designed to improve accountability, also makes it easier for editors, reviewers and readers to judge the actual conduct of the study.

Digital files of images, figures and tables should adhere to appropriate standards in its field. Image should not be unnecessarily modified in comparison with the original or lead to misconceptions.

Editors could also consider identifying plagiarism, duplicate or redundant publication by using anti-plagiarism software, or for works with images. If plagiarism or fraudulent image manipulation is detected, this should lead to corresponding consequences for authors (see clause 5.2 on how to fix the offense).

5. In response to criticisms and comments

Reaction and response to published research by other researchers is an important part of scholarly debate in most fields, which, as a rule, should be encouraged. In some fields, journals can facilitate this discussion publishing the responses of readers. Criticism can be part of a General scientific discussion, and you can also select the intersection of the research or the integrity of the publication.

5.1 Ensuring the integrity of the published record - correction

When these errors in published works are indicated by readers, authors, editors, or who do not show that the work invalid, a correction (or erratum) should be published as soon as possible. Online version of the newspaper can be fixed from the date of repair, and links to a typo. If the error indicates that the work or a substantial part of it invalid, the article should be rejected with the reason of withdrawal (i.e., honest error).

5.2 Ensuring the integrity of the published record - suspected research or publication misconduct

If serious concerns are raised by readers, reviewers or other, behavior, conduct, or reporting of academic work, editors should initially contact the authors (ideally all authors) and give them the opportunity to respond to the concerns. If the response is unsatisfactory, editors have to accept it at the institutional level (see below). In rare cases, mainly in the field of Biomedicine, when problems are very serious and the published work may affect clinical practice or public health, editors should inform readers about these problems, for example by issuing an "expression of concern", while the investigation is ongoing. After the investigation is completed, appropriate measures should be taken by editors with an accompanying comment that explains the results of the investigation. Editors should also respond to the findings received from the national research organizations that indicate misconduct relating to a paper published in the journal. Editors may decide to remove the article, if they are convinced that serious misconduct has taken place, even if the institution that conducted the investigation or national body does not recommend it.

Editors should respond to all allegations or suspicions of research or illegal publications raised by readers, reviewers or other editors. Editors are often the first recipients of information about such issues and should act, even in the case of an article which has not been accepted or already rejected (rejected). In addition to responsibility for publication in their journal, the editors have a collective responsibility to study and should act in cases when they become aware of potential violations, if at all possible. Cases of possible plagiarism or duplicate / redundant publication can be assessed by means of editors. However, in most other cases, editors should request an institutional investigation or other appropriate bodies (after receiving the explanation from the authors, if this explanation is unsatisfactory).

Rejected documents should be saved on the website, and they should be clearly marked as a failure in all online versions, including PDF, for the benefit of future readers.

More complete information on specific allegations and suggested actions, such as deviation see website COPE scheme and principles of the challenge:

(http://publicationethics.org/flowcharts; http://publicationethics.org/files/u661/Retractions\_COPE\_gline\_final\_3\_Sept\_09\_\_2\_.pdf).

5.3 Encourage scholarly debate

All journals should consider the best mechanism by which readers can discuss papers, voice criticisms, and add to the debate (in many fields this is done via a print or online in the correspondence). Authors can participate in the debate on published articles and can respond to comments and criticism as appropriate. Such a scientific discussion of published works should occur in a timely manner. Editors should clearly distinguish between criticisms of the limitations of the study and critical comments which indicate possible violations in the studies. Any critical comments which indicate the possibility of misconduct should not just be published, but required further study, even if they are obtained through long time after publication.

Editorial policy relating to journals that publish research in humans and animals.

6. Critically evaluate and raise the standard of ethics research

Especially in biomedical research, but in the social Sciences and Humanities, ethical conduct of research is paramount in the protection of humans and animals. Ethical oversight, appropriate consent procedures, and compliance with relevant laws — all that is required from the authors. Editors should be alert to the problems in this area.

6.1 Confirmation of Ethics and ethical behavior

Editors should generally require approval of the research ethics Committee (or ethics committees) and to be confident that the study was approved and conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki for medical research on humans, but, in addition, must be prepared for problems in the ethical aspects of research. This may mean that the document is sent to reviewers with particular expertise in this area, or the ethics Committee of the magazine if there is one, or that editors require further reassurances or evidence from authors or their institutions.

Articles can be rejected for ethical reasons, even if the studies received approval of the ethics Committee.

6.2 Consent (to participate in the study)

If the research is conducted on humans, editors should ensure that the statement of the approval procedure is included in the content of the article. In most cases, written informed consent is mandatory. If there are any concerns about procedures for obtaining consent, if the research is conducted among vulnerable groups, or if there are doubts about the ethical conduct editors should request that they provide a consent form and to learn more from the authors how it had obtained the consent.

6.3 Consent (to publish)

For all clinical cases, small groups and photographs of people, editors should require authors to have obtained explicit consent for publication (which differs from the consent to participate in the study). This consent should inform participants of work, which will be published in the journal, to make it clear that although every effort will be made to remove unnecessary identifiers, complete anonymity is not possible, and, ideally, described in the work of the people saw and agreed with the article submission.

A signed consent form must be stored in the patient file and not to be sent to the journal (for maximum protection and confidentiality, see paragraph 6.4). There can be exceptions when it is not possible to obtain consent, such as when the person died. In such cases, after careful consideration of the possible harm, you need to be polite to try to obtain consent from relatives. In very rare cases, a very important message to public health can justify publication without consent unless this is not possible, despite all the efforts to obtain the consent and the benefit of publication outweighs the potential harm.

6.4 Data Protection and privacy

Editors should critically assess any potential breaches of data protection and confidentiality of patient information. This includes the requirement to properly execute the consent for the actual research presented, consent for publication where applicable (see clause 6.3), and having editorial policies consistent with the guiding principles of medical confidentiality.

6.5 Observance of relevant laws and best practice principles for ethical behavior

Editors should require authors to adhere to relevant national and international laws and best practice principles where applicable, for example, when conducting research on animals. Editors should encourage the registration of clinical trials.

Editorial Processes

7. Ensuring fair and appropriate peer review process

One of the most important responsibilities of editors is organizing and using a wise and expert evaluation. Editors should explain their processes of peer review information for authors, and specify which parts of the journal are peer-reviewed.

7.1 The Decision on the review

Editors may reject the document without expert assessment, if it is deemed unsuitable for the journal's readers or is of poor quality. This decision must be made objectively and impartially. The criteria used to make that decision, should be clear. The decision not to send the document for review must be based only on the academic content of the article, and should not be under the influence of the nature of the authors or organizations.

7.2 Interaction with reviewers

Editors should use appropriate peer reviewers for the article that is selected for publication by selecting people with sufficient expertise and avoiding conflicts of interest. Editors should ensure that reviews are received in a timely manner.

Reviewers should be told what is expected of them, and they should be informed about any changes in editorial policy. In particular, reviewers should be asked to assess research challenges and ethics of publication (i.e., do they think that the study was conducted without any ethics violations reported or if they have any suspicions of plagiarism, forgery, falsification, or redundant publication). Editors should have a policy to require a formal statement about conflict of interest with the peer reviewers and should ask peer reviewers to inform them about any such conflict of interest at the earliest opportunity so they can make the decision is not biased opinion, if it is possible. Some conflicts of interest can disqualify a Reviewer. Editors should stress confidentiality of the material to peer reviewers and should require peer reviewers to inform them when they ask a colleague for assistance in the review or if they mentor a more Junior colleague in conducting the expert evaluation. Editors should ideally have a mechanism to monitor the quality and timeliness of expert evaluation and to provide feedback to the authors.

7.3 Misconduct of the Reviewer

Editors must take reviewer misconduct seriously and record any allegations of breach of confidentiality, failure to declare conflict of interest (financial or non-financial), misuse of confidential material, or delay of peer review for competitive advantage. Serious misconduct allegations, the reviewer, such as plagiarism, should be considered at the institutional level (for further guidance see: http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/07\_Reviewer\_misconduct.pdf ).

7.4 Interaction with authors

Editors should make it clear to authors what the role of the Reviewer, as this can vary from journal to journal. Some editors consider reviewers as consultants and do not necessarily follow (even if they ask) reviewers ' recommendations about acceptance or rejection. Correspondence with the editors, as a rule, carries out the corresponding author, who must guarantee the involvement of co-authors at all stages. Communicating with all authors at first submission and in the final stage of acceptance can be helpful to be sure that all authors were aware of the submission and approved the publication. As a rule, editors should provide authors with comments of all reviewers in their entirety. However, in exceptional cases, it may be necessary to exclude part of the review, if it contains libelous or insulting remarks. It is important, however, that such editorial changes uncomfortable comments would not be used improperly.

Must always be compelling reasons which should be clearly communicated to the authors if additional reviewers are sought at a late stage in the review process.

The final decision of the editorial Board and the reasons for this should be clearly communicated to authors and reviewers. If the paper is rejected, editors should ideally have an appeals process. The editors, however, are not obliged to reverse its decision.

8. Decision-making Editors

Editors are in a better position to make decisions about publications, so it is very important that the process was fair and impartial as possible, and in accordance with the academic vision of the particular journal.

8.1 Editorial and journal processes

All editorial processes should be clearly specified in the information for authors. In particular, it should be noted that it is expected from the authors, what types of work will be published and how the documents are processed in the log.

All editors should be completely familiar with the journal's policy, vision and constraints. The ultimate responsibility for all decisions rests with the editor-in-chief.

8.2 Editorial conflicts of interest

Editors should not be involved in decisions about papers in 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 shares in a particular company, or if they have a personal relationship with their authors. Journals should have a process for handling such documents. Magazines must also carry out the processing articles submitted by editors or editorial Board members, therefore, to provide objective and independent processing. This process must be specified in the information for authors. Editorial conflicts of interests should be declared, ideally publicly [1].

Responsible research publication: international standards for authors

Introduction

Publication is the final stage of research and, therefore, responsible for her to lie on all researchers. Scientific publications are expected to present a detailed and permanent record of research. Since publications form the basis for new research and application results, they can affect not only scientists, but also, indirectly, on society as a whole. Researchers therefore have a responsibility to their publications are honest, clear, accurate, complete and balanced, and should avoid misleading, selective or ambiguous reporting. The editors of the magazines have a responsibility for ensuring the integrity of research literature, as outlined in the General guidelines.

This document aims to establish international standards for authors of scholarly research publications and to describe responsible practice of reporting on research. We hope that these standards will be endorsed by research institutions, funding and professional societies; will be useful for editors and publishers; and will assist in the preparation of research integrity.

Responsible publication of research

1. Durability and reliability

1.1 The Research reported must be conducted in accordance with ethical standards and responsible manner in compliance with all relevant laws. [See also Singapore statutes on research integrity, www.singaporestatement.org]

1.2 The Research reported must be securely and carefully executed.

1.3 Researchers should use appropriate methods of analysis and display of data (and, if necessary, seek and follow the expert advice on this).

1.4 The Authors should take collective responsibility for their work and for the content of their publications. Researchers should carefully check their publication at all stages, to accurately report the methods and results. The authors should carefully check the calculations, presentations, typescripts, presentation and evidence.

2. Honesty

2.1 Researchers should present their results honestly and without fabrication, falsification or inappropriate data manipulation. Research images (e.g. micrographs, x-rays, photographs of the gel electrophoresis) should not be changed in such a way to mislead.

2.2 Researchers should strive to describe their methods and present their conclusions clearly and unambiguously. Researchers should follow the relevant guidelines for reporting. Publications should provide sufficiently detailed descriptions of the experiments to be repeated by other researchers.

2.3 The Reports research needs to be complete. They should not omit inconvenient, inconsistent or inexplicable results, or results that do not support the hypothesis or interpretation of the authors or sponsors.

2.4 funding Agency and sponsors should not be able to veto publication of findings that do not favor their product or position. Researchers should not enter agreements that allow sponsors to veto the conduct of research or to control the publication of the findings (if there are exceptional circumstances, such as research classified by governments because of security implications).

2.5 The Authors should alert the editor promptly if they discover an error in the submitted, accepted or published papers. Authors should cooperate with editors, and when you want the results of correction or refutation.

2.6 The Authors should submit the work of others accurately in citations and references.

2.7 The Authors should not copy references from other publications if they have not read the cited work.

3 Balance

3.1 The New data should be presented in the context of previous studies. The works of other authors must be fairly represented. Scientific review and synthesis of existing research should be complete, balanced, and should include findings regardless of whether they support the hypothesis or the intended interpretation. Advanced ideas or opinions, represents a common point of view or arguments should be clearly separated from the scientific reviews.

3.2 Shortcomings of this study should be considered in the publications.

4. Originality

4.1 Authors should adhere to the requirements under which the present work is an original study and has not been published elsewhere in any language. The work must not be submitted simultaneously in more than one publication unless the editors agreed to co-publication. If the articles are written in collaboration, that fact should be clearly marked readers.

4.2. Must adhere to applicable laws and copyright conventions. Copyright applies to all published materials such as tables, figures or extensive quotations that can be reproduced only with appropriate permission and acknowledgement.

4.3 Previous Relevant work and publications of other researchers and authors must be appropriately acknowledged and noted in the references. The primary literature should be cited where possible.

4.4 Data, text, figures or ideas provided by other researchers should be properly acknowledged and should not be presented as if they were obtained independently by the author. Original wording taken directly from publications by other researchers should be given in quotes with appropriate references to the sources.

4.5 Authors should inform the editors if the data have been published previously or if multiple reports or multiple analyses of the same dataset under consideration for publication in another journal. Authors must provide copies of appropriate publications or to work in other journals.

4.6 Multiple publications arising from a single research project must be clearly identified as such and the primary publication should be indicated in the references. Translation and adaptation of messages for different audiences should be clearly marked as such, should acknowledge the original, and must comply with the relevant conventions on copyright and permissions requirements. If in doubt, the authors must obtain permission from the original publisher before you republish any work.

5 Transparencies

5.1 All sources of research funding, including direct and indirect financial support, supply of equipment and materials, and other types of support (e.g., helping professionals statistical analysis or writers) must be disclosed.

5.2 The Authors should disclose the role of research funds or sponsors (if any) in the design of the study, execution, analysis, interpretation and reporting.

5.3 the Authors should disclose relevant financial and non-financial interests and relationships which could be considered as affecting the interpretation of their results, or which editors, reviewers and readers would want to know. This includes any connection with the magazine, for example if editors publish their own research in their own journal. In addition, the authors should follow the journal rules and institutional requirements for disclosing competing interests.

6 Appropriate authorship and acknowledgement

6.1 The Research literature serves to record not only what was discovered but also the one who made the discovery. Authorship of scientific publications should therefore accurately reflect the contribution of individuals in work and reporting.

6.2 In cases when the main contribution belongs listed as authors while those who made less substantial or purely technical contributions in research or in the publication are listed in the confirmation section, criteria for authorship and acknowledgement should be agreed at the beginning of the project. Ideally, the criteria of authorship within a particular area should be agreed, published and consistently applied in research institutions, professional and scientific societies, as well as sponsors. While the editors of the journals should publish and promote the accepted authorship criteria appropriate to their region, it is impossible to expect that they can adjudicate in copyright disputes. The responsibility for proper attribution rests with the authors, working under the leadership of their companies. Research institutions should encourage and support fair and accepted standards of attribution and recognition. If necessary, institutions must make decisions in copyright disputes, and should provide the confidence to the process.

6.3 Researchers must ensure that only those persons who meet authorship criteria (i.e. made a substantial contribution to the work) is awarded with authorship and that decent authors are not missed. Agencies and editors of journals should encourage practices which will prevent to guest, gift or Ghost authorship.

Note:

• Guest Authors are those who do not meet the criteria for authorship;

• Gift Authors are those who meet authorship criteria but are listed because of their seniority, reputation or supposed influence;

• Ghost authors are those who meet the criteria for authorship but are not included because meet the criteria for authorship, but as a personal favor or in exchange for payment.

6.4 All authors should be listed, to accept and approve the submitted and accepted versions of the publication. Any changes in the list of authors needs to be approved by all authors including any who have been removed from the list. The corresponding author should act as a liaison between the editor and other authors and should inform the sponsors and involve them in key decisions about the publication (for example, responding to the comments of reviewers).

6.5 The Authors should not use the confirmation erroneously implied contribution or endorsement by individuals who, in fact, was not involved or did not give approval.

7 Accountability and responsibility

7.1 All authors should read this manual and should ensure that publications follow the principles set out in this manual. In most cases, authors should take responsibility for the integrity of the study and its reporting. However, if the authors assume responsibility only for certain aspects of the study and its reporting, this should be stated in the publication.

7.2 Authors should work with the editor or publisher to correct their work promptly if errors or omissions are detected after publication.

7.3 The Authors must observe the relevant conventions, rules and requirements to make the materials, reagents, software or datasets available to other researchers who request them. Researchers, institutions and sponsors should have a clear policy on handling such requests. Authors must also follow the appropriate standards of the journal. While proper gratitude and appreciation is appropriate, researchers should not demand authorship as a condition for the exchange of materials.

7.4 The Authors should appropriately respond to the comments and published the correspondence. They should try to answer questions and to provide clarification or further details where necessary.

8 Adherences to the rules review and publication

8.1 Authors should follow the requirements of publishers that work did not simultaneously submitted for consideration in more than one publication.

8.2 Authors should inform the editor if they withdraw their work from review, or don't want to answer the reviewer's comments after receiving the message of acceptance.

8.3 Authors should respond to reviewers ' comments in a professional and timely manner.

8.4 The Authors have to respect the desire of publishers to embargo for the media and should not generally allow their findings were reported in the press, if they were accepted for publication (but not yet published) in a scientific publication. The authors and their institutions should liaise and cooperate with publishers for the coordination of the media (e.g. press releases and press conferences) and all publications. Press releases should accurately reflect the work and should not include statements that go further than research.

9 Responsible reporting of research involving people or animals

9.1 Appropriate approval, licensing or registration must be obtained prior to the start of the study and the details should be presented in the report (for example, the Advisory Council, approval of the ethics Committee of research of the national licensing authorities for the use of animals).

9.2 At the request of the editors, the authors should provide evidence that the study had received permission and conducted with consideration of ethics (e.g. copies of permits, licenses and consent forms).

9.3 Researchers should not generally publish or transfer of identifiable individual data collected in the course of research without specific consent of the person (or his representative). Researchers should remember that many scholarly journals are now freely available on the Internet, and should therefore be aware of the risk of causing danger or emergency disorders of the readers (e.g. research participants or their families who recognize themselves in the description of the study, images or pedigrees).

9.4 Appropriate statistical analyses should be determined at the beginning of the study, and the data analysis for pre-defined results have to be ready and consistent. Secondary or after-the-fact analysis should be distinguished from primary analyses and those set out in the data analysis.

9.5 Researchers should publish all meaningful research results that could contribute to understanding. In particular, there is an ethical responsibility to publish results of all clinical trials. Publication of unsuccessful studies or experiments that reject a hypothesis may help to prevent others from spending time and resources on such projects. If the findings of small studies and those that are not able to achieve statistically significant results can be combined to produce more useful information (e.g., meta-analysis), such data should be published.

9.6 the Authors must submit research protocols to journal editors on demand (e.g. for clinical trials) so that reviewers and editors can compare the research report with the Protocol and to check that they are carried out in accordance with the plan and that no relevant details have not been overlooked. Researchers should follow the relevant requirements for clinical trial registration and should include the registration number in all publications, to avoid trial .
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 [1] It is necessary to specify in the statement for publication