

PUBLICATION ETHICS AND PUBLICATION MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

(Composed using the publication principles of Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK) and in accordance with recommendations of Elsevier, Best practical methods of COPE for journal editors and Publication ethics of Academy Publisher)

The publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal is an essential building block in the development of a coherent and respected network of knowledge. It is a direct reflection of the quality of the work of the authors and the institutions that support them.

It is very important to agree upon standards of expected ethical behavior for all parties involved in the act of publishing: the author, the journal editor, the peer reviewer, the publisher and the society.

The publisher and editorial board of the Journal "Innovative technologies and scientific solutions for industries" pay serious attention to the responsibilities on the surveillance for all publishing stages, at the same time the editorial board recognizes the plenitude of ethical or other obligations.

The editorial board of the Journal "Innovative technologies and scientific solutions for industries" is committed to ensuring that advertising, reprint or other commercial revenue has no impact or influence on editorial decisions. In addition, the Editor-in-Chief personally as well as the entire editorial board will assist in communications with other journals and/or publishers where this is useful and necessary.

1. ETHICAL OBLIGATIONS OF REVIEWERS

The aim of the institute of review of the scientific journal is to maintain the highest ethical standards of research, according to which before the beginning of the review reviewer should aware about requirements for ethics in scientific publications. The process of reviewing articles submitted to the journal targets on the requirements of the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#) and on the experience of leading scientific communities. This can improve the quality of printed materials and overcome prejudice and injustice in declining or accepting articles. The journal policy towards main ethical norms, which should the subjects of the reviewing process rely upon, includes the following:

1. If the reviewer is not sure that his qualifications are not enough for the level and direction of research presented in the article, he should refuse from reviewing;
2. The aim of reviewer is an objective evaluation of the current articles' quality and identifying the extent of its compliance with the scientific, literary and ethical standards;
3. During the process of review the selfish interests of individuals should be negated and the intellectual independence of authors should be respected;
4. For the ensuring of the each author's right for the intellectual property any use of the received arguments and conclusions of the author by the reviewers is prohibited without his permission;
5. If there is a conflict of interests of the research results with personal reviewer development or if there is any such professional or personal-close ties between author and reviewer, which may effect on the reviewer's opinion, he should return the article, pointing to a conflict of interests;
6. The priority item is the confidentiality of peer-reviewed articles, given that reviewer could not disclose information from the article or discuss not yet made public the findings and recommendations by other colleagues (exception is when a reviewer needs special consultation, which requires permission of the editorial board);
7. The seriousness of the accusations in plagiarism requires by the reviewer an adequate and reasoned justification of his comments. Any allegations in plagiarism or the presence of biased citations should be accompanied by reference (the reviewer's conclusions should not be defamatory or to discredit the author without any serious grounds for this);
8. If a reviewer has doubt about plagiarism, authorship or falsification of data, he necessarily has to contact the editorial board with the requirement for collective consideration of the article;

9. Because the reviewer has to tag any cases of insufficient quoting by the authors of works of other scholars, working in area of peer-reviewed article, by the authors, comments about the lack of citation in own reviewer research identified as biased;

10. The maintenance of a constant frequency of publication of the journal requires high reviewer's discipline, which revealed through the timely provision of review on article and the respectable relations to the authors (if there are a manifestation of discourtesy towards the authors or systematic low-quality reviews of articles or violation of terms of reviews, the relationship with this reviewer is terminated);

11. It is forbidden for reviewers to use or disclose unpublished information or arguments of the author, it is not considered controversial to some ethical termination to stop own reviewer's research if in his opinion they are inconclusive.

2. ETHICAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD

1. **Decision on publication.** The Editor-in-Chief of the Journal “Innovative technologies and scientific solutions for industries” is responsible for the decision, which articles submitted to the Journal should be published. Check of the scientific work for the timeliness of the topic and its worth for researchers and readers should always be the main factors, which influence the decision of the article publication. Editor-in-Chief can follow the policy of the journal editorial board, his decision should also be based provisions of the law, which prohibits copyright infringement and plagiarism.

2. **Fair play principle.** The Editor-in-Chief and editorial board should evaluate the manuscripts based on their intellectual content irrespective of the author's race, gender, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political views.

3. **Confidentiality.** The Editor-in-Chief and all employees of the editorial office have no rights to disclosure the information on submitted works to anybody except the respective author, reviewer, other editorial consultants, and editor, if necessary.

4. **Disclosure of information and conflict of interests.** Unpublished materials used in the manuscript should not be used in own researches of the Editor-in-Chief without the author's written consent. Closed information or ideas obtained during the reviewing process should remain confidential and not used for personal benefits. The Editor-in-Chief should declare about the withdrawal of his candidacy (to commission the Deputy Editor-in-Chief or other member of the editorial board to engage in review of the manuscript instead of him) regarding the manuscript review, if he has a conflict of interests as a result of competitive relationships, cooperation, or other relationships and relations with one of authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions related to the submitted manuscripts. The Editor-in-Chief has to demand disclosure of corresponding competitive interests and publication of amendments from all participants of the process, if a conflict of interests was discovered after publication. If necessary, other respective measures should be taken such as publication of denial or apology.

5. **Participation and cooperation in an investigation.** If an ethical complaint is submitted regarding the provided manuscript or published article, the Editor-in-Chief should take appropriate reasonable measures. Such measures usually include the contact with the author of the article or manuscript and appropriate consideration of the corresponding complaint or claim, however, an addressing to appropriate institutions and research organizations can be needed. If the complaint is supported, it is necessary to publish the corresponding corrections, denials, or apologies. Every report on facts of unethical conduct should be considered, even if it was done years later after the publication.

3. ETHICAL OBLIGATIONS OF AUTHORS

1. **Reporting standards.** Authors reporting the results of original research should provide the exact report on the performed work as well objectively report its significance. Date, based on which the research has been performed, should be clearly reported in written form. The article should contain a sufficient amount of information and references to primary sources that will allow others to use the particular work. Fraudulent or knowingly false statements are equal to unethical conduct and are unaccepted. Review of articles and special publications should also be precise and objective, while the editorial “point of view” should be clearly outlined.

2. **Access to data and their storage.** Authors can be asked to provide initial data for editorial review. They should be ready to provide free access to such data, if it is possible, and in any case, they should be ready to store these data during a rational period after their publication.

3. Originality and plagiarism. Authors should submit only entirely original works, and if the authors used works and/or statements of other people, they should be used appropriately as citations. There are different forms of plagiarism, e.g., “presentation” of another’s article as an own one, copying or rephrasing of a significant part of another’s text (without quoting the authorship), conversion of the results of studies conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms is considered as an unethical conduct and is inappropriate.

4. Multiple, repeated, and competing publications. Author should not publish an article, which describes in fact the same study, in more than one journal or primary publication. Submission of the article to more than one journal at the same time is considered as an unethical conduct and is inappropriate. The author should not submit previously published articles for consideration to other journals. Sometimes, publication of some kinds of articles (e.g., medical recommendations, translations) in more than one journal is justified, if respective requirements are met. The authors and editors of involved journals has to come to an agreement regarding the fact that the secondary publication should reflect the same data and same interpretation as the primary document. The secondary publication should also contain a reference to the primary publication.

5. Confirmation of sources. It is always necessary to present correctly the works of other authors. The authors should provide references on publications having fundamental effect on determination of the nature of the presented work. Information obtained privately, by letter writing or discussion with third parties should not be used without receiving written consent from its source. Also, information obtained while providing / obtaining confidential services such as judicial acts or grant applications should not be used without written consent of the executive of these services.

6. Authorship of the work. The authorship should be restricted by those people who contributed significantly to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported research. All those who made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Those who participated in some significant aspects of the research project should be reflected in the list of project participants. The author should ensure that the names of all co-authors are indicated in the article and nobody who is not a co-author is not included and all co-authors have seen the final version of the paper and approved it as well as gave their permission for its publication.

7. Risks and issues regarding using humans or animals. If a work/article is related to chemical substances, physicochemical processes, or equipment, which pose great risks for human or animal health, the author should clearly indicate it in his work. If the work supposes using animals or humans as experimental objects, the author should guarantee that the works contains statements and proofs that all procedures have been performed in accordance with respective laws and institutional principles as well as the fact that the appropriate state committees approved it. The work should include a statement and confirmation from appropriate authorities about the consent for experiments with humans. The right of people for confidentiality should be always observed.

8. Disclosure of information and conflict of interests. All authors should disclose information on any financial and other significant conflicts of interests, which can influence the research results or their interpretation. All sources of financial support of the project should be disclosed. Examples of possible conflicts of interests, which should be disclosed, are: information on employer, informational consultations, stock ownership, honorary, paid consultations of experts, patent applications/registrations as well as grants and other kind of financial support. All potential conflicts of interests should be disclosed at the earliest stage as possible.

9. Significant errors in published works. If the author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his published work, he has to promptly notify the editor or publisher of the journal about it and cooperate in retracing or correcting this error. If the editor or publisher learns from a third person that the published work contains significant errors, it is the obligation of the author to promptly retract or correct them or provide evidence to the editorial board of the correctness of the original article.