

# **ACNR Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement**

*This ethics statement for ACNR is based on the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.*

## **Duties of Editors**

### *Fair play and editorial independence*

Submitted manuscripts are evaluated for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

### *Confidentiality*

Editors and editorial staff will not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

### *Disclosure and conflicts of interest*

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an Editor's own research without the explicit written consent of the author(s).

### *Publication decisions*

The editors ensure that all submitted manuscripts being considered for publication undergo peer-review by reviewers who are expert in the field. The Editors are responsible for deciding which of the manuscripts submitted to the journal will be published, based on the validation of the work in question, its importance to researchers and readers, the reviewers' comments, and such legal requirements as are currently in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The Editors may confer with other reviewers in making this decision.

## **Duties of Reviewers**

### *Contribution to editorial decisions*

Peer review assists editors in making editorial decisions and, through editorial communications with authors, may assist authors in improving their manuscripts. ACNR believes that peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication and lies at the heart of scientific endeavour.

### *Promptness*

Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should immediately notify the editors and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

### *Confidentiality*

Any manuscripts received for review are confidential documents and must be treated as such; they must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorised by the Editor (who would only do so under exceptional and specific circumstances). This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

### *Standards of objectivity*

Reviews should be conducted objectively and observations formulated clearly with supporting arguments so that authors can use them for improving the manuscript. Personal criticism of the authors is inappropriate.

#### *Acknowledgement of sources*

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that is an observation, derivation or argument that has been reported in previous publications should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also notify the editors of any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other manuscript (published or unpublished) of which they have personal knowledge.

#### *Disclosure and conflicts of interest*

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the submission.

### **Duties of Authors**

#### *Reporting standards*

Authors of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed and the results, followed by an objective discussion of the significance of the work. The manuscript should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Review articles should be accurate, objective and comprehensive, while editorial 'opinion' or perspective pieces should be clearly identified as such. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

#### *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.

#### *Multiple, duplicate, redundant or concurrent submission/publication*

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Parallel submission of the same manuscript to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

#### *Authorship of the manuscript*

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. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be named in an Acknowledgement section. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors (according to the above definition) and no inappropriate co-authors are included in the author list of the manuscript, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

#### *Disclosure and conflicts of interest*

All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or their interpretation in the manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

#### *Acknowledgement of sources*

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.

#### *Hazards and human or animal subjects*

If the work involves chemicals, procedures or equipment that have any unusual hazards inherent in their use, the authors must clearly identify these in the manuscript.

#### *Peer review*

Authors are obliged to participate in the peer review process and cooperate fully by responding promptly to editors' requests for raw data, clarifications, and proof of ethics approval, patient consents and copyright permissions. In the case of a first decision of "revisions necessary", authors should respond to the reviewers' comments systematically, point by point, and in a timely manner, revising and re-submitting their manuscript to the journal by the deadline given.

#### *Fundamental errors in published works*

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal's Editors or publisher and cooperate with them to either retract the paper or to publish an appropriate erratum.

### **Publisher's confirmation**

In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism the publisher, in close collaboration with the Editors, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum or, in the most severe cases, the complete retraction of the affected work. The Publisher and the Journal do not discriminate on the basis of age, colour, religion, disability, marital status, race, gender or sexual orientation in its publishing programmes, services and activities.

#### *Access to journal content*

The publisher is committed to the permanent availability and preservation of scholarly research and ensures accessibility by maintaining our own digital archive.