

Publication ethics and publication malpractice statement

To uphold integrity in the publishing process, Editors are expected to do the following:

1. Provide unbiased consideration to all manuscripts offered for publication, judging each on its merits without regard to personal bias, race, religion, politics, nationality, gender, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).
2. Process all manuscripts promptly.
3. Take full responsibility for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript, working in the best interest of science and excellence and utilizing the recommendations of peer reviewers. Manuscripts may be rejected without review if considered inappropriate for the journal, and Editors may consult with Associate Editors or reviewers to aid in this decision.
4. Ensure the peer review process is objective, fair, and thorough. Be vigilant in avoiding conflict of interest among reviewers and authors.
5. Never disclose information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than those from whom professional advice is sought. An Editor may disclose manuscript titles and names of authors of papers that have been accepted for publication.
6. Respect the intellectual independence of authors. Results that are at variance with the dominant paradigm, as well as null results, should be given full and equal consideration based upon the criteria of importance, originality, clarity, and relevance.
7. Fully delegate responsibility of a manuscript to another Editor or Associate Editor to avoid conflict of interest. This includes manuscripts authored by the Chief Editor, manuscripts authored by scientists with whom the Editor has a close relationship, or when a manuscript is so closely related to the research of an Editor as to create a conflict of interest.
8. Never use unpublished information or interpretations from a submitted manuscript for their own or a reviewer's own research, except with the consent of the author.
9. Quickly facilitate publication of errata to correct erroneous information in a published report.

Ethical Obligations of Authors/Contributors:

To contribute the highest quality science to publications, authors are expected to do the following:

1. Present a precise and accurate account of the research performed and a clear, objective discussion of its significance.
2. Include sufficient detail and reference to sources of information in a manuscript to permit the author's peers to repeat the work. Limitations on use of or access to data must be clearly identified.
3. Identify sources of all information and cite those publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work and that guide the reader quickly to the primary and other earlier work essential for understanding the present investigation. Information obtained privately, as in conversation or correspondence, should not be used or reported without explicit permission from the source.
4. Carefully document methodology, assumptions, and uncertainty.

5. Follow the appropriate procedures in force in their countries that govern the ethics of work done with human or animal subjects.
6. Never plagiarize of other works. Always provide appropriate citation.
7. Avoid unnecessary fragmentation or redundant publication of research reports to artificially increase the number of publications.
8. Never include personal criticism in a written piece of work.
9. Report to the Editor any changes made to the manuscript after acceptance.
10. Include as coauthors only those persons who have made significant scientific contributions to the work, and determine order of authorship in a manner appropriate to the contribution. All coauthors share responsibility for the quality and integrity of the submitted and published manuscript.
11. Reveal to the Editor any potential conflict of interest that might be affected by publication of the results contained in a manuscript or in the development of the research.
12. In the role of corresponding author, ensure that all coauthors are fully cognizant of the steps and changes in the manuscript during the review and that all authors agree to the final version of the manuscript.

Ethical Obligations of Reviewers of Manuscripts

To ensure the highest quality science to publications, reviewers are expected to do the following:

1. Provide clearly written, unbiased feedback in a timely manner on the scholarly merits and scientific value of the work, together with a documented basis for the reviewer's opinion.
2. Thoroughly address all review criteria provided by the journal.
3. Decline to review manuscripts for which the reviewer lacks sufficient time, is not Professional Ethics qualified, or has a conflict of interest with any of the authors, including personal or competitive relationships.
4. Explain and support judgments adequately so that Editors and authors may understand the basis of their comments. Any statement by a reviewer on an observation, derivation, or argument that has been previously published should be accompanied by the relevant citation.
5. Provide citations to relevant work by other scientists as appropriate.
6. Alert the Editor to any significant similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper or manuscript submitted concurrently to another journal. Report any plagiarism or the appearance of plagiarism.
7. Never use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, except with the consent of the author.
8. Never include personal criticism of the author in reviewing a manuscript

Publication ethics and publication malpractice statement has been compiled on the basis of American Geophysical Union (AGU) Scientific Integrity and Professional Ethics – 2013 (<http://ethics.agu.org/files/2013/03/Scientific-Integrity-and-Professional-Ethics.pdf>)