



ALMANAC OF CLINICAL MEDICINE

PUBLISHING ETHICS REGULATIONS

Publishing ethics of the journal “Almanac of Clinical Medicine” is based on Ethics Code for scientific publications developed by the Ethics Committee on scientific publications, as well as on materials on editorial ethics from the Elsevier Publishing House*. The Code pool together and reveal general principles and rules to be complied with by participants of scientific publication process in their relationship, including authors, reviewers, editors, publishers, distributors and readers.

Main Terms

Ethics of scientific publications – a normative system of professional conduct among authors, reviewers, editors, publishers and readers in the process of creation, distribution and use of scientific publications.

Editor – a representative of a scientific journal or editorial who prepares materials for publications and maintains communication with authors and readers of scientific publications.

Author – a person or group of persons (authors team) participating in creation of a publication of results of a study.

Reviewer – an expert acting on behalf of a scientific journal or an editorial and providing scientific expertise and assessment of author’s materials with a purpose to determine possibility of their publication.

Editorial – a physical or legal entity releasing a scientific publication to the public.

Reader – any person who got access to published materials.

Plagiarism – intended misappropriation of authorship of somebody else’s work of science or art, somebody else’s ideas or inventions. Plagiarism can be a breach of copyright laws and legislations and patent legislations and, as such, may entail legal liability.

Principles of professional ethics in editorial and publisher’s functions

In his/hers functions, Editor is responsible for making author’s work public that is associated with necessity to comply the following basic principles:

- when making publication decision, Editor of a scientific journal is governed by reliability of data and by scientific significance of the work under consideration,
- Editor should evaluate intellectual contents of a manuscript irrespective of author’s race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, origin, nationality, social status or political preferences,
- unpublished data obtained from manuscripts submitted for consideration should not be used for personal purposes or transmitted to the third parties without a written author’s consent. Any information and ideas obtained during editing and related to potential benefits should be kept confidential and not be used for any personal benefit,
- Editor should not allow publication of information if there are enough grounds to consider it plagiarism,
- Editor, together with Publisher, should not leave unanswered any claims related to manuscripts considered, or to published materials, as well as in the case of a conflict situation they should undertake all the necessary to restore violated rights.

Ethical principles in a reviewer's function

Reviewer provides his/hers scientific expertise in evaluation of author's materials, whereby his/hers activities should be unbiased and compliant with the following principles:

- any manuscript received for reviewing should be regarded as a confidential document that is must not be transmitted for inspection or discussion to any third parties that are not authorized by the Editorial,
- a Reviewer should give objective and well-reasoned assessment to results of a study. Any personal criticism to the author is unacceptable,
- unpublished data obtained from manuscripts submitted for consideration should not be used by a Reviewer for his/hers personal purposes,
- should a Reviewer, in his/her own opinion, not have enough qualification to assess a manuscript, or cannot be objective, for instance, if a conflict of interests is present with an author or an organization, he/she must inform the Editor so that he/she can be excluded for reviewing of the manuscript.

Principles to be complied with by an author of scientific publications

Author (or authors' team) is aware that he/she takes primary responsibility for newness/originality and reliability of results of a scientific study that implies compliance with the following principles:

- Authors of a manuscript should give reliable results of their studies. Deliberately erroneous or fraud statements are unacceptable,
- Authors should guarantee that results of their study given in the submitted manuscript are fully original. Imported/unoriginal fragments or statements must be accompanied by a mandatory reference to their author and primary source. Excessive adoptions, as well as any form of plagiarism, including improperly formatted citations, rephrasing or appropriation of rights for somebody else's results, are unethical and unacceptable,
- it is obligatory to recognize contributions of all persons who anyhow influenced the study, in particular, giving references to the works that had been of importance during study conduct,
- Authors should not submit a manuscript that has been sent to another journal and is under consideration elsewhere, as well as a paper that has been already published,
- all persons who contributed significantly to study conduct are to be included into the authors' list. It is impossible to include those who did not participate in the study into the author's list,
- if an author reveals significant errors or inaccuracies in his/hers manuscript when it is being considered or after it has been published, he/she should inform the Editorial as soon as possible.

* Sources: <http://publicet.org/code/>; Code of conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors – Committee on Publication Ethics (<http://publicationethics.org/resources/code-conduct>). Publishing Ethics, Publishing Ethics Resource Kit – Elsevier (<http://www.elsevier.com/about/publishing-guidelines/publishing-ethics>)