

**«Approved»**

**Rector of PSU**

**I. Yu. Makarikhin**

## **Regulations on ethical standards of editorial policy of Perm State University**

**Perm, 2014**

### **1. GENERAL PROVISIONS**

1.1. These Regulations set norms of ethical conduct for parties of the process of publication (authors, editors, peer reviewers, publisher), including rules of honesty, confidentiality, control over publications, necessity to take into account possible conflicts of interests.

1.2. Federal State-Funded Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education «Perm State University», being a publisher, undertakes obligations to control all stages of the process of preparing periodicals and admits its ethical and other responsibilities related to publishing scientific works.

1.3. PSU takes consistent measures in order to provide strict adherence to the principles of editorial ethics according to the recommendations and standards of the international Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and takes into account valuable experience of influential international journals and publishing houses. In its activity the publisher follows provisions of Chapter 70 «Copyright» of the Civil Code of the Russian Federation.

### **2. ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR AUTHORS OF PUBLICATIONS**

2.1. Standard of access to raw data of research and their storage.

Authors must furnish primary material (raw data) of their research at the request of the editors and should be ready to provide public access to the data. Authors must keep these data within a reasonable period of time after publication for their possible reproduction and inspection.

2.2. Standard of originality (inadmissibility of plagiarism and self-plagiarism).

Manuscripts submitted by authors for the editors' consideration should present results of original research. If an author used works of other persons in his/her article

or the article contains fragments (quotations) from works of other persons, this must be stated in a proper way, namely the original source should be stated in the list of references. Plagiarism, as well as autoplagerism, in any form is considered to be unethical and unacceptable.

### 2.3. Standard of scientific research results validity.

Authors must provide valid results of the research conducted. Scientific findings should be presented in a correct and unbiased manner. Knowingly false and fabricated statements are inadmissible.

### 2.4. Standard of single publication.

Manuscripts submitted to the editors should not be previously published elsewhere and should not be submitted to any other journals for consideration. Submission of the same article to a few journals simultaneously is unethical and impermissible. This rule is also fair for translation of articles into another language.

### 2.5. Standard of validation of sources.

Scientific and other sources that have been used by authors and that have essentially influenced research results should be accurately stated in the list of references.

### 2.6. Standard of authorship of manuscripts.

All persons who have essentially contributed to the research results should be listed as co-authors of the article. The authoring team should only include such persons. The author submitting a manuscript to the editors guarantees that all the co-authors have been mentioned and that all of them have seen and approved the final version of the manuscript and consent to its submission. Persons who contributed to the research in a less important way can be acknowledged in the text of the article.

### 2.7. Standard of disclosure of conflicts of interests on the part of authors.

Authors must disclose any conflicts of interests that can influence assessment and interpretation of their manuscripts. The corresponding conflict of interests should be stated in the text of the article with the authors' explanations. All sources of research funding should be disclosed and necessarily stated in manuscripts.

### 2.8. Standard of correcting mistakes in published works.

In the event that an author finds an essential mistake or inaccuracy in the article that has already been published, they must promptly give notice to editors in order to take a coordinated decision about the way of presenting objective information. If the editors learn about a mistake from third parties, the author must promptly eliminate the error or provide evidence proving that there is no mistake.

### 3. ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR THE EDITORS

#### 3.1. Standard of decision-making on publishing an article.

The editors take a decision as to which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published taking into account their compliance with formatting guidelines for manuscripts and results of peer review. Works are accepted for consideration due to their academic value alone.

While decision-making on publication of an article, the editors adhere to the journal's policy and do not allow publication of articles showing signs of slander, insult, plagiarism or copyright violation. The final decision as to whether an article should be published or rejected is taken by the editor-in-chief. The editor-in-chief is accountable and responsible for making a work of authorship available to the public.

#### 3.2. Standard of equality of all authors.

The editors only assess intellectual content of manuscripts regardless of authors' race, nationality, origin, citizenship, sex, occupation, place of work, place of residence, as well as their political, philosophical, religious and other views.

#### 3.3. Standard of confidentiality.

The editors must ensure that submitted manuscripts are treated in a confidential manner, which means the information cannot be passed to third parties. The editorial board must not divulge any information concerning manuscripts to anyone apart from the authors, peer reviewers and publisher.

#### 3.4. Standard of disclosure of conflicts of interests on the part of the editors.

The editors guarantee that materials of manuscripts rejected from publication will not be used in works prepared by members of the editorial board unless the authors give their permission in writing.

The editorial board will refuse to consider a manuscript if there is a conflict of interests arising from competition, collaboration or any other kind of relations with authors and organizations connected with the work. The editors must require all participants of the process of publishing articles to disclose any competing interests.

The editor-in-chief is obliged to require all authors to declare information about existing conflicts of interest, as well as publish corrections, if any appear to be necessary after the manuscript has been published. If needed, the editor-in-chief may take any other appropriate actions, such as publication of retraction or expression of concern.

### 3.5. Standard of handling complaints of an ethical nature.

The editors should promptly handle each complaint of an ethical nature concerning a submitted manuscript or published article irrespective of when it was received. The editors must take appropriate reasonable measures towards such complaints. These measures include informing the author, consideration of the complaint, further communication with corresponding institutions and research organizations, if necessary. In the event that validity of the claim is avowed, correction, retraction or another corresponding declaration is to be published. The editors may reject the article from publication, sever further collaboration with the author, as well as take any other appropriate steps to prevent the author's unethical conduct in the future.

### 3.6. Standard of citing the periodical where an article is published.

Under no circumstances may the editors force authors to cite one of the periodicals issued by PSU as a necessary condition for a manuscript to be accepted for publication. Any recommendations concerning citing should be based on scientific value of recommended works and aimed at improvement of the submitted material. The editorial board members may recommend some sources to authors as a part of the peer review procedure, however, recommendations of this kind cannot be reduced to directions to cite one of the scientific journals published by PSU.

## 4. ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR PEER REVIEWERS

### 4.1. Standard of peer reviewers' contribution to editorial decisions.

Expert assessment of manuscripts given by peer reviewers facilitates editorial decision-making and also helps authors to improve their manuscripts. The decision as

to whether to accept a manuscript for publication, return it to the author for revising and improving or reject it from publication is taken by the editorial board basing on the peer review results.

#### 4.2. Standard of peer reviewers' qualifications.

Peer reviewers must have qualifications sufficient for assessing manuscripts. Peer reviewers deeming themselves not competent enough to consider the given issues should refuse to perform peer review.

#### 4.3. Standard of the term of peer review.

Peer reviewers must accomplish reviews within the time periods specified by the editors. If it is impossible to consider a manuscript and prepare a review in a timely manner, the peer reviewer must inform the editors about the fact he/she cannot perform peer review.

#### 4.4. Standard of confidentiality on the part of peer reviewers.

A manuscript submitted for peer review must be treated as a confidential document irrespective of the form of peer review accepted in the journal. Peer reviewers may only show articles to others or discuss articles with them with the permission of the editor-in-chief. Peer reviewers must not use ideas or information presented in manuscripts before publication.

#### 4.5. Standard of objectivity of peer review.

Peer reviewers must conduct expert assessment in an impartial manner. It is impermissible for a peer reviewer to criticize an author's personality. Peer reviewers should assess manuscripts by their scientific content irrespective of the authors' race, sex, nationality, citizenship or political positions. All conclusions drawn by peer reviewers should be provided with strong arguments and references to reliable sources.

#### 4.6. Standard of validation of sources.

Peer reviewers should name the works that influenced results of the research but have not been stated by the author, if there are any. Peer reviewers must pay the editors' attention to any facts of substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and a work that has been published before and is familiar to the peer reviewer.

4.7. Standard of disclosure of conflicts of interests on the part of peer reviewers.

Peer reviewers cannot use materials of unpublished manuscripts in their own research except as authorized in writing by the authors. Peer reviewers must refuse to consider manuscripts if this entails a conflict of interests caused by competitive or other kind of relations with the author or an organization related to the manuscript.

**AGREED:**

**Vice-rector for Research and Innovation**

**V.N. Kataev**

**Head of the Department of Legal Support**

**of the Property Complex Office**

**N.S. Ardzeniya**

**Head of the Department**

**of Scientific Periodicals and Serials**

**N.V. Yakshina**