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The Editorial Board of the Journal *Izvestiya of Saratov University* commits to maintaining good scientific reputation. Our journals publish scholarly works and we bear responsibility for keeping high standards of the publications. The Editorial Board strives to uphold ethical norms accepted by the international research community and prevent any violation of such norms.

The present document is compiled in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee of Publishing Ethics[[1]](https://bonjour.sgu.ru/en/content/publishing-ethics#_ftn1). It also considers the experience of the leading international Publishing Houses[[2]](https://bonjour.sgu.ru/en/content/publishing-ethics#_ftn2) and Journals’ Editorial Boards.

**1. Duties of Editor in Chief and Editorial Board Members**

**1.1. Publication decision**

Editor in Chief (Editor) of the Journal is solely and independently responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The validation of the work in question and its importance to researchers and readers must always underpin such decisions. The Editor is guided by the policies of the Journal's Editorial Board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The Editor may consult other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

**1.2. Impartiality**

Editorial Board members should carry out proper assessment of the manuscripts for their intellectual content regardless of the race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political preferences of the authors.

**1.3. Confidentiality**

The Editor and other editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to third parties. Information about the submitted manuscript is permitted to be disclosed to the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, when deemed necessary.

**1.4. Disclosure policy and conflicts of interest**

1.4.1 Unpublished materials of a submitted manuscript must not be used in the research of the Editorial Board members without the author’s written consent. Information and/or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and cannot be used for personal advantage by the people who have had access to the manuscript.

1.4.2 Editorial Board members should refrain from considering the manuscripts (i.e. ask the Editor, Deputy Editor or other members of the Editorial board to review the manuscript instead) in case of the conflict of interests resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, and probably other organizations related to this paper.

**1.5. Monitoring publications**

An Editorial Board member presenting strong evidence of the invalidity of the paper research assumptions or conclusions, should report this to the Editor (and/or the Editorial Board) in order to promptly notify them about the necessity of introducing changes, paper withdrawal, expression of concern or other statements, as may be relevant in the situation.

**1.6. Engagement and collaboration in research**

The Editorial Board takes appropriate response measures in case of ethical claims concerning reviewed manuscripts or published papers. Such measures will generally include contacting the author of the manuscript or published paper and giving due consideration to the respective complaint or claim, but may also imply further communications with the corresponding institutions and research centers.

**2. Duties of reviewers**

**2.1. Contribution to the Editorial Board decisions**

Peer review helps the Editorial Board make decisions about publication and by means of the corresponding communication with the author may also help the author in improving the quality of the paper. Peer review is an essential component of formal scientific communications, and it lies at the heart of the scientific method. The Editorial Board shares the view that all scholars who wish to contribute to publications have to do a significant share of reviewing.

**2.2. Promptness**

In case a selected reviewer feels they do not have enough expertise to assess all aspects of the manuscript or if circumstances arise that will prevent them from submitting a timely review, they should notify the Editorial Board and ask to be removed from the review process.

**2.3. Confidentiality**

Any manuscript received for review must be treated as a confidential document. It must not be shown to or discussed with any other person unless authorized to do so by the Editor.

**2.4. Manuscript requirements and objectivity**

A reviewer should give an objective evaluation. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly and support them with arguments.

**2.5. Acknowledgement of sources**

Reviewers should alert the authors to the existence of prominent relevant papers of other researchers which they fail to reference. Any statement used in the manuscript (observation, conclusion or argument) originating from a previously published source should have a corresponding reference in bibliography. A reviewer should also draw the Editor's attention to any substantial similarity or match between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper they are personally aware of.

**2.6. Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

2.6.1 Unpublished materials of a submitted manuscript must not be used for the personal advantage of the reviewers without the author’s written consent. Information and/or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential. This information and ideas cannot be used for personal advantage of the reviewer.

2.6.2. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts if there is a conflict of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other interactions or relationships with any of the authors, companies, or other organizations related to the manuscript.

**3. Duties of Authors**

**3.1. Manuscript requirements**

A scientific article should contain the results of original research. The authors should present an accurate description of the work performed as well as objective evidence of its relevance. The data corroborating research results should be represented in the paper with the utmost exactness. The paper should contain sufficient information and references for a possible reconstruction of the results described. False or deliberately inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

**3.2. Data access and storage**

Authors may be asked to provide the intermediary (unprocessed) paper-related data for editorial review, and should be prepared to provide free access to such data (in accordance with the ALPSP-STM Statement on Data and Databases), if practicable. In any case, the authors should be prepared to save such data within a reasonable period of time upon publication.

**3.3. Originality and plagiarism**

3.3.1 The authors should only submit entirely original papers. In case they have used the works and/or statements of other authors, such papers or statements should be cited or referenced appropriately. All articles are reviewed for originality before being sent for review, which is carried out by the editorial board of the journal, in the textborrowing systems Antiplagiat.VUZ.

3.3.2 Plagiarism takes many forms, from presenting another scholar’s work as one’s own paper, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of other scholars’ papers (without referencing them), to laying claims to the results of the research conducted by other authors. Plagiarism in any of its forms constitutes unethical behaviour and is unacceptable.

**3.4. Multiple, redundant or concurrent Publication**

3.4.1 An author should not in general publish a manuscript describing essentially one research in more than one journal as an original publication. Submitting the same manuscript concurrently to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

3.4.2. In general, an author should not submit a previously published paper for consideration in another journal.

3.4.3. Publication of some kinds of articles (e.g., clinical guidelines, translations) in more than one journal is sometimes justifiable, provided certain conditions are met. The authors and editors of the journals concerned must agree to the secondary publication, which must reflect the same data and interpretation of the original document. The primary reference must be cited in the secondary publication. Further detail on acceptable forms of secondary publication (republishing) can be found at [www.icmje.org](http://www.icmje.org/).

**3.5. Acknowledgement of sources**

The contribution of other scholars must always be properly acknowledged. The authors should cite publications that have been of consequence in executing the reported work. Privately obtained information, such as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with the third parties, must not be used or reported without an explicit written permission of the source. Information obtained from confidential sources, such as in the course of evaluating a manuscript or awarding a grant, must not be used without the explicit written permission of the authors of the work related to confidential sources.

**3.6. Authorship of the paper**

3.6.1 Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the development of the idea of the paper, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported research. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Should the research participants make a significant contribution to a certain area of research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors.

3.6.2. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

**3.7. Hazards and human or animal subjects**

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

3.7.2 If the work involves the use of animal or human subjects, the author should ensure that the manuscript contains a statement that all procedures were performed in compliance with relevant laws and institutional guidelines and that they have been approved by appropriate institutional committee(s). Authors should include an explicit statement in the manuscript that an informed consent was obtained from all human subjects. Privacy rights of human subjects must always be observed.

**3.8. Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

3.8.1 In their manuscripts all authors should disclose any financial or other existing conflicts of interest that might be construed as influencing the results or conclusions of their manuscript.

3.8.2 Examples of potential conflicts of interest which should be disclosed include hired service, advice, corporate property, royalty payment, expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. Potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed at the earliest possible stage.

**3.9. Fundamental errors in published works**

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in a published work, it is the author's duty to promptly notify the Journal Editor or Publisher and cooperate with the Editor to retract or correct the paper. If the Editor or the Publisher learns from a third party that a published paper contains a significant error, it is the obligation of the author to promptly retract or correct the paper.

**4. Duties of the Publisher**

4.1 The Publisher should adopt policies and procedures that support Editors, reviewers and authors in performing their ethical duties under these ethics guidelines. The Publisher should ensure that the potential revenue from advertising or reprint has no impact or influence on editorial decisions.

4.2. The Publisher should support the Journal Editors in the review of complaints concerning ethical issues and help communications with other Journals and/or Publishers where this contributes to performing the duties of Editorial Boards.

4.3. The Publisher should develop codes of practice and implement industry standards for best practice on ethical matters, error correction and retraction procedures.

4.4 The Publisher should provide specialized legal support (resolution and advice) if necessary.

[[1]](https://bonjour.sgu.ru/en/node/883/edit?render=overlay" \l "_ftnref1" \o ") http://publicationethics.org
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