

# Publication Ethics Guide

## 1. Introduction

The conference is committed to upholding the highest standards of integrity and ethics in scholarly publishing. All parties involved in the publication process – authors, editors, and peer reviewers (as well as the publisher and conference organizers) – are expected to adhere to these ethical principles. This guide outlines the responsibilities of each stakeholder and the policies in place to prevent misconduct and ensure the integrity of the academic record. By following these guidelines, we aim to maintain the trustworthiness of the conference's publications and uphold the principles of academic honesty and transparency.

## 2. Duties of Authors

**Originality and Plagiarism:** Authors must ensure that their submitted work is entirely original. If the manuscript includes text, data, or ideas from other sources, the authors must give proper credit through citation and, where necessary, obtain permission for any use of copyrighted material. Any form of plagiarism is unacceptable and is considered unethical behavior. Plagiarism includes using someone else's work or results as one's own, copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another work without attribution, as well as self-plagiarism (reusing one's own previously published material without citing the original source). All submissions are subject to originality checks, and any manuscript found to contain plagiarized or fraudulent content will be rejected (or retracted if the issue is discovered post-publication).

**Multiple Submissions and Redundant Publication:** Authors should not submit the same manuscript to more than one journal or conference at the same time. Concurrent submission of identical or essentially similar work to multiple publications is a serious ethical violation. Likewise, publishing the same research findings in more than one primary venue (journal or conference proceedings) without appropriate justification is considered redundant publication and is not permitted. If any portion of the work has previously appeared in another form (such as a conference abstract or preliminary report), the author must clearly acknowledge the prior publication and ensure that the submitted manuscript offers significant new content. In all cases, authors should inform the editors about any closely related works under consideration elsewhere and abide by the originality requirements set by the publication.

**Research Reporting Standards:** Authors are expected to present their research findings honestly, accurately, and with rigor. All data and results should be reported truthfully – fabrication, falsification, or selective omission of relevant data to mislead readers is prohibited. The methodology and experiments should be described with sufficient detail and clarity to allow other researchers to replicate or verify the work. Authors should not selectively withhold results, even if some outcomes do not support their hypotheses or expectations; all significant findings, including those that challenge the main conclusions, should be transparently reported.

**Data Access and Retention:** Authors should be prepared to provide the raw data or supporting data underlying their findings if requested by the editorial board or reviewers, for the purposes of evaluating the manuscript. Where feasible, authors are encouraged to make key data publicly accessible (for example, by depositing data in an open repository) in

accordance with the publication's data policy. Even if data are not shared publicly, authors are expected to retain the original data and research records for a reasonable period after publication. This ensures that the data can be available for verification, replication, or any inquiries by other researchers regarding the research.

**Authorship and Collaboration:** Authorship should include all, and only, those individuals who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the study. No one who has not contributed substantially should be listed as an author (to avoid "honorary" or unwarranted authorship). The corresponding author must ensure that all appropriate co-authors (and no inappropriate names) are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to its submission. The order of authorship should be determined collectively in advance by the contributors. Any changes to the author list after the initial submission (such as adding or removing an author) are permissible only in exceptional circumstances and must be justified to the editor and agreed upon by all affected persons. All listed authors share collective responsibility for the contents of the work. Each author should be prepared to take public responsibility for their own contributions and answer questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work.

**Acknowledgment of Sources and Contributions:** Authors must properly acknowledge all sources of data, ideas, charts, images, or other content that were used in the research or influenced the work. All publications and works that significantly informed or influenced the study should be cited to provide proper context and credit to prior research. If individuals contributed to the work but do not meet the criteria for authorship (for example, technical staff, language editors, or statistical consultants), their assistance should be acknowledged in the manuscript's Acknowledgments section. Similarly, all sources of financial support or sponsorship for the research (such as grants, funding agencies, or institutional support) should be disclosed and acknowledged. Information obtained privately (through personal communication, correspondence, or during the peer review process) must not be used or disclosed without explicit written permission from the original source.

**Ethical Compliance in Research:** If the work involves human participants, animals, or potentially hazardous materials or procedures, authors must ensure that all relevant ethical standards and legal requirements have been met. Authors should obtain approval from appropriate ethics committees or institutional review boards (IRBs) and indicate within the manuscript that such approval was obtained, confirming that ethical guidelines were followed. For research involving human subjects, authors must confirm that informed consent was obtained from all participants. For experiments involving animals, authors should ensure that humane practices were followed in accordance with institutional or national guidelines. Any unusual hazards inherent in the research (chemicals, procedures, equipment, etc.) should be clearly identified in the manuscript. The privacy and personal data of research subjects must be protected; identifying information about participants should only be included in the manuscript if it is absolutely necessary and only after obtaining the explicit consent of the individuals concerned.

**Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest:** All authors are required to disclose any financial or other substantive conflicts of interest that could be perceived as influencing the results or interpretation of their work. Examples of potential conflicts include financial ties (such as

funding, grants, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony) or personal/professional relationships that might affect objectivity. All sources of financial support for the project must be disclosed, including detailed information about the role (if any) of the funder or sponsor in various stages of the research – from study design to data collection and manuscript preparation. If there are no conflicts of interest, authors should explicitly state that none exist in the manuscript.

**Participation in Peer Review:** Authors are expected to actively participate in the peer review process by responding to editorial and reviewer feedback in a timely and respectful manner. If revisions are requested, authors should carefully address each of the reviewers' comments: making the appropriate changes in the manuscript or providing a clear and reasoned explanation in their response letter if certain suggestions cannot be accommodated. Failure to perform requested revisions or an unjustified delay in responding to reviewer comments, without a valid reason, may result in the manuscript being rejected. If at any point an author decides to withdraw their manuscript from consideration, they should promptly inform the editor of their decision.

**Notification of Fundamental Errors:** If an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal's editor or publisher. The author should then cooperate with the editorial team to publish an appropriate correction (erratum or corrigendum) or, in cases of a major flaw, to retract the paper. If the editorial team or publisher is notified by a third party that a published work contains a serious error or ethical violation, the author must assist in the investigation and, if necessary, in the issuance of a correction or retraction. Maintaining the accuracy of the scholarly record is a collective responsibility, and authors play a critical role by informing the publication of any mistakes or inaccuracies discovered in their published work.

### 3. Duties of Editors

**Publication Decisions:** Editors have the ultimate responsibility for deciding whether submitted manuscripts are accepted for publication or rejected. This decision must be based on the work's scholarly merit – including its scientific quality, originality, clarity of presentation, the validity of the research and its relevance to the conference or journal's scope – as well as the reviewers' evaluations and recommendations. An editor may consult with other members of the editorial board or with peer reviewers in making this decision. In making publication decisions, editors are guided by the policies of the editorial board and constrained by applicable legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism. Under no circumstances should an editor's decision be influenced by commercial interests, personal relationships, or factors that are not relevant to the content and quality of the manuscript.

**Fair Play and Impartiality:** Editors must evaluate manuscripts solely on their intellectual and scientific content, without discrimination or bias. The nationality, ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, citizenship, political philosophy, institutional affiliation, or other personal characteristics of the authors should have no bearing on the editorial decision. Every submission should be given fair consideration – each manuscript is assessed on its own academic merits and its relevance to the conference's publication – free from prejudices or favoritism. Editors should strive to ensure that the review and decision process is conducted in an unbiased manner and that all authors are treated with fairness and respect.

**Confidentiality:** The editor must treat all submitted manuscripts as confidential documents. Information about a manuscript (including its content, status in the review process, and outcome) should not be disclosed to anyone other than those directly involved in the evaluation and processing of that manuscript. This typically includes the corresponding author, the assigned peer reviewers, other editors or editorial board members (as appropriate), and the publisher. The editor should also ensure that invited reviewers understand and adhere to the confidentiality of the review process. Unpublished materials contained in a submitted manuscript must not be used by the editor for personal research or otherwise disseminated without the express written consent of the author. Confidentiality must be maintained throughout the review process and even after the manuscript is accepted or rejected.

**Peer Review Management:** Editors are responsible for organizing a rigorous, fair, and timely peer review process for submitted manuscripts. Each manuscript should typically be evaluated by at least two independent reviewers who are experts in the relevant field. The editor should select reviewers who possess appropriate expertise and avoid those with clear potential conflicts of interest (for example, individuals who have close personal or professional relationships with the authors, or who have competing interests in the subject of the work). Reviewers are provided with clear instructions and guidelines regarding the expectations for evaluating the manuscript, and editors encourage feedback that is constructive and courteous. Upon receiving reviewers' reports, the editor will assess their quality and relevance; if any review contains ad hominem remarks or irrelevant commentary, the editor has the authority to exclude such content from what is communicated to the authors. The editor also monitors the peer review timeline to ensure that decisions are made in a timely manner and that the publication of accepted work is not unduly delayed.

**Conflicts of Interest:** If an editor has a conflict of interest with regard to a particular manuscript, they must recuse themselves from the decision-making process for that manuscript. For example, an editor should not handle a submission authored by themselves (or by a family member, close colleague, or recent collaborator) or a paper that is closely related to the editor's own research, especially if there is a direct competitive or financial interest. In such cases, the editor should delegate the manuscript to another qualified editor or an associate editor on the editorial board. Editors should also openly declare any relevant conflicts of interest (such as competitive or collaborative relationships with authors) to the publisher or within the journal, as required. Moreover, editors must not exploit information gained through handling manuscripts for personal gain or to disadvantage other individuals.

**Ethical Oversight and Misconduct:** Editors have a duty to uphold the integrity of the scholarly record. If an editor suspects or receives an allegation that a submission or published article may involve misconduct – for instance, plagiarism, data fabrication, image manipulation, or other unethical practices – the editor should address the issue promptly and seriously. The editor will follow established procedures (in line with recognized ethical guidelines) to investigate the matter. This may involve reaching out to the authors for clarification, consulting with additional reviewers or experts, notifying the publisher, and, if necessary, informing the authors' institution or relevant regulatory bodies. In cases where misconduct or a serious error is confirmed, the editor, in conjunction with the publisher, will take appropriate actions: for a manuscript under review, this may mean rejecting the paper; for a published article, this could involve issuing a correction, a retraction, or an expression of concern. The editor should carefully document all steps taken to investigate and resolve ethical

issues. Additionally, editors must ensure that any published corrections or retractions are clearly identified and linked to the original work, so that readers are duly informed about the changes or issues concerning the publication.

**Corrections and Appeals:** The editorial team should have a clear mechanism for handling appeals from authors regarding editorial decisions. If an author believes that their manuscript was unjustly rejected, they should have the opportunity to make a reasoned appeal. In such cases, it may be appropriate for the editor to involve another independent editor or additional peer reviewers to reevaluate the manuscript. Editors should be willing to reconsider their decisions if new information comes to light or if it is found that an aspect of the peer review process was unfair or erroneous. Furthermore, editors must be prepared to publish corrections or retract articles when necessary to correct errors or address ethical issues in published works, following established procedures for such cases. All decisions related to appeals, corrections, or retractions should be made with the principles of fairness and the preservation of scholarly integrity in mind.

#### 4. Duties of Reviewers

**Contribution to Editorial Decisions:** Peer reviewers play a crucial role in the publication process, providing essential expertise that assists editors in making informed decisions about submitted manuscripts. By critically evaluating a manuscript's content, methodology, data, and conclusions, reviewers help determine whether the work meets the publication's standards and contributes new knowledge to the field. The feedback from reviewers also guides authors in improving their manuscripts. Therefore, reviewers act as gatekeepers of scientific quality and as advisors to both editors and authors. They should take this role seriously and provide assessments that are honest, thorough, and based on sound reasoning and evidence.

**Promptness:** A potential reviewer who is invited to evaluate a manuscript should respond to the invitation as soon as possible. If the reviewer feels unqualified to assess the research presented in the manuscript, or knows that they will be unable to complete the review within the required timeframe, they should decline the invitation so that the editors can find an alternative reviewer without undue delay. Once a reviewer has agreed to review a manuscript, they are expected to dedicate sufficient time to perform a thorough evaluation and to submit their review by the agreed deadline. If circumstances arise that will prevent a timely review, the reviewer should promptly inform the editor and, if necessary, request an extension. Timely reviews are vital for maintaining an efficient editorial process and ensuring that authors receive feedback and decisions within a reasonable period.

**Confidentiality:** Any manuscript received for review must be treated as a confidential document. Reviewers must not share the manuscript or discuss its content with anyone outside the official peer review process, except in special cases where specific expertise is needed to inform the review – and only then with the explicit permission of the editor. In such cases, the person consulted must also maintain confidentiality. Reviewers should not use information or ideas obtained through the peer review process for personal advantage or to disadvantage or discredit others. After completing the review, a reviewer should not retain or copy the manuscript; all copies of the manuscript (whether in digital or print form) should be deleted or destroyed to preserve confidentiality.

**Objectivity and Constructiveness:** Reviews should be conducted objectively, and reviewers' comments should be constructive, clear, and supported by arguments and evidence. Reviewers should focus on evaluating the content of the manuscript – including the study's design, data analysis, interpretation of results, and how it fits within existing research – rather than critiquing the authors personally. Personal criticism or derogatory remarks are inappropriate and unacceptable. If the reviewer identifies weaknesses or problems in the manuscript, they should clearly explain these issues (for example, by pointing out specific methodological concerns or where the conclusions are not supported by the data) and, if possible, offer suggestions for improvements. It is also helpful for reviewers to note the strengths of the manuscript. The overall tone of the review should be professional and respectful, aiming to help the authors enhance the quality of their work.

**Acknowledging Sources and Detecting Plagiarism:** Reviewers should pay attention to whether the manuscript has properly acknowledged and cited relevant prior work. If important publications or previous studies in the field are not cited in the manuscript, the reviewer should point out these omissions. If a reviewer recognizes that any part of the manuscript appears to be derived from another work (whether published or unpublished) without appropriate attribution, they should inform the editor of this potential plagiarism or uncredited use of material. Similarly, if a reviewer suspects that the results or data might be fabricated, falsified, or that the manuscript represents a duplicate publication of the authors' own earlier work, these concerns should be conveyed confidentially to the editor. It is not the reviewer's role to investigate the matter themselves, but they should flag any suspicious content for editorial follow-up. Reviewers may also recommend that authors cite certain works if those are crucial and would genuinely improve the manuscript; however, reviewers should not insist on citation of their own work or associates' work unless it is fully justified academically, to avoid any impression of coercion for self-citation.

**Conflicts of Interest:** Reviewers must be vigilant about potential conflicts of interest that could bias their judgment. Before accepting a review assignment, a reviewer should consider any recent or ongoing relationships with the authors (such as collaboration or mentorship), any direct competition or rivalry with the authors or their research, or any financial interests in the work's topic or outcomes. If such factors exist that could compromise the reviewer's objectivity, the reviewer should either decline the assignment or disclose the conflict to the editor and ask for guidance. Reviewers should not use the peer review process to pursue their own interests; for example, they must not deliberately delay the review to gain a competitive advantage for their own research, and they must not appropriate ideas or data from the manuscript for personal use. If a reviewer realizes after starting the review that a conflict of interest is present (for instance, recognizing the authors or the work as a direct competitor to their own research), they should immediately inform the editor and recuse themselves from the review if necessary. Transparency and honesty about conflicts of interest are essential to preserve the objectivity and credibility of the peer review process.

## 5. General Provisions for Preventing Publication Ethics Violations

**Ethical Oversight:** The conference organizers and the publisher are committed to rigorous ethical oversight of the publication process. The publication adheres to recognized international standards aimed at preventing misconduct in research and publishing. All submitted materials may be screened for potential ethical issues, such as plagiarism, duplicate

submissions, or data fabrication. If any ethical concern or allegation arises regarding a submitted or published paper, the editorial team will act promptly, following established guidelines to investigate the issue and take appropriate action.

**Editorial Independence:** The editorial process is carried out independently of any commercial or political influence. The conference's organizers and publisher ensure that editors have full freedom in making decisions and that the content of the publications is not influenced by the conference's sources of funding, sponsors, or advertising (if any). Decisions on what to publish are based solely on the scholarly quality of the content and its relevance to the conference's scope, without interference from business considerations or outside pressures. A clear separation between editorial work and financial or organizational matters safeguards the integrity and objectivity of the publication.

**Integrity and Archiving:** The conference's editorial board and publisher strive to ensure the integrity and long-term preservation of the scholarly record. All published materials are reliably archived and remain accessible to the research community in the long run. If issues are discovered after publication – such as significant errors or ethical breaches – the editorial team, in collaboration with the publisher, will act swiftly to issue the necessary corrections or to retract publications if required. Any articles that are corrected or retracted will be clearly marked as such, and the original article will carry a prominent notice (for example, of correction or retraction) so that readers are aware of the status of the work. By maintaining a dependable archive of publications and promptly correcting the record when needed, the conference upholds the trust of the academic community.

**Transparency and Accountability:** The conference adheres to principles of transparency and accountability in its publishing practices. All editorial policies and procedures (including submission guidelines and author requirements) are clearly communicated to participants and made publicly available. The editorial board and publisher regularly review their practices to ensure they meet current ethical standards and to implement improvements as necessary. Feedback, questions, or complaints related to publication ethics are taken very seriously; the organizers and editors investigate such matters promptly and follow established procedures to resolve them. In the event of disputes or concerns, the conference and publisher can serve as a neutral party to help mediate issues between authors, reviewers, or editors in accordance with ethical norms. Through transparent processes and a willingness to engage with the community, the conference demonstrates its commitment to the highest standards of publication ethics.

## 6. Procedures for Corrections and Retractions

**Corrections (Errata):** If a published article is found to contain an error or omission that does not invalidate the work as a whole (for example, a minor factual mistake, a typographical error, or a clarification needed for a portion of the text or data), a formal correction (erratum or corrigendum) will be issued. The correction notice will clearly detail the nature of the error and provide the correct information. Such a notice is published as soon as possible after the error is identified and is linked to the original article so that readers are alerted to the change. The purpose of issuing a correction is to rectify the scholarly record while leaving the original article intact when its main findings remain reliable.

**Retractions:** If a published work is found to have serious flaws or ethical problems that undermine the validity of its results – for example, evidence emerges of data fabrication,

plagiarism, significant methodological errors, or unethical research practices – then the article will be retracted. The decision to retract is typically made by the editor-in-chief in consultation with the publisher and, if necessary, in collaboration with the authors' institution or other relevant authorities. A retraction notice will be published, clearly stating the reasons for the retraction (such as fraudulent data or a major error) and indicating who is issuing the retraction. The original article will usually remain available in the archive for the sake of transparency, but it will be marked as retracted, and a prominent retraction notice will be linked to it so that readers are fully informed of its status and the reasons for the decision. In certain cases where a potential issue has been raised but an investigation is not yet complete, the publication may first issue an “Expression of Concern” to warn readers that the article is under scrutiny pending the outcome of the investigation. Ultimately, the process of retracting publications and issuing related notices is intended to correct the published body of knowledge and to prevent readers from being misled by work that fails to meet ethical or scientific standards.