

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

For all parties involved in the act of publishing (the author(s), the journal editor(s), the peer reviewers, the society, and the publisher) it is necessary to agree upon standards of expected ethical behavior.

The ethics statements for the Journal “Ural-Altai Studies” are based on the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Code of Conduct guidelines available at www.publicationethics.org.

1. Publication and authorship

1.1. Authors reporting results of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the manuscript. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

1.2. All sources of financial support for the research should be disclosed and acknowledged.

1.3. The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.

1.4. An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication in the same language. Parallel submission of the same manuscript in the same language to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

2. Author’s responsibilities

2.1. An author is obliged to participate in peer review process and to provide the necessary corrections prescribed by the reviewers.

2.2. Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as coauthors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate coauthors (according to the above definition) and no inappropriate co-authors are included in the author list of the manuscript, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

2.3. An author should ensure that all the data in the paper are real and authentic (see 1.1).

2.4. When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author’s obligation to provide the journal’s editor or publisher retractions or corrections of mistakes and cooperate with them to either retract the paper or to publish an appropriate correction statement or erratum.

3. Peer review and reviewers’ responsibility

3.1. Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author(s) is unacceptable. Reviewers should express their views clearly with appropriate supporting arguments.

3.2. Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, institutions and/or the research funders connected to the submission.

3.3. Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the author(s). Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. Reviewers should also call to the editor’s attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published data of which they have personal knowledge.

3.4. Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the editor. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

4. Editors' responsibility

4.1. The editors are responsible for deciding which articles submitted to the journal should be published, and, moreover, are accountable for everything published in the journal. In making these decisions, the editors are guided by the selection criteria listed on the journal website, as well as, by the legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism.

4.2. The editors should take the decisions objectively and should have no conflict of interest with respect to articles they reject/accept. The editors should seek so ensure a fair and appropriate peer-review process. An editor should refuse himself/herself from handling manuscripts (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor, or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider) in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, institutions and/or the research funders connected to the submission. Manuscripts should be evaluated by the editors for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s).

4.3. The editors should maintain the integrity of the academic record, preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards, and always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies when needed.

4.4. The editors must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate. The editors are responsible to preserve anonymity of reviewers.

5. Publisher's responsibility

5.1. The publisher safeguards the publishing ethics of the editors in order to ensure the autonomy of editorial decisions, without influence from advertisers or other commercial partners.

5.2. The publisher should maintain the integrity of the academic record, preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards, and always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies when needed.

5.3. In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication, or plagiarism the publisher, in close collaboration with the editors, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. This includes the prompt publication of a correction statement or erratum or, in the most severe cases, the retraction of the affected work.