

# Publication ethics

## 1. Introduction

1.1. The publication in a peer reviewed learned journal, serves many purposes outside of simple communication. It is a building block in the development of a coherent and respected network of knowledge. For all these reasons and more it is important to lay down standards of expected ethical behavior by all parties involved in the act of publishing, namely: the authors, the journal editors, the peer reviewers, the publisher and the scientific community for Moscow economic journal.

1.2. Publisher supports the scientific communications and invests in the given process but also bears its responsible for observance of all present-day recommendations in the paper to be published.

1.3. Publisher undertakes the obligations concerning supervision of scientific materials. The papers to be published in the Journal are clean "reports" of the scientific thought and study development, therefore we also understand our responsibility for proper submission of these "reports", especially from the viewpoint of ethic aspects of the publications described in the present document.

## 2. Duties of Editors

### 2.1. Publication decision

The Editor of Moscow economic journal scientific Journal is solely and independently responsible for decision for publication, often in conjunction with the relevant scientific community. The validation of the work in question and its scientific importance must always be in the basis of the decision on publication. The Editor may be guided by the policies of the Editorial Board of the Moscow economic journal

and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism.

The editor may confer with other editors or reviewers (or community officers) in making this decision.

## 2.2. Decency

An editor should evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

## 2.3. Confidentiality

The editor and Editorial board of Moscow economic journal 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. The peer-reviewing is blind.

## 2.4. Disclosure and Conflicts of interest

2.4.1. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

2.4.2. Editors should recuse themselves (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers.

## 2.5. Vigilance over published record

An editor presented with convincing evidence that the

substance or conclusions of a published paper are erroneous should coordinate with the publisher (and/or society) to promote the prompt publication of a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or other note, as may be relevant.

## 2.6. Involvement and cooperation in investigations

An editor should take reasonably responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper, in conjunction with the publisher (or society). Such measures will generally include contacting the authors of the manuscript or paper and giving due consideration of the respective complaint or claims made, but may also include further communications to the relevant institutions and research bodies.

## **3. Duties of Reviewers**

### 3.1. Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper. Peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication, and lies at the heart of the scientific method. Publisher shares the view of many that all scholars who wish to contribute to publications have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

### 3.2. Promptness

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor of Moscow economic journal and excuse himself from the review process.

### 3.3. Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed

with others except as authorized by the editor.

### 3.4. Standard and objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

### 3.5. Acknowledgement of Sources

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

### 3.6. Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

3.6.1. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

3.6.2. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

## **4. Duties of Authors**

### 4.1. Reporting standards

4.1.1. Authors of reports 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 paper. A paper should

contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

4.1.2. Review and professional publication articles should also be accurate and objective, and editorial 'opinion' works should be clearly identified as such.

#### 4.2. Data Access and Retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data in connection with a paper for editorial review, and should be prepared to provide public access to such data (consistent with the ALPSP-STM Statement on Data and Databases), if practicable, and should in any event be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

#### 4.3. Originality and Plagiarism

4.3.1. The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others, this has been appropriately cited or quoted.

4.3.2. Plagiarism takes many forms, from 'passing off' another's paper as the author's own paper, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), to claiming results from research conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

#### 4.4. Multiple, Redundant or Concurrent Publication

4.4.1. An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal of primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

4.4.2. In general, an author should not submit for

consideration in another journal a previously published paper.

#### 4.5. Acknowledgement of Sources

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, must not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, must not be used without the explicit written permission of the author of the work involved in these services.

#### 4.6. Authorship of the Paper

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 co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors.

#### 4.7. Fundamental errors in published works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in a published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the editor of Moscow economic journal and cooperate with Publisher to retract or correct the paper, If the editor or the publisher learn from a third party that a published work contains a significant error, it is the obligation of the author to promptly retract or correct the paper.

### **5. Duties of the Publisher**

5.1. The Publisher should observe the principles and

procedures that support editors, reviewers and authors of Moscow economic journal in accordance with the given requirements.

5.2. The Publisher should support the editors Moscow economic journal in considering any complaints raised concerning ethical issues and help communications with other journals and/or publishers where this is useful to editors.