

Association of Science Editors and Publishers

Declaration “Ethical Principles of Scientific Publications”

Adopted at the Association of Science Editors and Publishers General meeting
within 5th International Scientific and Practical Conference
«World-Class Scientific Publication – 2016: Publishing Ethics, Peer-Review
and Content Preparation», Moscow, May 20, 2016
(2016 year edition)

1. The Declaration is developed by the Association of Science Editors and Publishers (ASEP) as a code of ethical principles for regulating the conduct of editorial offices, editors, reviewers, publishers, and authors in relation to scientific publications. The Declaration text is meant for using as a complete document, and each of its statements should be implemented with regard to all other applicable statements.
2. Parties involved in science and publication process aim at following the Declaration principles and recommendations of Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and other international associations of editors and publishers.
3. ASEP sees its aim as forming within the scientific community a clear notion of publication ethics, open and unconditional disapproval of unethical behavior and total refusal from any type of cooperation that leads to producing “garbage” publications that hinders scientific development as a whole.

Main principles:

4. **Editorial office ethical standards.** Scientific journal editorial team adheres to the principles of scientific character, objectivity, professionalism, and impartiality.
5. **Responsibility for adhering to ethical standards.** Researchers, authors, editors, reviewers and publishers have ethical responsibility for publication and distribution of scientific research results.
6. **Standards of communication with authors.** Interaction with authors is based on the principles of justice, objectivity, integrity, and transparency.
7. **Existence of peer reviewing institution.** All contents of the scientific journal except promotional and editorial materials, which are clearly labeled as ones, undergo mandatory peer reviewing (open, single-blind or double-blind) by independent experts. Double-blind peer reviewing is preferable.
8. **Access to publications.** Scientific journals guarantee access to publications by providing storage of their materials in leading libraries and repositories of the country.
9. **Information transparency.** Publication ethics and peer reviewing statements, clearly formulated journal politics, manuscript submission rules, author guidelines, and information on materials availability (open access or subscription) are published on the journal website. Journal ISSN and publisher address are necessary to be present.
10. **Information on chargeable services.** All the information about chargeable services, if they are present in any form, is clearly specified and available on the journal website and is approved by the editor-in-chief. If the journal does not provide chargeable services, it is also specified on the journal website.

11. **Adherence to ethical criteria of authorship.** 1. Only a person who participated significantly in the paper composing, its conception developing, scientific design, material collection, analysis, and interpretation can be considered as the author; 2. Getting publication agreement from all the authors is obligatory. All the co-authors should meet these criteria.
12. **Final manuscript approval by the author.** Paper publication under author's name implies copyright emergence. Publishing the text that was not accepted by the author as well as including strangers as co-authors is regarded as the copyright violation.
13. **Time frames for decision-making by editorial office.** The process of editorial decision-making is performed within a limited time frame and is presented in a clear and constructive form on the journal website and in author guidelines.
14. **Interaction with scientific and professional associations.** Editorial offices tend to interaction with professional scientific associations and professional societies for providing high quality of scientists' work.
15. **Preventing and correcting ethics violation.** The duty of scientific editors is to prevent the situations when authors, peer reviewers or other parties involved in scientific texts production conduct unethical behavior, as well as to provide withdrawal of unconscientious publications from scientific space and to cooperate with Ethical Counsel and scientific associations.
16. **Conflicts of interests.** Editors appeal to authors for disclosing their relationships with industrial and financial organizations that can lead to conflicts of interests. All the funding sources should be identified by the authors within the body of the paper.

ASEP declares unethical the following types of conduct in the field of scientific publication:

17. **Demanding from authors to provide reviews on their own papers, as well as conducting contractual and pseudo-reviewing.** Such practices imply the absence of peer reviewing in the journal.
18. **Offering agency services.** Providing such services to authors as a "publication package", corresponding with the editorial office from the author's name, improving the paper by the agent according to the recommendations of the reviewer, preparing paid reviews.
19. **Selling or granting the co-authorship, changing author lineup.** Mentioning persons who have not introduced any intellectual contribution into the research is violation of copyright and ethical standards as it not only misleads the readers but is also regarded as fraud.
20. **Publishing materials of extramural "scientific" conferences.** As the practice of such conferences directly deals with shenanigans and fraud in scientific field, publication of such conference materials is regarded as unethical and serving for pseudoscientific materials distribution.
21. **Transferring to other journals the texts of papers without their authors' agreement.** Publishing the paper in the journal that was not coordinated with the author is the violation of author's interests.
22. **Transferring authors' materials to the third parties.** Transferring paper materials, which were submitted to the editorial office, to the third parties except reviewers and editorial staff is regarded as violation of copyright and editorial process confidentiality.

23. **Citation manipulation.** Artificial increase of scientific indices, excessive self-citation, and friendly citation as well as irrelevant references mislead the readers and are interpreted as fraud.
24. **Plagiarism, falsification and fabrications.** Editorial office dutifully treats the texts of papers, prevents appearance of unconscientious scientific publications that contain plagiarism, falsification and data fabrication as part of its editions.

Ethics Counsel

The institution for coordination and consultation in the frame of the present Declaration is the Ethics Counsel formed at the Association of Science Editors and Publishers.

The Declaration is developed by the Ethics Counsel of ASEP by:

A.V. Kuleshova, D.M. Kochetkov, E.G. Abramov, A.A. Abalkina, D.A. Belyaeva, A.S. Kasyan, D.Ya. Maleshin, D.M. Nosov, A.L. Repetskaya, A.A. Rostovtsev, Yu.I. Filippov, O.S. Shishlakova.

The President of ASEP O.V. Kirillova participated in the Declaration development.