



## **SARDINIA SYMPOSIUM - Statement of Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice**

### **1. PUBLICATION AND AUTHORSHIP**

#### **1.1. List of references and financial support**

All materials and information derived from other sources should be properly cited in the manuscript and included in the list of references. Copyrighted materials (e.g. tables or figures) should be reproduced only with appropriate permissions and acknowledgements. Financial supports should be acknowledged in order to declare any potential conflicts of interest.

#### **1.2. Plagiarism and fraudulent data**

Data and information presented in the manuscript should be original. Data should not be fabricated, falsified or plagiarised. Plagiarism is the act of misrepresenting work or ideas of other authors as one's own without specifying its source.

#### **1.3. Dual submission and publication**

Authors should confirm that the submitted manuscript has not been published elsewhere and should not be under review or consideration of publication by other journals. This includes non-English publications. Poster or oral presentation of parts of the work including a short abstract is not considered as prior publication.

### **2. AUTHORS' RESPONSIBILITIES**

#### **2.1. Authors are obliged to participate in peer review process**

All the submitted manuscript should be reviewed by suitably qualified reviewers. Authors are obliged to follow the editorial policy during the review process. For the submission of the revised manuscript, all changes in all parts of the manuscript should be explicitly described in a note to the editor.

#### **2.2. All authors should have significantly contributed to the research**

All people who have made substantial contribution to the manuscript should be included on the list of authors; everyone listed as author should have made an independent material contribution to the manuscript. Corresponding author should have the approval of all the other listed authors for the submission, review and publication or all the versions of the manuscript.

#### **2.3. All data reported should be real and authentic**

Data and information presented in the manuscript should be original. Authors should maintain accurate records of data associated with their manuscript, and supply or provide access to them, on reasonable request.

Authors should ensure that any studies involving human or animal subjects conform to national, local and institutional laws and requirements and confirm that approval has been sought and obtained where appropriate.

#### **2.4. All authors are obliged to provide corrections or retractions of mistakes**

Authors should notify promptly the journal editor if a significant error in their publication is identified and cooperate with the editor to make the appropriate arrangements to correct the error.

### **3. REVIEWERS' RESPONSIBILITIES**

#### **3.1. Evaluation should be objective**

Reviewers should contribute to the decision-making process, and assist in improving the quality of the published paper by reviewing the manuscript objectively, in a timely manner.

Editors may also choose to modify review comments to ensure that civility is preserved if necessary.

#### **3.2. Reviewers should have no conflict of interest**

Reviewers should be aware of any potential conflicts of interest (with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders) and alert the editor to these. A reviewer who feels inadequate to judge the manuscript should return the manuscript promptly without review and inform the editor of any potential conflict of interest.

#### **3.3. Reviewers should perform thorough scientific review**

Reviewers should point out any constructive suggestions for revision of the manuscript, considering the quality and significance of the experimental work, the completeness of the description of material and methods, and the logical interpretation of the results.

Furthermore, reviewers should point out any relevant published work which is not yet cited and any unethical behaviour of the authors (plagiarism, fraudulent data, dual publication, etc.).

#### **3.4. Reviewed manuscripts should be treated confidentially**

Reviewers should maintain the confidentiality of any information supplied by the editor or author.

The manuscript is the property of the authors until a copyright agreement between the publisher and the authors is signed.

## 4. EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITIES

### 4.1. Editors have the complete responsibility and authority to reject or accept a manuscript

Editors' decisions to accept or reject a manuscript for publication should be based on the paper's importance, originality, and clarity, and the study's relevance. Editors should consider manuscripts submitted with all reasonable speed.

Editors should ensure that appropriate reviewers are selected for submissions (i.e. individuals who possess proper expertise and good sense of judgment and are free from disqualifying competing interests). Editors urge reviewers to be objective in their evaluation.

### 4.2. Editors should have no conflict of interest

Editors should have no potential conflicts of interest regarding the manuscript (with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders).

In case that editors have potential conflict of interest, they should avoid handling the manuscript and it should be delegated to another qualified person.

### 4.3. Editors should promote publication of correction or retraction when errors are found

Editors should correct errors if they are found before publication or publish corrections if they are found afterwards.

If an author or someone else brings an apparent error to editor's attention, the editor should notify all authors and ask for corrections to be made. If the authors do not conform to the request in a timely manner, the editor should publish a notice of correction or retract the article.

### 4.4. Editors must preserve anonymity of reviewers

Editors and members of the editorial staff should not reveal the identity of the reviewers before or after the publication of the manuscript.

## 5. PUBLISHING ETHICS ISSUES

### 5.1. Monitoring/safeguarding publishing ethics by the editorial board

Editors should be receptive to the opinions of authors, reviewers and editorial board members about ways to improve any aspects of the proceedings, in particular regarding the publishing ethics. Editors should actively monitor the fair performance of reviewers.

### 5.2. Guidelines for retracting manuscripts

Editors should consider retracting a publication if:

- the manuscript contains plagiarised and/or fraudulent data and information
- the results have been published elsewhere without proper citation, permission or justification.

### 5.3. Maintaining integrity of the published manuscripts

Editors should be responsible for the integrity of all the manuscripts published in the proceedings. Editors should have appropriate procedures and rules in place to make sure that the results they publish are of high quality.

### 5.4. Preclusion of business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards

Funding sponsors should not compromise the publication of results of the research. Researchers should not make agreements that allow the funding sponsor to influence the publication of the results.

### 5.5. Responsibility for publishing corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed

Authors should notify promptly the journal editor if a significant error in their publication is identified.

When a published paper contains a significant error or inaccuracy, authors should cooperate promptly with the editor to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies or to retract the paper, where this is deemed necessary.

### 5.6. Dealing with possible misconduct

Editors have a duty to act if they suspect misconduct or if an allegation of misconduct is brought to them. This duty extends to both published and unpublished papers. Editors should not simply reject papers that raise concerns about possible misconduct. They are ethically obliged to pursue alleged cases.

Editors should first seek a response from those suspected of misconduct. If they are not satisfied with the response, they should ask the relevant employers, or institution, or some appropriate body to investigate. Editors should make all reasonable efforts to ensure that a proper investigation into alleged misconduct is conducted; if this does not happen, editors should make all reasonable attempts to persist in obtaining a resolution to the problem.