# Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

##### **1. Ethical responsibilities**

**Editor(s):**

– The editor(s) undertakes to act in a balanced, objective, and fair way while carrying out his/her expected duties, without discriminating any gender, race, sexual orientation, religious or political beliefs, ethnic or geographical origin of the authors, or institutional affiliation;  
– Editors and editorial staff will 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;  
– All types of submissions will be treated equally so that articles are considered and accepted based on their academic merit and without commercial influence;  
– The editor(s) will adopt and follow reasonable procedures in case of complaints of an ethical or conflicting nature by the publishing house policies and procedures;  
– Authors will be allowed to respond to any complaints. No matter when the original publication was approved, all complaints should be analyzed. Documentation associated with any such complaints should be retained.

**Reviewer(s):**

– The reviewers have an essential contribution to the decision-making process; they help to improve the quality of the published papers by reviewing the submissions objectively and promptly;  
– The reviewers are chosen based on their expertise and relevance among the scientific community. InCoBPT intends to have a worldwide and diverse scientific committee to respond effectively to any language barriers that might exist and comprise the different social, cultural, and economic contexts of our authors;  
– InCoBPT Press relies on the double-blind peer review process to uphold the quality and validity of the articles published in the book of proceedings. Reviewers must maintain confidentiality and should not retain or copy the manuscript.  
– Any invited reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a proposal or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should immediately notify the editors and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted;  
– All works received must be treated as confidential papers, not to be shown or discussed with others: the review process should be conducted objectively and observations formulated clearly with supporting arguments so that authors can use them for improving the manuscript, not leaving room to personal views or criticism;  
– The reviewers should warn the editor about any published or submitted content substantially similar to that under review and of any potential conflicts of interest (financial, institutional, collaborative or other relationships between the reviewer and author), withdrawing their services for that proposal.

**Author(s):**

– All authors must own their original work, which has not been published previously somewhere else – research and analysis within the paper must reflect the author’s own work: fraudulent or knowingly fallacious declarations are not accepted and constitute unethical behavior;  
– Significant contributions of co-authors and co-researchers must be properly listed, whereas the corresponding author should ensure all agree with the final version and submission for application;  
– The framework of a prior and existing research/work must be guaranteed, ensuring that the work/words of others are appropriately quoted or cited: plagiarism in any form is unaccepted;  
– Authors must supply or provide access to existing research/work on reasonable request;  
– Not be submitted to more than one society, institute or journal for deliberation to prevent redundant concurrent peer review and unethical publishing behavior;  
– Procedures or equipment that may cause unusual hazards inherent in their use must be clarified: Human or animal subjects must have their privacy rights observed and human experimentation (institutional or private) must have informed consent, according to ethical standards;  
– 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. Authors should obtain express permission from human subjects and respect their privacy;  
– Any potential conflicts of interest (e.g. where the author has a competing interest that could be considered or viewed as exerting an undue influence on his or her duties at any stage during the publication process) must be declared.  
– Authors must read the Copyright Agreement carefully.  
– Notify the editor or publisher promptly if a significant error in their publication is identified, and cooperate with them to publish an erratum, addendum, or corrigendum notice or retract the paper where necessary.  
– Authors must participate in the peer review process and cooperate fully by responding promptly to editors’ requests for raw data, clarifications, and proof of ethics approval, patient consent and copyright permissions. In the case of a first decision of “revisions necessary”, authors should respond to the reviewers’ comments systematically, point by point, and promptly, revising and re-submitting their proposal within the timeframe given by the Editor and/or Publisher.

**Publisher:**

– InCoBPT is an Open Access publisher of books and journals. The publisher’s purpose is to disseminate quality research articles to the global community freely and accessible to everyone online, enabling the share of knowledge around the world;  
– InCoBPT is committed to achieving and maintaining high standards of excellence concerning the publications, its contents, style and presentation, educational value, editorial performance, and consistency and transparency in the access to the scientific community and public in general;  
– The publisher shall ensure that good practices are maintained to the abovementioned standards.  
– InCoBPT is committed to the permanent availability and preservation of scholarly research and ensures accessibility by maintaining an open-access digital archive.

##### **2. Resolution of situations of misconduct and unethical behavior**

– Misconduct and unethical behavior may be identified and brought to the attention of the editor and publisher at any time by anyone.  
– Misconduct and unethical behavior may include, but it is not limited to, the examples mentioned above;  
– The informer that denounces such conduct to the editor or publisher should provide sufficient information and evidence for an investigation to be initiated. All allegations should be taken seriously and treated in the same way until a successful decision or conclusion is reached;  
– The editor should take an initial decision, consulting the publisher, if appropriate;  
– Evidence must be gathered while avoiding the spread of any allegations beyond those who need to know;  
– Minor misconduct might be resolved without the need to consult more widely. In any event, the author should be allowed to respond to any allegations.  
– Serious misconduct might require the notification of the employers of the accused. The editor, in consultation with the publisher, should make the decision whether or not to involve the employers, either by examining the available evidence themselves or by further consultation with a limited number of experts.  
– Editors (along with the publisher) will take responsive measures when ethical concerns are raised about a submitted or published paper. Every reported act of unethical publishing behaviour will be looked into, even if discovered years after publication. inScience Press follows the [COPE Flowcharts](https://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts" \t "_blank) when dealing with cases of suspected misconduct. If, on the investigation, the ethical concern is well-founded, a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or any other relevant note, will be published on InCoBPT Press website.