

## **Publication Ethics**

The editorial staff of the Scientific Bulletin of the NII “Respirator” published by the Federal State Institute “The Scientific Research Institute “Respirator” of the Ministry of the Russian Federation for Civil Defence, Emergencies and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters” maintains a certain standard of requirements by selection and reception of the papers submitted to the editorial office of the journal. These rules are determined by the scientific fields regulated by the Certificate of registration of a mass medium and quality standards of scientific papers and their presentation adopted in the scientific community.

Formulating the items of the publication ethics of the Scientific Bulletin of the NII “Respirator” the editorial staff followed the recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and the operational experience of foreign professional associations, research institutions and redactions of editions.

An essential feature of the professional scientific community is acceptance of the code by the scientists and specialists. It sets basic rules of behavior and duties of members of the scientific community before each other and in relation to the public. Such a code is defined by the intention to ensure the maximum benefit to the professional community and to limit the actions that might serve the close-egoistical interests of individuals, as well as to guarantee the intellectual property right of each author.

In addition to the above the editorial staff of the journal sets a list of ethical standards below. It should guide the persons involved in the publication of the research results in the field of safety of vital functions of a man, related branches and other fields corresponding to the profile of the journal (editors, authors and reviewers).

The editorial staff believes that the rules presented below are realized and approved by the majority of the qualified researchers; they may also be of the great help to students, graduate students and young scientists who are rather beginners in the research activity. The researchers of authority may welcome the opportunity to return to the problems that are very important for scientific practice once again.

### **Ethical Obligations of Editors**

1. All published materials are carefully selected and reviewed. An editorial board reserves the right to reject a paper or to return it as a requiring improvement. An author is obliged to improve the paper according to the remarks of the reviewers or of the editorial board.

2. An editor should considerate all the manuscripts submitted for publication without prejudice, appreciating each of them without regard to race, religion, nationality, as well as status or institutional affiliation of the author(s). However, the editor may take into account the relationship of the manuscript under consideration at the moment to other works of the same author(s) submitted previously.

3. The editor should consider the manuscripts submitted for publication without

delays as best one can.

4. The whole responsibility for acceptance or rejection of the manuscript rests in the editor. The responsible and reasonable approach to the execution of this duty requires usually that the editor takes into account the recommendation of the reviewer with an academic degree of the corresponding scientific field as to quality and reliability of the manuscript submitted for publication. However, the manuscripts may be rejected without review if the editor considers them to be inappropriate for the profile of the journal.

5. The editor and members of the redaction should not disclose any information being related to the content of the manuscript under consideration to other persons except those persons who take part in the professional estimation of the manuscript given. After a positive decision of the editor concerning the manuscript the paper will be published in the journal and allocated in the corresponding electronic resources.

6. It is acceptable to spread any papers published in the journal or quotations from them over electronic nets with precondition of giving the reference and link to the primary source. The publication and/or distribution of the materials from the journal by the third parties or organizations on the paper and solid electronic data carriers are prohibited.

7. According to the international legislation in the part of observance of the electronic media copyright the materials of the site, electronic journal or project may not be reproduced in full or in part in any form (in electronic form or in print) without the prior written permission of the authors and editorial staff of the journal. By the use of the published materials in the context of other documents the reference to the primary source is required.

8. The editor should respect the intellectual independence of the authors.

9. The responsibility and rights of the editor of the journal pertaining to any submitted manuscript which author is the editor himself should be delegated to other qualified person.

10. Unpublished information, arguments or interpretations disclosed in the submitted manuscript may be used in an editor's own researches only with the consent of the author. If such a manuscript is so closely connected with the present or last researches of the editor that the conflict of interests may occur the editor should assume the measures that some other qualified person could take the editorial responsibility for the manuscript given.

11. If the convincing testimonies of that fact are presented to the editor that the main substance or conclusions of the work published in the journal are erroneous the editor should contribute to publication of the appropriate report pointing out this error and, if possible, correcting it. The report may be written by the person who discovered this error or by an independent author.

12. The author may request that the editor didn't use certain reviewers in consideration of the manuscript. However, the editor may decide to use one or several of these reviewers if he feels that their opinions are important for the fair consideration of the manuscript. Such decision might be made, for example, in case when the serious contradictions between the manuscript given and the previous work of the potential

reviewer are available.

### Ethical Obligations of Authors

1. The main duty of the author is to present the accurate report about the research performed as well as the objective discussion of its significance.

2. The authors of the papers are responsible for the content of the articles and for the fact itself of their publication. The editorial staff of the journal doesn't bear responsibility to the authors and/or third parties and organizations for the probable damage caused by publication of the manuscript. The editorial staff has the right to withdraw the paper already published if it will be ascertained that somebody's rights or the generally accepted standards of the scientific ethics were violated in the process of publication of the article. The redaction informs the author who submitted the paper, the persons who gave recommendations and the organization where the research was fulfilled about the fact of withdrawal of the article.

3. The journal volume is a limited resource that is why the author should use it wisely and economically.

4. The primary report about the research results should be sufficiently complete and contain necessary references to the accessible sources of information to permit the authors to repeat this work. When requested, the author should make a reasonable effort to provide other researchers with the samples of unusual materials that may not be obtained by another method; whereupon the corresponding agreements about the transfer of the materials restricting the field of the use of such materials are adopted to protect the legitimate interests of the authors.

5. The author should cite those publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work as well as those that may guide the reader quickly to the earlier works that are essential for understanding the present investigation. Except the reviews, the citation of the works that are not immediately relevant to this information should be minimized. The author is obliged to perform a literature search to find and to cite the original publications that describe the researches closely related to this information. The sources of the in the main important materials used in this work should be properly specified when these materials didn't obtained by the author himself.

6. Any hazards and risks connected with the researches carried out should be clearly identified in the manuscript.

7. The fragmentation of the research reports should be avoided. The scientist who carries out the extensive investigations of a system or a group of related systems should organize the publication so that each report gives the completely finished report about each aspect of the general study.

8. In submitting the manuscript for publication the author should inform the editor about the related manuscripts of the author presented for printing or being in press. The copies of those manuscripts should be submitted to the editor, and their relationships to the manuscript submitted for publication should be indicated.

9. The author should not submit the manuscripts describing essentially the same

results to more than one journal in the form of the primary publication if it is a resubmission of the manuscript rejected by the journal or withdrawn by the author. It is permissible to submit the manuscript of the full paper expanding the brief preliminary report (information) about the same work published before. However, by submission of such a manuscript the editor should be made aware of the earlier communication, and this preliminary information should be cited in the manuscript given.

10. The author should clearly identify the sources of all information cited or offered except the well-known data. The information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence or during discussion with the third parties should not be used or reported in the author's work without explicit permission of the investigator, whom this information was obtained from. The information obtained in the course of confidential services, e.g. by reviewing the manuscripts or projects submitted for grant applications, should be treated by the same procedure.

11. An experimental or a theoretical study may sometimes serve as the basis for criticism of the work of another scientist. The published papers may contain such criticism in the appropriate cases. However, the personal criticism may be considered to be appropriate under no circumstances.

12. The co-authors of the paper should be all those persons who have made the significant scientific contributions to the work introduced and who share responsibility for the results obtained. Other contributions should be referred in the footnotes or in the "Acknowledgments" section. The administrative relationships to this investigation don't of itself be the basis for qualifying the proper person for co-authorship (but in some cases it may be appropriate to acknowledge the major administrative assistance). Deceased persons who meet the criteria formulated above should be included as co-authors with a footnote reporting the date of their death. No fictitious names should be listed as authors or co-authors. The author who submits the manuscript for publication accepts the responsibility of having included in the co-author list all those and only those persons that meet the authorship criterion. In the paper written by several authors that author who submits contact data, documents to the redaction

and carries on correspondence with the editors takes the responsibility for consent of other authors of the paper for its publication in the journal.

13. The authors should inform the editor about any potential conflict of interests, e.g. about the conflict of consulting or financial interests of any company that might be affected by the publication of the results contained in the manuscript given. The authors should guarantee the lack of contract relationships or property reasons which might affect the publication of the information contained in the presented manuscript.

### Ethical Obligations of Reviewers

1. So long as the reviewing of the manuscripts is the essential step in the publication process, and therefore in the realization of the scientific method itself every scientist has an obligation to do a certain part of the works on reviewing.

2. If a chosen reviewer is not sure that his qualification corresponds to the investigation standard presented in the manuscript he should return the manuscript promptly.

3. The reviewer should judge objectively the quality of the manuscript, submitted experimental and theoretical work, its interpretation and exposition with due regard how much the work corresponds to the high scientific and literary standards. The reviewer should respect the intellectual independence of the authors.

4. The reviewer should take into account the possibility of the conflict of interests in case when the manuscript under consideration is closely related to the being in progress or published work of the reviewer. If in doubt, the reviewer should return the manuscript promptly without the review specifying the conflict of interests.

5. The reviewer should not evaluate the manuscript authored or co-authored by a person, whom he has the personal or professional connections with, if such relationships might influence on the judgment about the manuscript.

6. The reviewer should treat the manuscript sent for the review as a confidential document. He should neither show the manuscript other persons nor discuss it with other colleagues with the exception of the particular cases when the reviewer needs somebody's special consultation.

7. The reviewers should explain and support their judgments adequately so that the editors and authors might understand the basis of their comments. Any statement that an observation, derivation or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant reference.

8. The reviewer should note any cases of the insufficient citation of the works of other scientists being relevant to the reviewing work by the authors. Besides, it should be taken into account that the observations concerning the insufficient citation of own investigations of the reviewer may seem self-serving. The reviewer should call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper or any manuscript submitted to another journal at the same time.

9. A reviewer should present the review in proper time.

10. The reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments or interpretations contained in the manuscript under consideration without consent of the author. However, when this information indicates that some of the own researches of the reviewer may come to the ground the termination of such a work by the reviewer doesn't contradict the ethical standards.