

Editorial Board of the Journal «**Current Studies in Herpetology**» follows the Publishing Ethics of the Scientific Journals published by the Saratov State University.

Publishing Ethics of the Scientific Journals published by the Saratov State University

Adopted at the University Academic Council sitting
September, 19, 2017

Minutes № 8.

Approved by the Rector of SSU
September, 19, 2017

Editorial Board of the Journal commits to maintaining good scientific reputation. Our journals publish scholarly works and we bear responsibility for keeping high standards of the publications. Editorial Board strives to uphold ethical norms accepted by the international research community and prevent any violation of such norms.

The present document is compiled in accord with the Committee of Publishing Ethics¹ recommendations. It also considers the experience of the leading international Publishing Houses² and Journal Editorial Boards.

1. Duties of Editor in Chief and Editorial Board Members

1.1. Publication decision

Editor in Chief (Editor) of the journal is solely and independently responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The validation of the work in question and its importance to researchers and readers must always underwrite such decisions. The Editor is guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editor may consult other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

1.2. Unbiasedness

Editorial Board members should carry out proper assessment of the manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to the race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

1.3. Confidentiality

The editor and any editorial staff 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, as appropriate.

¹ <http://publicationethics.org>

² <http://health.elsevier.ru/about/news/?id=990>, <http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk>

1.4. Disclosure policy and conflicts of interest

1.4.1 Unpublished materials of a submitted manuscript must not be used in the editor's own research without the author's express written consent.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

1.4.2 Editorial Board members should recuse themselves from considering the manuscripts (i.e. ask the Editor, Deputy Editor or other members of the editorial board to review and consider the materials instead) in case of the conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions related to the papers.

1.5. Vigilance over published record

The Editorial Board member presenting convincing evidence of the invalidity of the paper research assumptions or conclusions should report about it to the Editor (and/or Editorial Board) with the purpose of prompt notification about the necessity of correction, paper retraction, expression of concern, or other note, as may be relevant.

1.6. Involvement and cooperation in investigations

Editorial Board must take appropriate responsive measures in case of ethical complaints concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper. Such measures will generally include contacting the author 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.

2. Duties of Reviewers

2.1. Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Peer review assists in making editorial decisions and through 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. Editorial Board shares the view that all scholars who wish to contribute to publications have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

2.2. Promptness

Selected reviewers who feel they do not have the expertise to assess all aspects of the manuscript or if circumstances arise that will prevent them from submitting a timely review should notify the editor and recuse themselves from the review process.

2.3. Confidentiality

Any manuscript received for review must be treated as a confidential document. It must not be shown to or discussed with any other person except as authorised by the editor.

2.4. Standard and objectivity

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

2.5. Acknowledgement of Sources

Reviewers should be alert to failure of authors to cite relevant published work of other scholars. Any previously reported statement in an observation, derivation, or argument 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.

2.6. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

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

2.6.2. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts if there is a conflict of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions related to the papers.

3. Duties of Authors

3.1. Reporting standards

Authors of scientific articles describing the original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective assessment of its significance. Underlying data should be accurately represented in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references for possible replication. Fraudulent or wittingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

3.2. Data Access and Retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data related to the paper for editorial review, and should be prepared to provide free 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.

3.3. Originality and Plagiarism

3.3.1 The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if they have used the works and/or assertions of other authors, this has been appropriately cited or quoted.

3.3.2 Plagiarism takes many forms, from presenting other scholar's work as the author's own paper, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of other scholars' papers (without references), to claiming results of research conducted by other

authors. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

3.4. Multiple, Redundant or Concurrent Publication

3.4.1 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 behaviour and is unacceptable.

3.4.2. In general, an author should not submit for consideration in another journal a previously published paper.

3.4.3. Publication of some kinds of articles (e.g., clinical guidelines, translations) in more than one journal is sometimes justifiable, provided certain conditions are met. The authors and editors of the journals concerned must agree to the secondary publication, which must reflect the same data and interpretation of the primary document. The primary reference must be cited in the secondary publication. Further detail on acceptable forms of secondary publication can be found at www.icmje.org.

3.5. Acknowledgement of Sources

Proper acknowledgment of the work of other scholars 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.

3.6. Authorship of the Paper

3.6.1 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.

3.6.2. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

3.7. Hazards and Human or Animal Subjects

3.7.1 If the work involves chemicals, procedures or equipment that have any unusual hazards inherent in their use, the author must clearly identify these in the manuscript.

3.7.2 If the work involves the use of animal or human subjects, the author should ensure that the manuscript contains a statement that all procedures were performed in compliance with relevant laws and institutional guidelines and that the appropriate institutional committee(s) have approved them. Authors should include a statement in the manuscript that informed consent was obtained for experimentation with human subjects. The privacy rights of human subjects must always be observed.

3.8. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

3.8.1 All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed as influencing the results or interpretation of their manuscript.

3.8.2 Examples of potential conflicts of interest which should be disclosed include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. Potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed at the earliest possible stage.

3.9. 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 journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper. If the editor or the publisher learns from a third party that a published paper contains a significant error, it is the obligation of the author to promptly retract or correct the paper.

4. Duties of the Publisher

4.1 The publisher should adopt policies and procedures that support editors, reviewers and authors in performing their ethical duties under these ethics guidelines. The publisher should ensure that the potential revenue for advertising or reprint has no impact or influence on editorial decisions.

4.2. The publisher should support journal editors in the review of complaints raised concerning ethical issues and help communications with other journals and/or publishers where this contributes to performing the duties of Editorial Boards.

4.3. The publisher should develop codes of practice and inculcate industry standards for best practice on ethical matters, errors and retractions.

4.4 The publisher should provide specialised legal review and counsel if necessary.