

Code of Practice

Here IAVSD provides a code of good practice and ethical behaviour in the publication, dissemination, and assessment of research, and we specify what we consider to be misconduct or unethical behaviour. All members of IAVSD are expected to adhere to this code.

Responsibilities of authors

1. Individual researchers and authors should understand and uphold high standards of ethical behaviour, particularly in relation to the publication and dissemination of their research. Our guiding principle is that an author or authors, who submit a work to editors or publishers take responsibility for the integrity of what they have written, seeking carefully to ensure that the methods and the analysis are described in sufficient detail and the results presented are correct and that the work of others is appropriately acknowledged. The authors must be prepared to send upon request relevant documentation or data in order to verify the validity of the results. This could be in the form of raw data, samples, records, etc.

It is important to note that it is not unethical to be mistaken in the attribution, or lack of attribution, of results, provided that authors have carefully sought to determine whether their claimed results are new, and provided that errors of attribution are corrected in a timely and appropriate manner, as they are discovered or pointed out.

Publication of any material as one's own when the author has learned of the material from other's, constitutes plagiarism: this is a form of theft, is unethical, and constitutes serious misconduct.

2. Each co-author should have contributed significantly to the research reported in any published work, and each person who contributed significantly to the relevant research should be named as a co-author. Further, all named authors should accept joint responsibility for any submitted manuscript and final publication. It is misconduct for one author to submit and to publish joint research without the consent of his or her named co-authors.
3. Simultaneous or concurrent submission of a manuscript describing the same research to more than one publication constitutes misconduct. Similarly, the publication of the same research in more than one journal or outlet without appropriate acknowledgement and citation constitutes misconduct.
4. Translations of published or unpublished works should always fully acknowledge the source of the work.
5. Engineers and scientists should not make public claims of potential new ideas and results or the resolution of particular problems unless they are able to provide full details in a timely manner.
6. It is unethical to include inappropriate citations of one's own work or of the work of particular colleagues or of articles in journals with which the author has a connection.

Responsibilities of editors and referees

1. Editors and referees should adhere to high standards of ethical treatment of all authors in arriving at a responsible and objective decision about publication. An editor and a referee should withdraw from any editorial duties that would involve a personal, commercial, or professional conflict of interest. An editor or referee should also avoid any misuse of their privileged position or of information received as part of their editorial duties to influence the handling of their own papers, or those of colleagues, students, or personal acquaintances. Certainly no information received in confidence should ever be used in the editor's or referee's own work.
2. Editors should consider carefully and make objective judgements about the acceptance of submitted manuscripts. Normally this will be on the basis of reports from appropriate referees, but IAVSD recognizes that it will sometimes be clear to editors that a submitted manuscript is considerably below the standards of the journal, or not in an appropriate subject area, and can therefore be rejected without submission to referees. In this case, the authors should be courteously informed of this rejection in a timely and reasoned manner.
3. The editors should inform potential authors of decisions taken in a courteous and timely manner, always passing on constructive criticism and information provided by the referees. Editors may decide that it is appropriate that certain comments provided by the referees should be confidential to the Editorial Board, and not passed on verbatim to the authors.
4. An author may communicate to the editors the information that a statement or an attribution in his or her published article is incorrect. In the case where this information is significant, it is recommended that the editors publish a correction or retraction, preferably written by the original author.
5. In some cases, it may be pointed out to the editors by another person that certain statements or attributions in an article appear to be incorrect. In these cases, the editors should consider the comments carefully and react in a proportionate manner; when appropriate, they should insist that the authors write a correction or retraction.
6. In rare cases, the editors may become convinced that parts of a work that they have published have resulted from plagiarism from another source. In these cases, the editors should request the authors to submit for publication a substantial retraction; if this is not forthcoming, the editors themselves should publish a statement giving details of the plagiarism involved.
7. Many articles are first published on the journal web site. It may become apparent that an article so published contains errors, incorrect attributions, or has resulted from plagiarism in whole or in part. It is recommended that publishers retain the original article for the historical record, but that they indicate by addition at a later specific date appropriate corrections, as they would for a printed article. In extreme cases, it may be that the publishers should indicate that the article has been 'withdrawn' either at the request of the authors or by a decision of the publishers. In this case, any subsequent printed version should reflect this decision. In the case of plagiarism the action described in section 6 above must be executed.
8. Any person acting as editor or editorial advisor should be aware of, and content with, the standards and editorial procedures and policies of the journal, and be willing to act in extreme cases when it is clear that the publishers are not following this Code.

Responsibilities of referees

1. Referees should adhere to high standards of ethical treatment of all authors in arriving at responsible and objective recommendations about the publication of material that they assess. Referees should seek to validate the correctness, significance, novelty, and clarity of a manuscript under consideration, and then report their findings to the editor in a careful and constructive manner. Nevertheless, final responsibility for the published work lies with the authors.
2. A person asked to accept the task of refereeing a paper may feel that there is a potential personal or professional conflict of interest, for example, when he or she is asked to referee a manuscript from a recent student, collaborator, or colleague. In such cases, the potential referee should discuss with the editor any possible conflicts of interest, and continue to act only with the agreement of the editor.
3. Once they have accepted the task of refereeing a manuscript, referees should seek to report in a timely manner, taking into account the length of the manuscript and the requests of the editors.
4. A referee, who suspects any element of plagiarism in a manuscript under consideration, or any other unethical behaviour, should quickly report these concerns to the editor.