



EU PVSEC Statement of Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice

EU PVSEC is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and takes all possible measures against any publication malpractices.

Our publication ethics and publication malpractice statement is mainly based on COPE's Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors (Committee on Publication Ethics, 2011) and is supplemented by instructions to authors.

1. Duties of Editors

Publication decisions

The editor, means the EU PVSEC Executive Committee, is responsible for deciding which of the abstracts submitted to EU PVSEC will be accepted for presentation and for publication of the final paper in the EU PVSEC Conference Proceedings. The decision is based on the scoring results of the abstracts review process, accomplished by the EU PVSEC Scientific Committee (Topic Organisers and Paper Review Experts). Main selection criteria are the contribution's importance, originality and clarity, and the study's validity and its relevance. Current legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism will also be considered. The submitted abstracts are reviewed without regard to the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy.

Confidentiality

The editor and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted abstract to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript will not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author.

2. Duties of EU PVSEC Scientific Committee (Paper Review Experts and Topic Organisers)

Promptness

Any selected Paper Review Expert or Topic Organiser who feels unqualified to review the research reported in an abstract or knows that its prompt review will be impossible, should notify the EU PVSEC Executive Committee and withdraw from the review process.

Confidentiality

Any abstracts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be disclosed to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly, if necessary with explanation. The submitted abstracts are reviewed without regard to the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify cases in which relevant published work referred to in the extended abstract has not been cited in the reference section. They should point out whether observations or arguments derived from other publications are accompanied by the respective source. Reviewers will notify the editor of any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through the review process must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider abstracts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions associated with the papers.

3. Duties of Authors

Reporting standards

Authors of original research reports should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the abstract and in the final manuscript. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

Data access and retention

Authors could be asked to provide the raw data of their study together with the paper for abstract review and should be prepared to make the data publicly available if practicable. In any event, authors should ensure accessibility of such data to other competent professionals for at least ten years after publication (preferably via an institutional or subject-based data repository or other data center), provided that the confidentiality of the participants can be protected and legal rights concerning proprietary data do not preclude their release.

Originality and Plagiarism

Authors will submit only entirely original works, and will appropriately cite or quote the work and/or words of others. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work should also be cited.

Acknowledgement of sources

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same paper to more than one journal or Conference constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Authorship of the paper

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.

The corresponding author ensures that all contributing co-authors and no uninvolved persons are included in the author list. The corresponding author will also verify that all co-authors have approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

Fundamental errors in published works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the editor or publisher and to cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

Publisher's confirmation

In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism the publisher, in close collaboration with the editors, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum or, in the most severe cases, the complete retraction of the affected work.

References

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). (2011, March 7). Code of Conduct and Best-Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors. Retrieved from http://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf

EU PVSEC, 5 September 2013