

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement of The Perm Agrarian Journal

The publishing of the scientific and practical journal "Perm Agrarian Journal" is based on traditional ethical principles of Russian scientific periodical publications and ethical standards of editors and publishers' work, enshrined in the *Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors* and *Code of Conduct for Journal Publishers*, and developed by the Committee on Publications Ethics (COPE).

International copyright protection regulations, applicable laws of the Russian Federation, international publishing standards underlie the Editorial Board's publishing activity and the journal's Editorial Board.

Duties of Authors

Author (or group of authors) should understand, that he or she (or they) is (are) responsible for originality and results authenticity of scientific researches, which means that:

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Authors reporting results of original research 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 manuscript. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work.

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 author should ensure that inappropriate co-authors are excluded. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be named in an Acknowledgement section.

The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors (according to the above definition) have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication.

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

Duties of Editor

The editor of a peer-reviewed journal is responsible for deciding which articles submitted to the journal should be published, it means that:

The Editor uses editing ethics and sees that the fair play is observed.

The Editor of the journal is solely and independently responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published, often working on conjunction with the relevant society (for society-owned or sponsored journals). The validation of the work in question and its importance to researchers and readers must always underwrite such decisions. The Editor may be 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 confer with other editors or reviewers (or society officers) in making this decision.

The editor should evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s).

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.

The editor presented with convincing evidence that the substance or conclusions of a published paper are erroneous should coordinate with

the publisher (and/or society) to promote the prompt publication of a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or other note, as may be relevant. The editor reserves the right to refuse the manuscript in case of violation of the rules described above.

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

Editors should recuse themselves (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers.

Duties of Publisher

Publisher, Editor, Reviewer should comply with the rules of ethics, accepting the adopted norms in selecting manuscripts to be published in the journal. The publisher should provide specialized legal review and counsel if necessary.

Duties of Reviewer

The reviewer provides scientific expertise of author's manuscripts. Therefore, reviewer's actions should have unbiased assessment, which is based on the following principles:

The reviewer should keep the term of manuscripts reviewing and also the reviewer must ensure of the allotting confidential mark. Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process.

Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or

connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

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

The reviewer should tell about actuality, scientific level, the level of novelty, theoretical and practical importance, does this article correspond to the topic of the journal or not and does he recommend or not for publishing.

The reviewer must give an objective mark. The reviewer should give a reason for his or her opinion and if its need to attach the exile on source.

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the author(s). Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. Reviewers should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published data of which they have personal knowledge.

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