



ROMANIA
MINISTERUL EDUCAȚIEI NAȚIONALE
UNIVERSITATEA "OVIDIUS" DIN CONSTANȚA
B-dul Mamaia 124, 900527 Constanța
Tel./Fax: 40-241- 606467, 511512, 618372, 0723151222
E-mail: rectorat2@univ-ovidius.ro
Webpage: www.univ-ovidius.ro

Ovidius University Annals-Series Civil Engineering (OUASCE)

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

Background and structure

The publication ethics and malpractice statement of the OUASCE journal is mainly based on the Code of Conduct and Best-Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors (Committee on Publication Ethics, 2011) and Elsevier recommendation. This document is designed to provide a set of minimum standards to will respect by editor board, authors and reviewers.

Section A. Editors' responsibilities

1. Publication decisions

- (a) The editor is responsible for deciding which of the papers submitted to the journal will be published.
- (b) The editor will evaluate manuscripts without regard to the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy.
- (c) The decision to accept or reject a paper will be based on the academic merit from review rapport.

2. Confidentiality

The editor and any editorial staff must ensure that information regarding manuscripts submitted by the authors is kept confidential.

3. Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted paper will not be used by the editor or the members of the editorial board for their own research purposes without the author's explicit written consent.

Section B. Reviewers' responsibilities

1. Contribution to editorial decisions

The peer-reviewing process assists the editor and the editorial board in making editorial decisions and may also serve the author in improving the paper.

2. Promptness

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, so that the manuscript could be sent to another reviewer.

3. Confidentiality

Any manuscripts 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.

4. Standards of objectivity

- (a) Reviews should be conducted objectively with no personal criticism of the author.
- (b) The observations should be formulated clearly with supporting arguments, so that authors can use them for improving the paper.
- (c) Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

5. Acknowledgement of sources

- (a) Reviewers should identify cases in which relevant published work referred to in the paper has not been cited in the reference section.
- (b) They should point out whether observations or arguments derived from other publications are accompanied by the respective source.
- (c) 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.

6. Disclosure and conflict of interest

- (a) Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.
- (b) 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 associated with the papers.

Section C. Authors' duties

1. Reporting standards

- (a) Authors of original research reports should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance.
- (b) Authors must state that all data in the paper are real and authentic.
- (c) A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work.

(d) Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

2. Data access and retention

Authors could be asked to provide the raw data of their study together with the paper for editorial review and should be prepared to make the data publicly available if practicable.

3. Originality, plagiarism and acknowledgement of sources

(a) Authors will submit only entirely original works.

(b) Authors must identify all sources used in the creation of their manuscript.

(c) Authors must certify that their manuscripts are their original work.

4. Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

In general, papers describing essentially the same research should not be published in more than one journal. In this respect,

(a) Authors must certify that the manuscript has not previously been published elsewhere.

(b) Authors must certify that the manuscript is not currently being considered for publication elsewhere.

(c) In addition, manuscripts under review by the journal should not be resubmitted to copyrighted publications. However, by submitting a manuscript, the author(s) retain the rights to the published material.

5. Authorship of the paper

(a) All authors mentioned in the paper must have significantly contributed to the research.

(b) The corresponding author ensures that all contributing co-authors are included in the author list.

(c) 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.

6. Disclosure and conflicts of interest

(a) Authors must notify the Editors of any conflicts of interest that may be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript.

(b) All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

7. 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 journal editor or publisher and to cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper in form of an erratum.

Section D. Publication and authorship

All submitted papers are subject to strict peer-review process by at least two international/national reviewers that are experts in the area of the particular paper.

The factors that are taken into account in review are relevance, soundness, significance, originality, readability and language.

The possible decisions include acceptance, acceptance with minor or major revisions, or rejection.

If authors are encouraged to revise and resubmit a submission, there is no guarantee that the revised submission will be accepted.

Rejected articles will not be re-reviewed.

The paper acceptance is constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism.

No research can be included in more than one publication.

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
<http://www.jisis.org/publication-ethics-and-malpractice-statement.php>
http://www.psychopen.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/documents/guidelines/publication_ethics_and_publication_malpractice_statement.pdf