

## **Ethical policy for publishing in Stromingen**

**The editorial board of Stromingen has adopted the ethical guidelines for publishing and review directly from the AGU, and has added the guidelines of COPE in relation to “Responding to possible misconduct / inappropriate behaviour and dealing with complaints”.**

### **A. Ethical Obligations of Editors**

1. Provide unbiased consideration to all manuscripts offered for publication, judging each on its merits without regard to ethnic origin, race, religion, citizenship, language, political or other opinion, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, appearance, age or economic class seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).
2. Process all manuscripts promptly, with fairness, equity, and respect.
3. Take full responsibility for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript, working in the best interest of science and excellence and utilizing the recommendations of peer reviewers. Manuscripts may be rejected without review if considered inappropriate for the journal, and Editors may consult with Associate Editors or reviewers to aid in this decision.
4. Ensure the peer review process is objective, fair, and thorough. Be vigilant in avoiding conflict of interest, bias, discrimination, harassment, bullying or ad hominem attacks among reviewers and authors.
5. Never disclose information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than those from whom professional advice is sought. An Editor may disclose manuscript titles and names of authors of papers that have been accepted for publication.
6. Respect the intellectual independence of authors. Results that are at variance with the dominant paradigm, as well as null results, should be given full and equal consideration based upon the criteria of importance, originality, clarity, and relevance.
7. Fully delegate responsibility of a manuscript to another Editor or Associate Editor to avoid conflict of interest. This includes manuscripts authored by the Editor, manuscripts authored by scientists with whom the Editor has a close relationship, or when a manuscript is so closely related to the research of an Editor as to create a conflict of interest.
8. Never use unpublished information or interpretations from a submitted manuscript for their own or a reviewer's own research, except with the consent of the author.
9. Quickly facilitate publication of errata to correct erroneous information in a published report.

### **B. Ethical Obligations of authors**

1. Present a precise and accurate account of the research performed and a clear, objective discussion of its significance.
2. Include sufficient detail and reference to sources of information in a manuscript to permit the author's peers to repeat the work. If there are any limitations on use of or access to data, these must be clearly identified.
3. Identify sources of all information and cite those publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work and that guide the reader quickly to the primary and other earlier work essential for understanding the present investigation. Information obtained privately, as in conversation or correspondence, should not be used or reported without explicit permission from the source. Proper credit should also be given to holders of indigenous knowledge.

4. Carefully document methodology, assumptions, and uncertainty.
5. Follow the most recent acknowledged governing standards for ethics of work done with human or animal subjects.
6. Never plagiarize the work of others or your own work. Always provide appropriate citation.
7. Avoid unnecessary fragmentation or redundant publication of research reports to artificially increase the number of publications.
8. Never include personal criticism in a written piece of work.
9. Report to the Editor any changes made to the manuscript after acceptance.
10. Include as coauthors only those persons who have made significant scientific contributions to the work, and determine order of authorship in a manner appropriate to the contribution. Pay careful attention to inclusion and appropriate attribution of student work. All coauthors share responsibility for the quality and integrity of the submitted and published manuscript.
11. Reveal to the Editor any potential conflict of interest that might be affected by publication of the results contained in a manuscript or in the development of the research.
12. In the role of corresponding author, ensure that all coauthors are fully cognizant of the steps and changes in the manuscript during the review and that all authors agree to the final version of the manuscript.

### **C. Ethical Obligations of Reviewers of Manuscripts**

1. Provide clearly written, unbiased feedback in a timely manner on the scholarly merits and scientific value of the work, together with a documented basis for the reviewer's opinion. Judge the paper on its merits without regard to personal bias, ethnic origin, race, religion, citizenship, language, political or other opinion, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, appearance, age, or economic class, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).
2. Thoroughly address all review criteria provided by the journal.
3. Decline to review manuscripts for which the reviewer lacks sufficient time, is not qualified, or has a conflict of interest with any of the authors, including personal or competitive relationships.
4. Explain and support judgments adequately so that Editors and authors may understand the basis of their comments. Any statement by a reviewer on an observation, derivation, or argument that has been previously published should be accompanied by the relevant citation.
5. Provide citations to relevant work by other scientists as appropriate.
6. Alert the Editor to any significant similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper or manuscript submitted concurrently to another journal. Report any plagiarism or the appearance of plagiarism.
7. Never use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, except with the consent of the author.
8. Never include personal criticism of the author in reviewing a manuscript.

#### **D. Ethical Obligations of Authors Publishing for the Public**

Any communication of research to the public, including social media communications such as blogs and related platforms, should adhere to the same levels of accuracy and empirical support for results as do scientific communications. Authors writing for the public are expected to do the following:

1. Maintain accuracy of the science when using common words or simplifying concepts to be understood.
2. Announce a discovery to the public only when the experimental, statistical, or theoretical support for it is of sufficient strength to warrant publication in the scientific literature. Ensure submission of such work as quickly as possible.
3. Maintain scientific accuracy while using analogies that are emotionally compelling or that relate to popularly understood concepts or themes.

#### **E. Ethical Obligations of the NHV Toward Its Editors:**

To maintain honesty and trust in the NHV publishing process, the officers and staff of NHV are expected to do the following:

1. Fully inform Stromingen Editors of their responsibilities, authorities, terms of appointment, and mechanisms for resolving conflict.
2. Never interfere in the evaluation, selection, or editing of individual articles, and respect that Editors have authority over the editorial content of the journal, generally referred to as "editorial independence."
3. Support editorial decisions made based on the clarity, originality, importance, and relevance to the journal's audience including manuscripts that are critical of the current paradigm or that may be contrary to the published statements of NHV.
4. Protect the editorial, peer review, and publishing process from influence of commercial interest, personal self-interest, political influence, or other non-scientific influences.
5. Responsibly use the right to appoint and terminate Editors. Cause for dismissal should be for substantial reasons such as scientific misconduct, irresponsible decisions, personal behavior contrary to the ethical standards of the profession, or failure to fulfill responsibilities as Editors.

#### **F. General Process for Filing and Investigating Allegations of Misconduct or complaints**

The COPE Code of Conduct states that editors have a responsibility for pursuing cases of suspected misconduct even in submissions they do not intend to publish. It is important that editors act politely, fairly but firmly at all times. The COPE flowcharts show recommended actions and this usually starts with contacting the author or reviewer to ask for an explanation. Such letters can be difficult to write: they should not accuse authors or reviewers, but rather should state the facts clearly, giving any evidence, and allow authors or reviewers a chance to explain their actions before coming to a decision. COPE has prepared sample letters to help editors and these can be adapted as required.

If you have concerns about plagiarism, data fabrication, or an authorship dispute you should (if possible) involve other editors (preferably the one who was involved directly in dealing with the manuscript) and inform the publisher. You may wish to consult the cases discussed at the COPE forum as well as the flowcharts. It is essential to handle serious cases appropriately because they may have important

implications for the individuals involved and may even have legal and financial implications for your journal.

Editors should always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. COPE has produced guidance on retractions. Prompt retraction of a seriously flawed article should not be viewed as an admission of failure on the part of the journal but as a responsible action to safeguard the academic record.

Formal complaints regarding articles or the review process of Stromingen will firstly be discussed within the editorial board and the coordinator of the board will respond to the person complaining and inform the NHV board. In case the person complaining is not satisfied with the response provided, the board of the NHV can mediate between complainant and editorial board.