

PUBLISHING POLICY
of the scientific and practical journal
“The Bulletin of Izhevsk State Agricultural Academy”
and ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR PUBLICATIONS

The editorial board of the scientific and practical journal "The Bulletin of Izhevsk State Agricultural Academy" (hereinafter referred to as the Editorial Board) maintains a certain level of requirements for the selection and acceptance of articles submitted to the Editorial Board of the journal. These norms are determined by the scientific directions of the journal and the international standards for the quality of scientific papers and their presentation, adopted in the academic community.

Developing the provisions of the publishing policy the Editorial Board was guided by the recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics and the experience of foreign and Russian professional communities, scientific organizations and editorial offices of scientific publications.

I Ethical obligations of journal editors

1.1 The editor should consider all manuscripts submitted for publication without prejudice, appreciating them according to their merits, regardless of race, religion, ethnicity, as well as the position or place of work of the author (authors). However, the editor may take into account the relationship of the currently reviewed manuscript with other previously submitted works by the same authors.

1.2 The science editor is fully responsible for accepting or rejecting a manuscript. The editor takes into account the reviewer's recommendation regarding the quality and authenticity of the manuscript submitted for publication. However, manuscripts may be rejected without peer review if the editor considers that they do not conform the scientific sphere of the journal.

1.3 The editor and members of the Editorial Board should not provide other persons with any information related to the contents of the manuscript under consideration, except for the persons making the professional evaluation of this manuscript. The article is published in the journal and posted on the related electronic resources after the positive decision of the editor regarding the manuscript.

1.4 In accordance with international legislation regarding the observance of copyright for electronic information resources, the materials of the journal cannot be reproduced in whole or in part in any form (electronic or printed) without the prior written consent of the authors and the editors of the journal. A reference to the original source (journal) is required when using published materials in the context of other documents.

1.5 The editor should respect the intellectual independence of authors.

1.6 The responsibility and rights of the journal editor must be delegated to some other qualified person if the author of the submitted manuscript is the editor himself.

1.7 Unpublished information, arguments or interpretations disclosed in a submitted manuscript may be used in the editor's own research only with the consent of the author. If a manuscript is so closely related to the present or past research of the editor that a conflict of interest may arise, the editor should arrange for some other qualified person to accept editorial responsibility for the manuscript.

1.8 If the editor is provided with convincing evidence that the main content or conclusions of the work published in the journal are erroneous, the editor should contribute to the publication of the appropriate report indicating this error and, if possible, correcting it. This report may be written by the person who discovered the error or by an independent author.

1.9 The author may request that the editor should not engage certain reviewers in reviewing the manuscript. However, the editor may decide to employ one or more of these reviewers if he feels that their opinions are essential to an unbiased review of the manuscript. Such a decision can be made, for example, in the case when there are serious contradictions between this manuscript and the previous work of a prospective reviewer.

II Ethical obligations of authors

2.1 The authors of the articles take full responsibility for the contents of the articles and for the mere fact of their publication. The Editorial Board of the journal does not take any responsibility to the authors and / or third parties and organizations for possible damage caused by the publication of the article.

2.2 The author should cite the publications that have had a decisive influence on the essence of the work being presented, as well as those that can quickly introduce the reader to the earlier papers that are essential for understanding this research. Citations of papers that are not directly related to the given report should be minimized except for the reviews. It is also requisite to indicate the sources of essential materials used in this work as required, if these materials were not obtained by the author himself.

2.3 When preparing a manuscript for publication, the author must inform the editor about related manuscripts of the author submitted for publication or accepted for publication. Copies of these manuscripts should be submitted to the editor, and their relations to the manuscript submitted for publication should be indicated.

2.4 The author should not submit manuscripts describing essentially the same results to more than one journal as a primary publication. It is acceptable to submit a manuscript of a full article expanding on a previously published short preliminary report (message) on the same work. However, when submitting such a manuscript, the editor must be notified of the earlier report, and that preliminary report must be cited in the current manuscript.

2.5 The author must clearly indicate the sources of all information cited or presented with the exception of generally known information. The information obtained while providing confidential services, such as peer review of manuscripts or projects submitted for grants, should be handled in the same way.

2.6 Experimental or theoretical research can sometimes serve as a basis for criticizing the work of another researcher. The published articles may, where appropriate, contain such criticism. Personal criticism, however, cannot be considered appropriate under any circumstances.

2.7 The co-authors of the article should be all those persons who have made a significant scientific contribution to the submitted work and who share responsibility for the results obtained. Other contributions should be noted in the notes or in the Acknowledgments section. Deceased persons who meet the above criteria should be included among the authors, and the date of their death should be indicated in a note. Fictitious names must not be used as the author or co-author. The author submitting the manuscript for publication is responsible for ensuring that the list of co-authors includes all those and only those persons who meet the criterion of authorship. In an article written by several authors, one of the authors who submits contact information, documents to the editorial office and conducts correspondence with the editors takes responsibility for the consent of the other authors of the article to its publication in the journal.

2.8 Authors should make the editor aware of any potential conflict of interest, such as consulting or financial interests of any company, which could be affected by the publication of the results contained in this manuscript. Authors must guarantee that there are no contractual relationships or proprietary considerations that could affect the publication of the information contained in the submitted manuscript.

III Ethical obligations of reviewers

3.1 The reviewer ought to assess objectively the quality of the manuscript, the submitted experimental and theoretical work, its interpretation and presentation, and also take into account the extent to which the work meets high scientific and literary standards. The reviewer must respect the intellectual independence of the authors.

3.2 If the selected reviewer is not sure that his qualifications correspond to the level of research presented in the manuscript, he must immediately return the manuscript.

3.3 The reviewer should take into account the possibility of a conflict of interest in the case when the manuscript under consideration is closely related to the current or published work of the reviewer. If in doubt, the reviewer should immediately return the manuscript without a review indicating a conflict of interest.

3.4 The reviewer should not evaluate the manuscript of the author or co-author with whom he has personal or professional relations, and if such relationships may affect the judgment of the manuscript.

3.5 The reviewer must treat the manuscript sent for review as a confidential document. He should not show the manuscript to others or discuss it with other colleagues except for special cases when the reviewer needs someone's special advice.

3.6 Reviewers should explain and justify their judgments adequately so that editors and authors can understand what their comments are based on. Any claim that an observation, conclusion, or argument has already been published must be accompanied by an appropriate citation.

3.7 The reviewer should note any cases of insufficient citation of other scientists that are directly related to the peer-reviewed work by the authors of the works; however, it should be noted that comments on insufficient citation of the reviewer's own research may be considered to be biased. The reviewer should draw the editor's attention to any significant similarity between the manuscript in question and any published article or any manuscript simultaneously submitted to another journal.

3.8 The reviewer must provide feedback in a timely manner.

3.9 Reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments or interpretations contained in the manuscript under consideration without consent of the author. However, when such information indicates that some of the reviewer's own research may prove to be ineffective, the stoppage of such work of the reviewer are in agreement with the ethical standards.

IV Privacy

4.1 The reviewer undertakes the obligation not to disclose the papers received from the editorial office for review to third parties.

4.2 Articles should not be discussed or passed on to third parties for reading, unless it is specified additionally with the editors.

4.3 Unpublished data in the submitted manuscript should not be used in the reviewer's own research without the written consent of the authors. Non-public information or ideas obtained as a result of the peer review of the work must be kept confidential and must not be used for personal purposes.

4.4 It is justified to seek the opinion of one of the colleagues in some cases only with prior notice to the editor. The person additionally involved in the peer review must respect confidentiality issues.

4.5 Personal data of reviewers, as a rule, are not disclosed to the authors. At the same time, reviewers should not try to establish contact with the authors independently.