



101000, Moscow, Armyanskiy lane,
9/1/1, bldg.1, office 203
russian-arctic.info
facebook.com/russianarcticjournal
info@arctic-centre.com

Editorial ethics and standards of the «Russian Arctic» Scientific Journal

«Russian Arctic» is a peer-reviewed scientific journal that adheres to international standards of editorial ethics and aims to prevent violations of ethical standards.

The main terms used in the current guidelines:

Ethics of scientific publications are the standards of professional behaviour among authors, reviewers, editors, publishers and readers during the creation, distribution and use of scientific publications.

Author is a person or a group of persons (a team of authors) involved in publication of the results of scientific research.

Editor-in-chief is the person who oversees the work of the Editorial Desk and makes final decisions regarding production and publication of the Journal.

Founder is a legal entity or an individual who publishes the Journal.

Scientific article is a complete and published author's work.

Plagiarism is the deliberate appropriation of someone else's scientific or artwork, of someone else's ideas or inventions. Plagiarism may result in a violation of copyright law and patent law and as such may result in legal liability.

Editor is a representative of the Journal or publishing house tasked with preparing materials for publication, as well as maintaining a line of communication with authors and readers.

Editorial Board is an advisory body consisting of persons of authority who assist the Editor-in-chief in the selection, preparation and review of Manuscripts prior to publication.

Reviewer is an expert who acts on behalf of the Journal or publishing house and conducts a peer review (scientific examination) of manuscripts in order to determine whether they're suitable for publication.

Manuscript is an Author's work submitted for publication to the Editorial Desk but not yet published.

Reader is any person who has read the published materials.

1. General provisions

1.1. The present guidelines establish ethical standards for the parties involved in the publication of original scientific articles in the Russian Arctic Journal: authors, editors, Editorial Desk, Editorial Board, reviewers and the Founder (Publisher). The parties adopt a responsible approach based on decency, confidentiality, supervision of publications and work to avoid a conflict of interest.

1.2. LLC «Centre for Information and Legal Support for the Development of the Arctic» (hereinafter – the Centre of the Arctic), as the Founder and Publisher of the Journal, assumes obligations to monitor all stages of scientific and publishing process and recognizes its ethical and other obligations related to the publication of scientific articles in the «Russian Arctic» Journal.

1.3. The Centre of the Arctic and the Editorial Desk of the «Russian Arctic» Journal adhere to the ethical guidelines set out by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), draw on the experience of established international journals and publishing houses and act under the provisions of Chapter 70 («Copyright») of the Civil Code of the Russian Federation.

2. Ethical Responsibilities of Authors

2.1. The Author adheres to the publication requirement that submitted work has not been published elsewhere or submitted to other journals for consideration. Concurrent submission to several journals is unacceptable and is considered to be unethical behaviour. The same applies to the translation of an article into a foreign language and its publication in another journal (i.e. redundant publication).

2.2. The Manuscript submitted by the Author to the Journal is a scientific article that presents the findings of original research. If the Author uses text, quotes or any data originated by other Authors/researchers, such use should be properly acknowledged and referenced, with the source cited in the Reference list. Plagiarism in any form is considered unethical and dishonest behaviour of the Author. Self-plagiarism is a form of plagiarism and is regarded by the Editors as a violation of editorial ethics. The Author copying or recycling their own work without a reference to previously published material, in the absence of new research findings that make the submitted work significantly different from previous publications, is considered self-plagiarism.

2.3. Research results provided by the Author should be sound and honest. Scientific results must be presented clearly and unambiguously. Deliberately erroneous or falsified statements are unacceptable.

2.4. The Author is obliged to provide the source materials (data) of the study at the request of the editorial staff of the Journal and should be prepared to provide public access to them. The Author should keep this data for a reasonable time after publication for possible reproduction and verification.

2.5. The Author undertakes to appropriately cite scientific and other sources used in preparation of the Article in the Reference list. The Author should appropriately acknowledge and mark quotes and links to other research and not copy links to articles from other publications the Author did not familiarize him/herself with.

2.6. All individuals who made significant contributions to the study should be listed as contributing authors. The team of authors should be limited to those individuals only. The Author presenting a scientific article to the Editorial Desk of the Russian Arctic Journal guarantees that he/she has indicated all the co-authors, that all the co-authors approve of the final version of the Manuscript and agree with its submission to the Journal. At the same time, the responsible Author who sends the article to the Journal on behalf of and with the consent of the team of authors acts as the contact person between the Journal's editorial staff and other authors and should keep the co-authors informed about the stages of the editorial process and the decisions made by the Journal's Editorial Board. Persons who made less substantial or technical contributions to the research may be acknowledged in the body of the Article.

2.7. Authors should declare financial and any other relevant conflicts of interest in the body the Article or report a conflict of interest to the editors of the Journal in any other available way, since the presence of a conflict of interest can affect the assessment and interpretation of a scientific article.

2.8. If the Author finds a significant error or inaccuracy in an Article that has already been published, they must immediately inform the Editors in order to take a joint decision on publishing a correction. If the Editorial staff are informed of an error by third parties, the Author must immediately correct the error or to prove the claim to be false.

3. Ethical Responsibilities of Reviewers

- 3.1. The peer review of scientific articles facilitates decision-making by the Journal's Editorial Board and helps Authors improve the articles' content. The decision on whether to accept an Article for publication, return it to the Author for revision or reject it is made by the Journal's Editor-in-chief and Scientific Editor based on the results of the peer review and the recommendations provided by the Editorial Board of the Journal.
- 3.2. The Reviewer is required to have sufficient expertise to carry out assessment of a scientific article. If the Reviewer doesn't feel competent to review a study on a particular issue, they should withdraw from the reviewing process.
- 3.3. The Reviewer is obliged to provide a review within the timeframe specified by the Editors. If the Reviewer understands that examining the Manuscript and preparing the review in a timely manner isn't possible, they must notify the Editors thereof.
- 3.4. A Manuscript submitted for review should be considered to be a confidential document, regardless of how the peer review is taking place. The Reviewer may show the Manuscript or discuss it with other persons only after obtaining permission of the Journal's Editor-in-chief or Scientific Editor. The Reviewer may not use the ideas and information presented in the Manuscript before its publication.
- 3.5. The Reviewer undertakes to carry out a fair and objective assessment of the Manuscript. The review must be unbiased, personal criticism is unacceptable. The Reviewer should evaluate the scientific content of the Manuscript only, regardless of the race, gender, nationality, citizenship or political opinion of the Author. The Reviewer's conclusions should be reasonable and valid and supported by references to reliable sources.
- 3.6. In case the Reviewer finds works that influenced the Manuscript in question but were not appropriately referenced by the Author, the Reviewer must inform the Editors thereof. The Reviewer must inform the Editorial Desk of any significant similarities or overlap found between the Manuscript in question and a previously published work.
- 3.7. The Reviewer may not use materials from an unpublished Manuscript for his own research without written consent of the Author. The Reviewer must withdraw from reviewing process in case there's a conflict of interest due to competitive, joint or other relations with the Author or organization related to the Manuscript under review.

4. Ethical Responsibilities of the Editors

4.1. The Editorial Desk decides which of the submitted Manuscripts should be published, based on their compliance with publication guidelines and the results of peer review. Manuscripts are approved for publication solely on the basis of their scientific value, relevance, high theoretical and practical significance. When deciding on whether to publish, the Editors are guided by the Journal's policy and do not allow the publication of Articles that contain slander, insults, plagiarism or copyright infringement. The final decision on publication is made by the Editor-in-chief and Scientific Editor, who assume responsibility for all published materials.

4.2. The Editors of the Journal evaluate scientific content of the article only, regardless of race, nationality, origin, citizenship (citizenship), gender, occupation, place of work, residence of the Author, as well as their political, philosophical, religious and other views.

4.3. The Editors of the Journal undertake to protect the confidentiality of the submitted material by not sharing any information thereof with third parties. The Editorial Board of the Journal should not disclose any information about the submitted material to anyone other than the Author, Reviewers, Publisher and Founder.

4.4. The Editors guarantee that any materials of a rejected Manuscript will not be used by members of the Editorial Board in their own research without written consent of the Author. The Editorial Board will refuse to consider a Manuscript if there is a conflict of interest arising from competitive, cooperative or other relations with Authors or organizations associated with the study. The Editors undertake to require that all participants of the publication process disclose competing interest. The Editor-in-chief or deputy Editor-in-chief require that all Authors declare a conflict of interest if there is any and publish corrections if a conflict of interest is discovered after publication. The Editor-in-chief or deputy Editor-in-chief may publish a refutation, issue an 'expression of concern' or retract the Article.

4.5. The editorial staff of the Journal protect the Authors' reputation and take all cases of plagiarism or other facts of publication misconduct very seriously. The editorial staff promptly respond to any claim of ethical nature about a submitted or published Article, regardless of the time it was received. The Editors undertake to act correctly and reasonably on such claims by taking the following measures: informing the Author, investigating the claim and, if necessary, communicating with relevant institutions or research organizations. If the claim is substantiated, the Editors publish a correction, retraction or other relevant statement. The editors may refuse to publish the Article, retract the Article, terminate further cooperation with the Author for a certain period of time and take other necessary measures to prevent further possible misconduct by the Author. The Editors reserve the right to ignore allegations of plagiarism if the person making the allegation provides false personal information (for example, acts under an alias) or acts in an unethical or threatening manner. The Editors are not obliged to discuss plagiarism allegations with persons not directly related to them.

5. Ethical Responsibilities of the Founder

- 5.1. The Founder must follow the procedures that allow the Editors, Reviewers and Authors to adhere to ethical and publication standards.
- 5.2. The Founder cannot influence the Journal's editorial policy. The Editors of the Russian Arctic Journal decide on publication independently of the Founder.
- 5.3. The Founder should provide legal and other support to the Editors of the Journal, including with investigation of cases of research and publication misconduct, and help resolve these issues.
- 5.4. The Founder ensures the timely publication of the Journal's issues.
- 5.5. The Founder, subject to agreement with the Editor-in-chief, publishes corrections, refutations and retracts Articles that violate publication and research ethics or contain critical errors.

6. The procedure for retraction of Article

In the event of allegations of ethical misconduct regarding Articles published in the Journal, the Editor-in-chief together with the Founder take appropriate measures based on the «Retraction Guidelines» of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Such measures include an investigation of the alleged misconduct by the Editorial Desk of the Journal, communication with the Authors and substantiation of the complaint or claim, as well as communication with relevant organizations and research centres within the framework of cooperation in honest research, and retraction of the Article.