

Ethical Obligations of Authors

When an author wants to address to a Journal “ANNALS OF THE ORADEA UNIVERSITY. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering” editor, to send a manuscript is expected to know and adhere to ethical rules declared the Journal, or if they are violated, it may be that the author or committed offenses that can lead to penalties by the editor, including, but not limited to suspension or revocation publishing rights.

National Science Foundation (NSF) from USA, provides and apply following definitions for major offenses to the ethical publication of reported research(<http://www.nsf.gov/oig/resmisreg.pdf>):

- (a) **Research misconduct** means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing or performing research (...).
 - (1) **Fabrication** means making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
 - (2) **Falsification** means manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
 - (3) **Plagiarism** means the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results or words without giving appropriate credit.
 - (4) **Research**, for purposes of paragraph (a) of this section, includes proposals submitted to NSF in all fields of science, engineering, mathematics, and education and results from such proposals.
- (b) **Research misconduct** does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

The authors of scientific papers must adhere to the Journal ethical system of values, any failure to follow rules of ethics is unconditionally punished by the Editorial Board of the Journal, leading to the suspension of any collaboration relationship between the author, who fail to comply rules of ethics or academic morals, and the Journal.

The most important duty of an author is to present an accurate and complete description of the research, the priority is avoiding deceit, including data collected or used and an objective discussion of the significance of research. The data are defined as the information gathered or used for generating research findings. The research report and data collected should contain sufficient detail and references to public sources of information to allow to any professional in the field be able to replicate the experimental observations.

Aware that a Journal is a great resource and a public space at the same time, these qualities being acquired and maintained with considerable costs, the author has the obligation to respect, to use this space with wisdom and efficiently.

When the authors of a scientific research state that they used unusual or unconventional materials, public unavailable to other researchers, it is necessary that the manuscript's authors to disclose characteristics of the materials used and to store the database so that they may become available public to anyone interested.

The accurate and honestly citation of all publications which have guided an author in its work constitutes a significant commitment for the author, because of this issue depends the quick understanding of the research presented in the study, and the reader will be easily guided, in turn, into the professional literature. An exception to this rule might be accepted for a form of review papers, where the number of bibliographical references is limited. Any law does not allow to the published scientific papers to deviate from ethics, on the grounds that the author has not been pretty, or fully aware of the original papers, similar in content to the paper submitted for publication. That is why the author's manuscript is required to undertake research and database searches, for complete and honest citation of all papers similar to the manuscript.

A manuscript have to report honestly, any randomly functionand with full hazard, a equipment or any unconventional behavior of a material under normal circumstances. The authors have to notify the editor if under given conditions the manuscript may lead to misunderstanding of the phenomena or procedures that spur entirely incidental instances, or uncontrollable harmful to beings or the environment.

The authors of manuscripts submitted for Journal publication must treat its space with honesty and efficiently, therefore extensive studies fragmentation is not allowed. This way the authors speculates to publish more papers by the same basis, namely that concerned with the same subject. A manuscript should give the reader a well outlined and clearly defined description of a topic.

If when submitting a manuscript for publication, the author / authors other manuscripts related to this are into the analysis and peer review of other Journals or other proceedings, they must notify the editor, the latter having been advised on the appropriateness publication of the paper in question.

It is not an acceptable practice, to submit a manuscript that describes basically the same study, or the same research, simultaneously at several Journals, so long as one of the Journal was published a preliminary study, a communication or a research letter, in order to speculate if it shall be rejected by an editor or another. Editorial practice allows for submission a complete manuscript of a paper which is an extension of preliminary paper (communication or letter of research), to the same Journal that previously published the communication or the letter of research. Furthermore, the author will be required to cite preliminary paper into manuscript paper (the extension) submitted for publication.

It is known that there is not an easy task to identify the sources of all information contained in the paper, and of which an author acknowledges that they are non-original, unless the information that represents common knowledge. Also, the authors do not should report as reliable data, that kind of information gathered through direct conversations, correspondences or discussions with other researchers without their explicit permission. In the same manner, it goes without saying, shall be treated the information obtained during the peer-review procedures, publication procedures or assessment of grants.

The justified hard criticism of a study or an experiment, it is admissible from a high scientific personality which has reputation in the field. It is not indicated, and it is even inadmissible the personal criticism.

The Journal "ANNALS OF THE ORADEA UNIVERSITY. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering" adheres and applies the instructions guide of the [International Committee of Medical Journal Editors](#) (ICMJE) headed "Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts", which clearly sets what an "author" and what a "co-author" of a scientific paper is (http://icmje.org/ethical_1author.html). As follows:

„Authorship and Contributorship

Byline Authors

An "author" is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study, and biomedical authorship continues to have important academic, social, and financial implications (1). *An author must take responsibility for at least one component of the work, should be able to identify who is responsible for each other component, and should ideally be confident in their co-authors' ability and integrity.* In the past, readers were rarely provided with information about contributions to studies from persons listed as authors and in Acknowledgments (2). Some Journals now request and publish information about the contributions of each person named as having participated in a submitted study, at least for original research. Editors are strongly encouraged to develop and implement a contributorship policy, as well as a policy on identifying who is responsible for the integrity of the work as a whole.

While contributorship and guarantorship policies obviously remove much of the ambiguity surrounding contributions, they leave unresolved the question of the quantity and quality of contribution that qualify for authorship. The IJCM has recommended the following criteria for authorship; these criteria are still appropriate for Journals that distinguish authors from other contributors.

- Authorship credit should be based on 1) substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; 2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and 3) final approval of the version to be published. Authors should meet conditions 1, 2, and 3.
- When a large, multicenter group has conducted the work, the group should identify the individuals who accept direct responsibility for the manuscript (3). These individuals should fully meet the criteria for authorship/contributorship defined above, and editors will ask these individuals to complete Journal-specific author and conflict-of-interest disclosure forms. When submitting a manuscript authored by a group, the corresponding author should clearly indicate the preferred citation and identify all individual authors as well as the group name. Journals generally list other members of the group in the Acknowledgments. The United States National Library of Medicine (NLM) indexes the group name and the names of individuals the group has identified as being directly responsible for the manuscript; it also lists the names of collaborators if they are listed in Acknowledgments.
- Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of the research group alone does not constitute authorship.
- All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship, and all those who qualify should be listed.
- Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content.

Some Journals now also request that one or more authors, referred to as “guarantors,” be identified as the persons who take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, from inception to published article, and publish that information.

Increasingly, authorship of multicenter trials is attributed to a group. All members of the group who are named as authors should fully meet the above criteria for authorship/contributorship.

The group should jointly make decisions about contributors/authors before submitting the manuscript for publication. The corresponding author/guarantor should be prepared to explain the presence and order of these individuals. It is not the role of editors to make authorship/contributorship decisions or to arbitrate conflicts related to authorship.

Contributors Listed in Acknowledgments

All contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an acknowledgments section. Examples of those who might be acknowledged include a person who provided purely technical help, writing assistance, or a department chairperson who provided only general support. Editors should ask corresponding authors to declare whether they had assistance with study design, data collection, data analysis, or manuscript preparation. If such assistance was available, the authors should disclose the identity of the individuals who provided this assistance and the entity that supported it in the published article. Financial and material support should also be acknowledged.

Groups of persons who have contributed materially to the paper but whose contributions do not justify authorship may be listed under such headings as “clinical investigators” or “participating

investigators,” and their function or contribution should be described—for example, “served as scientific advisors,” “critically reviewed the study proposal,” “collected data,” or “provided and cared for study patients”. Because readers may infer their endorsement of the data and conclusions, these persons must give written permission to be acknowledged.”

Conflicts of Interest

There are situations where it is compulsory that corresponding author (one of the authors that keep in touch and communicates directly with the editor) detailing to the editor and readers too, any potential financial claim that might be generated after the publication of results described in the manuscript.

Any conflict of interests (according to the “*Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts*” guide, by ICMJE, section “Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Conflicts of Interest”, http://icmje.org/ethical_4conflicts.html) or financing sources of the research described in the manuscript, should be stated and presented very clearly when author submitting the manuscript and will be a part of the manuscript. Is the corresponding author the one which must warn the editor that he cannot declare any conflict of interests as he is the one which must disclose conflict of interests and to recognize them in its published paper. According to ICMJE’s “*Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts*” guide: “Public trust in the peer-review process and the credibility of published articles depends in part on how well conflict of interest is handled during writing, peer review, and editorial decision making. Conflict of interest exists when an author (or the author’s institution), reviewer, or editor has financial or personal relationships that inappropriately influence (bias) his or her actions (such relationships are also known as dual commitments, competing interests, or competing loyalties). These relationships vary from being negligible to having great potential for influencing judgment. Not all relationships represent true conflict of interest. On the other hand, the potential for conflict of interest can exist regardless of whether an individual believes that the relationship affects his or her scientific judgment. Financial relationships (such as employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, and paid expert testimony) are the most easily identifiable conflicts of interest and the most likely to undermine the credibility of the Journal, the authors, and of science itself. However, conflicts can occur for other reasons, such as personal relationships, academic competition, and intellectual passion.

All participants in the peer-review and publication processes must disclose all relationships that could be viewed as potential conflicts of interest. Disclosure of such relationships is also important in connection with editorials and review articles, because it can be more difficult to detect bias in these types of publications than in reports of original research. Editors may use information disclosed in conflict-of-interest and financial-interest statements as a basis for editorial decisions. Editors should publish this information if they believe it is important in judging the manuscript.

Potential Conflicts of Interest

Related to Individual Authors' Commitments

When authors submit a manuscript, whether an article or a letter, they are responsible for disclosing all financial and personal relationships that might bias their work. To prevent ambiguity, authors must state explicitly whether potential conflicts do or do not exist. Authors should do so in the manuscript on a conflict-of-interest notification page that follows the title page, providing additional detail, if necessary, in a cover letter that accompanies the manuscript. (*See Section IV. A. 3. Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure* on http://icmje.org/manuscript_1prepare.html) The ICMJE developed and declared that “other Journals are welcome to adopt this form” such an uniform

disclosure form that ICMJE member Journals piloted in 2009 (http://icmje.org/coi_instructions.html). The second version of the form is now available as an accompanying [Glossary](#) (PDF).

Authors should identify individuals who provide writing or other assistance and disclose the funding source for this assistance.

Investigators must disclose potential conflicts to study participants and should state in the manuscript whether they have done so.

Editors also need to decide whether to publish information disclosed by authors about potential conflicts. If doubt exists, it is best to err on the side of publication.

Potential Conflicts of Interest Related to Project Support

Increasingly, individual studies receive funding from commercial firms, private foundations, and government. The conditions of this funding have the potential to bias and otherwise discredit the research.

Scientists have an ethical obligation to submit creditable research results for publication. Researchers should not enter into agreements that interfere with their access to all of the data and their ability to analyze them independently, and to prepare and publish manuscripts. Authors should describe the role of the study sponsor, if any, in study design; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication. If the supporting source had no such involvement, the authors should so state. Biases potentially introduced when sponsors are directly involved in research are analogous to methodological biases. Some Journals, therefore, choose to include information in the Methods section about the sponsor's involvement.

Editors may request that authors of a study funded by an agency with a proprietary or financial interest in the outcome sign a statement, such as "I had full access to all of the data in this study and I take complete responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis." Editors should be encouraged to review copies of the protocol and/or contracts associated with project-specific studies before accepting such studies for publication. Editors may request a statistical analysis of all data by an independent biostatistician. Editors may choose not to consider an article if a sponsor has asserted control over the authors' right to publish.

Potential Conflicts of Interest Related to Commitments of Editors, Journal Staff, or Reviewers

Editors should avoid selecting external peer reviewers with obvious potential conflicts of interest--for example, those who work in the same department or institution as any of the authors. Authors often provide editors with the names of persons they feel should not be asked to review a manuscript because of potential, usually professional, conflicts of interest. When possible, authors should be asked to explain or justify their concerns; that information is important to editors in deciding whether to honor such requests.

Reviewers must disclose to editors any conflicts of interest that could bias their opinions of the manuscript, and they should recuse themselves from reviewing specific manuscripts if the potential for bias exists. As in the case of authors, silence on the part of reviewers concerning potential conflicts may mean either that conflicts exist and the reviewer has failed to disclose them or conflicts do not exist. Reviewers must therefore also be asked to state explicitly whether conflicts

do or do not exist. Reviewers must not use knowledge of the work, before its publication, to further their own interests.

Editors who make final decisions about manuscripts must have no personal, professional, or financial involvement in any of the issues they might judge. Other members of the editorial staff, if they participate in editorial decisions, must provide editors with a current description of their financial interests (as they might relate to editorial judgments) and recuse themselves from any decisions in which a conflict of interest exists. Editorial staff must not use information gained through working with manuscripts for private gain. Editors should publish regular disclosure statements about potential conflicts of interests related to the commitments of Journal staff.”

Council of Science Editors defines infringements from the norms of ethics publication of scientific papers as follows (<http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3643#313>):

“Although no standard definition of research misconduct exists, and new variations are, likely to arise as scientific methods progress, research misconduct generally falls into one of the following areas:

- Mistrustreatment of research subjects
- Falsification and Fabrication of data
- Piracy and Plagiarism

As a general guide, the term “research misconduct” applies to any action that involves mistreatment of research subjects or purposeful manipulation of the scientific record such that it no longer reflects observed truth. A Joint Consensus Conference on Misconduct in Biomedical Research in October 1999 led to the following broad definition of misconduct: “Behaviour by a researcher, intentional or not, that falls short of good ethical and scientific standard.” This section attempts to objectively define research practices that do not meet these subjective standards.

The U.S. Office of Research Integrity (ORI) defines research misconduct as “fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.”

The concepts of negligence and deceit are central to the definition of research misconduct. Not every instance of harm to a research subject is necessarily the result of research misconduct. However, editors and others should consider research misconduct in circumstances in which the harm occurs in the setting of, or as a direct result of, research practices that do not meet ethical norms or as a direct result of irresponsible behavior of the investigator. Similarly, not all inaccurate reports of data are the result of misconduct. For example, the Wellcome Trust, Britain’s largest biomedical charity, specifically states that research misconduct does not include honest error or honest differences in the design, execution, interpretation, or judgment in evaluating research methods or results. The ORI definition has a similar statement. Poor-quality research is not misconduct unless the investigators used poor-quality methods with the intention to deceive or without regard to the harm that might befall subjects.

Mistrustreatment of Research Subjects

Researchers have an obligation to the subjects they study. These obligations apply whether the subjects are humans or animals and whether the entire organism or just specimens are being studied. When research involves human subjects or their specimens, failure to adhere to the principles in the Declaration of Helsinki of **World Medical Association** Council (<http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/>) and to seek approval from and adhere to the ethical standards of the appropriate institutional or national committee on human experimentation is a serious form of scientific misconduct: “For researchers who study animals, failure to follow

institutional or national recommendations for the care and use of laboratory animals is also a serious type of research misconduct.

The following are examples of actions that constitute mistreatment of research subjects:

- Failure to obtain approval from an ethical review board before starting the study
- Failure to follow the approved protocol during the conduct of the study
- Absent or inadequate informed consent of human subjects
- Maltreatment of laboratory animals
- Exposure of subjects to physical or psychological harm without informing them of the potential for harm
- Exposure of subjects (or the environment) to harm because research practices or protocols do not meet accepted and/or specified standards
- Failure to maintain confidentiality of human data without specific consent from the subject”

Additional information on this subject one found on WMA website, at:
http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/30ethicsmanual/pdf/ethics_manual_en.pdf

Falsification and Fabrication of Data

Perhaps the most blatant and easy to define (although not always easy to detect) form of research misconduct is investigators' fabrication or falsification of data. Fabrication refers to the invention, recording, or reporting of data. Falsification refers to the alteration of research materials, equipment, protocols, data, or results. Fabrication and falsification are two points along a spectrum, but both are serious forms of misconduct because they result in a scientific record that does not accurately reflect observed truth. Sample correspondence is available on the CSE website.

Piracy and Plagiarism

Piracy is defined as the unauthorized reproduction or use of ideas, data, or methods from others without adequate permission or acknowledgment. Again, deceit plays a central role in this form of misconduct. The intent of the perpetrator is the untruthful portrayal of the ideas or methods as his or her own.

Plagiarism is a form of piracy that involves the unauthorized use or close imitation of the language (figures images or tables) and thoughts of others and the representation of them as one's own original work without permission or acknowledgment by the author of the source of these materials. Plagiarism generally involves the use of materials from others, but can apply to researchers' duplication of their own previously published reports without acknowledgment (this is sometimes called self-plagiarism or duplicate publication).

(Authorship: Christine Laine took the lead in writing this section of the white paper on behalf of the CSE Editorial Policy Committee. Christine Laine revised this section for the 2009 Update. Gene Snyder and Heather Goodell revised this section for the 2012 Update. Members of the Editorial Policy Committee and the CSE Board of Directors reviewed and commented on it. This section was formally approved by the CSE Board Directors on March 30, 2012.)

The Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM) has purposed a document entitled “*Authorial Integrity in Scientific Publication*”, which “is intended as an overview of SIAM's policies and procedures related to authorial integrity, meaning intellectual honesty and personal responsibility for distinguishing between the work of others and one's own work. These policies apply to all of SIAM's publications, including Journals, conference proceedings, books, and

SIAM News. They cover materials that are submitted, in review, accepted for publication, or already published in a SIAM publication.

SIAM considers two specific violations of authorial integrity to be misconduct: *plagiarism* and *duplicate publication* (sometimes called "self-plagiarism"). It is the responsibility of every author who submits a book, paper, or article to SIAM to avoid plagiarism and duplicate publication. It is the responsibility of editors, referees, and members of book editorial boards to ensure that the highest standards of authorial integrity are maintained."

SIAM states, relative to the plagiarism, that: "The most common form of authorial misconduct is plagiarism, for which there is no single accepted definition": (<http://www.siam.org/books/plagiarism.php>).

" Material can be plagiarized even if it is publicly available (e.g., posted on the Web). In scientific publications, plagiarism normally requires a knowing misrepresentation, explicit or implicit, of someone else's work as one's own.

Plagiarism arises in a range of forms that vary widely in ease of identification. The form of plagiarism that is most straightforward to identify involves verbatim or near-verbatim copying, or very close paraphrasing, of text or results from another's work.

The least clear-cut form of plagiarism (and the subject of the most complaints to SIAM) is an *inadequacy of relevant citations*, i.e., insufficient acknowledgement of the work of other authors. Allegations of this form of plagiarism often arise when authors include or mention results originally obtained by others without citing the associated publications. SIAM's assessment of whether an inadequacy of citations constitutes plagiarism will involve questions such as:

1. Does the omission of citations give a false or misleading impression that the author is the originator of the relevant results?
2. Was the author aware of the work that he/she omitted to cite?
3. Are results in the omitted citations essential to the work presented in the author's paper? Are the results in question regarded as common knowledge in the SIAM community?

Duplicate Publication

A related form of authorial misconduct is duplicate publication, meaning unacceptably close replication of the author's own previously published text or results without acknowledgement of the source. (This is sometimes called "self-plagiarism".)

SIAM applies a "reasonable person" standard when deciding whether a submission constitutes duplicate publication. If a few identical sentences previously published by the current author appear in a subsequent work by the same author, this is unlikely to be regarded as duplicate publication. In contrast, it is unacceptable for an author to include significant verbatim or near-verbatim portions of his/her own work, or to depict his/her previously published results as new, without acknowledging the source."

The authors of submitting papers for publishing in the Journal "ANNALS OF THE ORADEA UNIVERSITY. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering" must comply with the the ethical norms stated here.

The reason of publishing here this wide range of norms and definition consists of multidisciplinarity of paper expected to be submitted for publishing on Journal.