

# **Publication Ethics**

**Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften  
Austrian Academy of Sciences Press**

Version 1.0, 13.9.2021

Contents

**Research Integrity**..... 3

**Bias** ..... 4

**Research with Humans or Animals** ..... 4

**Peer Review / Editorial Process** ..... 4

**Authorship, Copyright** ..... 6

**Plagiarism**..... 7

**Originality, Redundant Publication**..... 7

**Conflicts of Interest** ..... 8

**Research Misconduct, Fabrication** ..... 8

**Data publishing policy** ..... 9

**Integrity of Record**..... 9

**Fair access** ..... 9

**Gender-sensitive language**..... 9

**Advertising**..... 10

## Introduction

The Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften is part of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. This document is intended for editors, authors, and reviewers of journals. As a division of the Academy, the Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie is bound to regulation by bodies of which the Austrian Academy of Sciences is a member, e.g. the "[Österreichische Agentur für wissenschaftliche Integrität](#) / Austrian Agency for Research Integrity", and upholds the same standards as the Academy. The Academy runs a [Commission on Ethics in Science](#). Being committed to maintaining the highest level of integrity, the press and its journals adhere to the principles of the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\) Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journals](#). The editorial teams of our journals are invited to formulate discipline-specific additions to this document.

## Research Integrity

The content of a journal will be analysed/judged/published according to the following criteria:

- The scientific basis of the contribution and academic level.
- The scientific relevance of the work submitted
- The work must be carried out in a methodologically flawless manner and be based on the latest state of research.
- It should not merely reflect the current state of research, however, but should develop it further on the basis of the authors' own ideas.
- Completeness of the work, including the bibliography, indices, references and footnotes
- Fulfilment of formal criteria (language, consistency)

Personal value judgements are permitted to a limited degree but must be clearly distinguished from scholarly assertions. Polemical statements must be avoided. All scholarly assertions must be verifiable. Usually, this will be achieved by providing adequate evidence regarding the relevant sources.

Anyone submitting a contribution warrants that all relevant legal provisions (e.g. archival, copyright, criminal law provisions) have been observed and that he or she will indemnify the publisher and editorial staff in the event of an infringement of rights for which he or she is responsible or liable.

Editors should evaluate manuscripts solely for their intellectual content without any bias regarding the race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

Material from submitted, unpublished manuscripts should be kept confidential and must not be used by others without the express written consent of the author.

## Bias

The editors will ensure that only peers who are not biased, e.g. on the basis of a work or family relationship with one of the peer-reviewed authors, affiliation, ideology, academic reasons (competition), financial reasons, or patent conflict, are engaged.

In order to ensure that all submissions receive an objective and unbiased evaluation, we have adopted policies that exclude editors and editorial team members from reviewing submissions and from making publication decisions when they are authors or have contributed to a manuscript. In particular, the journal editors will adhere to the following policies:

- The editors engage only appropriate reviewers who are suitably qualified to gauge the merits of the manuscript under review and who are free from disqualifying competing interests.  
For any submission co-authored by an editor, the handling of the reviewing process is assigned to an editor from a different institution or a member of the editorial board from a different institution. Details of the reviewing process are not disclosed to the editor co-authoring the manuscript and he/she must not be involved in the editorial decision on the
- Editors are not permitted to be in charge of the reviewing process on submissions by current or recent (during the last three years) collaborators or authors affiliated with the editor's home institution. In addition, the editors are not involved in the editorial decision on the respective submission.

The authors are entitled and obliged to point out conflicts of interest of which they are aware in one or more members of the advisory board. Likewise, each member of the advisory board is entitled and obliged to refuse to accept an assignment if there is a conflict of interest.

## Research with Humans or Animals

We expect authors to follow ethical standards of scientific conduct, in particular with regard to publications on vulnerable populations, informed consent to publication, the handling of confidential data and other relevant ethical and data protection issues. Authors should include a statement of compliance with ethical standards in the submission cover letter and should provide information on approval by appropriate bodies, such as research ethics committees or institutional review boards, if applicable.

## Peer Review / Editorial Process

Scientific contributions submitted to a journal of the Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften for publication undergo an international review process.

All submitted contributions are assigned to at least two members of the editorial board<sup>1</sup>, who will carry out a preliminary assessment as to whether the contribution should be rejected

---

<sup>1</sup> *Herausbergremium / Editorial Board*

The editorial board comprises a number of persons based on the standard practices to date of the particular journal. The editorial board elects one or more editor(s)-in-chief from among its number.

immediately or subjected to peer review; in the latter case, they nominate two members of the International Advisory Board<sup>2</sup> or external peers as reviewers.

The two reviews are collected by the editorial board and are treated in a confidential manner so that third parties are not able to identify with any degree of certainty which review was written by which person. For this reason, the content of the reviews may only be communicated to the author in an anonymised form and may be paraphrased if necessary.

The reviewers shall assess whether the work has been executed in a methodologically correct manner. It is not a criterion for the assessment that the author arrives at the same results or even the same individual views as the reviewers. Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation or argument has already been reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published work of which they have personal knowledge. Reviewers are asked to return their reviews within six weeks. They must not show or discuss the contents of the manuscript with others.

The peer review is “double blind”: the peers receive the contributions only in anonymised form, and the author will likewise not know the names of the reviewers. If both reviews are positive, the contribution will be accepted for print. If they are both negative, it will be rejected, and the author will receive an anonymised copy of the reviews. If one review is negative and the other positive, a third peer will be asked to provide a review, which will then be decisive.

If the contribution is accepted for print but suggestions for improvement are made, these will also be sent to the author in anonymised form and he or she will be given the opportunity to rewrite the contribution accordingly. If the author does not follow the recommendations for redacting the contribution without giving good reasons for this, the article must be rejected by the editorial committee.

All reviews will be archived in the respective journal's editorial office<sup>3</sup> for internal documentation purposes.

An established manuscript management system for administering the peer review process is being offered to journal managers.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Internationaler wissenschaftlicher Beirat / International Advisory Board*

The editorial board appoints an International Advisory Board composed of experts who live and work outside Austria. Members of the advisory board may not be members of the editorial board. The so-called Publications Commission of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, an academy-wide quality committee, is entitled to object to the appointment of individual members of the advisory board. For this, a simple majority is required. In the event that changes are made to the composition of the advisory board, the publications commission must be informed.

<sup>3</sup> *Editorial Team (optional)*

The editorial board nominates persons to be responsible for editing the journal. Members of the editorial team may also be members of the editorial board.

The editorial team is responsible for any editorial work and for contact between the reviewers, the authors and the press's Book Production Department.

All members of boards and managing editors must be named in the publication and the website of the journal.

Any complaints or appeals against an editorial decision must be made in writing and directed to the respective editors. The rebuttal letter should include as much detail as possible. The case will be reviewed by the editor-in-chief, who may seek expert advice on the topic.

Note that we do not consider letters that are abusive or threatening; in such cases, we reserve the right to initiate misconduct proceedings.

## Authorship, Copyright

Authors must confirm that they hold the copyright and/or right to use all parts of the work; this especially applies to images in the work. The contribution must be submitted by the author who ranks first; he or she guarantees that all other authors agree with the way they are credited in the contribution.

In accordance with the recommendations on transparency in authors' contributions and our responsibility to promote integrity in scientific publications<sup>4</sup>, our press assumes that each author listed on the manuscript has made substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or to the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data; or to the creation of new software used in the work; or has drafted the work or substantively revised it; AND has approved the submitted version and any revision of the manuscript; AND has agreed both to be personally accountable for the author's own contribution and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

The ordering is at the authors' discretion and all co-authors are assumed to have agreed on the order of authors prior to the submission of manuscript. The authors must also agree on **one corresponding author**. The corresponding author acts on behalf of all co-authors in any communication about the article through submission, peer review, production, including the copyright agreement, and after publication. Corresponding authors' contact details and their affiliation are published in the article.

Authors are required to list all relevant affiliations, particularly the institution where the majority of their work was done. If an author has subsequently moved, the current institution may also be stated.

---

<sup>4</sup> Marcia K. McNutt, Monica Bradford, Jeffrey M. Drazen, Brooks Hanson, Bob Howard, Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Véronique Kiermer, Emilie Marcus, Barbara Kline Pope, Randy Schekman, Sowmya Swaminathan, Peter J. Stang, Inder M. Verma. (2018). Transparency in authors' contributions and responsibilities to promote integrity in scientific publication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115 (11): 2557-2560; doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1715374115

Changes in authorship, including the sequence of authors, are generally not allowed after the manuscript has been accepted. Adding and/or deleting authors at the revision stage is only permitted in exceptional cases and must be agreed upon by all authors, including those being added or removed. The authors must provide evidence of the agreement to the editorial office with a full explanation about why the change was necessary. The journal reserves the right to retract the manuscript in the event of disagreement among the authors.

Any individuals who have contributed to the article (i.e., technical assistance, scholarly discussions, etc.), but who do not meet the criteria for authorship, should be listed by name in an Acknowledgments section printed at the end of the article. It is the responsibility of the authors to notify and obtain permission from those they wish to identify in this section.

In the case of equal contributions, the authors shall be listed in alphabetical order. Translations must be acknowledged in a footnote at the beginning of the text; any other support may be acknowledged there as well.

Authors who discover a major error in their own published work are required to notify the publisher or editor and assist with the withdrawal or correction of the manuscript.

## Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the deliberate and unlawful adoption of another's intellectual property: the author uses, in whole or in part, works by others in his or her own work without acknowledging the source. It is irrelevant whether the other person's work has been taken over verbatim or slightly altered.

The following cases in particular are considered plagiarism:

- If another person's work is passed off as one's own with or without the consent of the actual author (ghostwriting or complete plagiarism)
- If a portion of another's work is taken over without adequate reference to the source (citation without reference)
- If a foreign-language work is translated and reproduced without appropriate reference to the source (translation plagiarism)

Using special software, each contribution is checked to see if any plagiarism has occurred. If plagiarism is detected through this or any other means, this leads to the immediate rejection of the contribution; the editorial board reserves the right to impose further sanctions (e.g. blocking the submission of further contributions) in particularly serious cases.

## Originality, Redundant Publication

The submitted paper and all supplementary materials are expected to constitute an original work that has been written by the stated authors and has not been published before. Preprints posted on public preprint servers, institutional working papers, conference proceedings and papers on conference websites do not count as prior publication and therefore do not infringe the latter requirement. Authors should disclose details on preprint or working paper posting, and in the event that the submitted article is accepted for publication in the journal, authors are responsible for ensuring that the preprint or working paper record is updated with a reference and link to the published article.

Duplicate, multiple or redundant publications (“self-plagiarism”) are not accepted by the journals and will be considered as academic misconduct. Any expansion of previously published work must provide sufficiently novel results and must be properly cross-referenced.

The submission must not include copyrighted materials, in full or in part, unless explicit permission from the copyright holder that it can be reproduced under the respective terms of the particular journal is provided along with the submission.

## Conflicts of Interest

The Verlag der ÖAW requires authors, editors and reviewers to disclose potential conflicts of interest, in order to ensure unbiased selection procedures.

The relevant policy can be found at

[http://austriaca.at/general/service\\_fuer\\_autoren/Vademecum/Befangenheitsregelungen.pdf](http://austriaca.at/general/service_fuer_autoren/Vademecum/Befangenheitsregelungen.pdf)

and is aligned with the conflict of interest policy of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF),

<https://www.fwf.ac.at/de/forschungsfoerderung/entscheidung-evaluation/entscheidungsverfahren/profile-und-interessenkonflikte-von-gutachterinnen>

Authors are entitled and obliged to point out conflicts of interest of which they are aware in one or more members of the advisory board. Likewise, each member of the advisory board is entitled and obliged to refuse to accept an assignment if there is a conflict of interest.

Transparency is requested with regard to the funding of research projects, in particular by naming funding sources and the persons and/or institutions that support such projects with financial or material contributions, or by disclosing economic interests associated with research projects. A competing interest or conflict of interest can occur when the authors (or their employers) have a financial, commercial, legal, or professional relationship with other organisations that could influence the work submitted for publication. The disclosure statement should be included in the cover sheet accompanying the submission of the manuscript. In addition, sources of funding must be declared in the final accepted paper in the Acknowledgement section.

## Research Misconduct, Fabrication

Research misconduct refers to wilful, conscious or grossly negligent violations of the Standards of Good Scientific Practice<sup>5</sup>. Violations are deemed “wilful” when a researcher considers a violation of the Standards of Good Scientific Practice possible and accepts that possibility when conducting research. Violations are deemed “conscious” when a researcher considers a violation of the Standards of Good Scientific Practice not merely possible, but certain. Violations are deemed “grossly negligent” in cases where a researcher shows blatant disregard for due diligence in a given research context and therefore fails to recognize that s/he is violating the Standards of Good Scientific Practice to a great extent; for example, this is the case if even the simplest, most obvious considerations are not taken into account and the researcher disregards considerations which should have occurred to any person. Critical statements in scientific/scholarly discourse (“honest differences of opinion”) or errors made in good faith (“honest errors”) are

---

<sup>5</sup> [Richtlinien : ÖAWI \(oeawi.at\) https://oeawi.at/richtlinien/?lang=en](https://oeawi.at/richtlinien/?lang=en)



not considered to be forms of research misconduct.<sup>6</sup> Errata will be published.

Any forms of misconduct, including copyright infringement, plagiarism, duplicate submission, redundant publication and recycling, citation manipulation, data fabrication, peer review manipulation, translations of articles without prior notification of the editors, undisclosed competing interests and other breaches of good scientific practice, are taken seriously, and the journal will take the necessary actions in accordance with the COPE guidelines<sup>7</sup> in dealing with the allegations.

In suspected cases of misconduct, we will initially alert all those affected and ask for their response. If the response is not deemed satisfactory, we reserve the right to impose sanctions commensurate with the circumstances and the gravity of the alleged offence. The sanction may range from suspension of the review process, publishing an expression of concern or the retraction of published papers, to involving relevant employers, institutions and funders, or reporting the incident to an appropriate regulatory body to investigate more serious cases.

## Data Publishing Policy

We support reproducible research. We thus encourage authors to submit data, code, etc. as supplementary materials along with their manuscript. We recommend uploading data connected with journal articles to a repository like Zenodo or Epub.OEAW, or to a discipline-specific repository, or the use of protocols.io.

## Integrity of Record

If we are obliged to retract a publication, i.e. for legal reasons, we retain a record and keep information about the original record available for users in the form of a landing page for the relevant digital object identifier and in accordance with the crossref doi policy<sup>8</sup>.

## Fair Access

The least developed countries according to the United Nations<sup>9</sup> list are entitled to free access to all of our content. In addition, the share of publications made available through open access is increasing steadily. At the time of writing, 40% of our 23 journals are open to access for everyone.

## Gender-sensitive Language

Gender-sensitive language is encouraged, but not at the expense of grammar or when it would constitute an unreasonable impediment to readability. Alibi references, for example in the form of a generalising footnote (“In all references to persons, the chosen form applies to both genders” or similar), are unwelcome.

---

<sup>6</sup> OeAWI Brochure, 2015

<sup>7</sup> [www.publicationethics.org](http://www.publicationethics.org)

<sup>8</sup> [www.crossref.org](http://www.crossref.org)

<sup>9</sup> United Nations/UNCTAD. [UN list of least developed countries | UNCTAD <https://unctad.org/topic/least-developed-countries/list#:~:text=%20UN%20list%20of%20least%20developed%20countries%20,43%20Uganda%2044%20Yemen%2045%20Zambia%20More%20>](https://unctad.org/topic/least-developed-countries/list#:~:text=%20UN%20list%20of%20least%20developed%20countries%20,43%20Uganda%2044%20Yemen%2045%20Zambia%20More%20) .

## Advertising

There is no advertising in the journals published by Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften nor is it intended that any should be included.

Zusammengestellt von:

Herwig Stöger

13.9.2021