**THE PROVISION ON THE OBSERVANCE OF PUBLISHING ETHICS**

Publishing ethics is a system of professional standards of conduct governing the relationships between authors, reviewers, editors, publishers, and readers in the course of creating, distributing, and using scientific publications. The policy pursued by *Vestnik of Samara State University of Economics* in the field of publishing ethics is based on the guidelines and standards developed by the Committee on Publication Ethics ([COPE](http://publicationethics.org/)).

**1. Duties of Authors**

1.1. By submitting a manuscript to *Vestnik of Samara State University of Economics*, the author confirms that it is original work, has not been published previously as an academic article (in the same or similar form), and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. If the work (or its part) has been published previously in the form of a report, preprint or working paper, the author should declare this.

1.2. Only persons who have made significant contributions to the submitted work may be considered authors of the publication. Wherein, the author, who submitted a paper, does not take sole decisions and notifies all co-authors about possible corrections in the article.

1.3. Authors should present their results honestly, without fabrication, falsification or inappropriate data manipulation.

1.4. Authors guarantee that their work does not contain plagiarism in any form and provide respective references or quotations if they use the works or assertions of other authors.

1.5. Authors should avoid self-plagiarism and properly crossrefer their previous works. Presenting the same data in several publications, verbatim copying and paraphrasing of the author’s own works are unacceptable.

1.6. Authors should disclose in their manuscripts any financial and/or other

existing conflicts of interest (including grants or other financial resources), which may be regarded as having affected the results or conclusions presented in the paper.

1.7. If the author discovers material errors or inaccuracies in the published article, he or she should promptly notify the journal’s editors, and collaborate with them to make a joint decision on the possible form of correction.

**2. Duties of Reviewers**

2.1. Reviewing assists the editor in making adequate decisions regarding publication and, through relevant collaboration with the authors, can also help them improve the quality of his or her work. Reviewing is an essential link in formal scientific communications, which lies at the heart of the scientific approach. The editors share the view that all scientists wishing to publish their works should also participate in peer reviews of submitted manuscripts.

2.2. Any appointed reviewer who realizes the inadequacy of his or her qualifications to review the manuscript or lacks the time to complete the job on time, should promptly notify the editor and request to be excluded from reviewing the respective manuscript.

2.3. Any manuscript submitted for review should be treated as a confidential document. It cannot be discussed with any person who has not been duly authorized by the editor.

2.4. Reviewers should evaluate texts in an unbiased manner. Personal criticism of the author is inadmissible. Reviewers should express their opinions clearly and reasonably.

2.5. Reviewers should identify significant published papers that are relevant to the subject area but are not included in the reference list of the manuscript. Any assertion (observation, conclusion, or argument) previously published should be referenced in the manuscript accordingly. Reviewers should also draw editor’s

attention to any identified material similarities and coincidences between the manuscript under review and any other published paper falling within the scientific expertise of the reviewer.

2.6. Unpublished data, obtained from manuscripts submitted for review, may not be used in one’s own research without written consent from the author. Information or ideas obtained in the course of reviewing, and associated with possible advantages, should be kept confidential and may not be used for personal benefit.

2.7. Reviewers should not participate in reviewing a manuscript in the event of a conflict of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, and other interactions or relationships with any of the authors, companies, or other organizations associated with the submitted paper.

**3. Duties of Editors**

3.1. The editor is solely and independently responsible for publication decisions, relying on cooperation with the journal’s editorial board. Editors’ decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based on the paper’s scientific depth and significance.

3.2. The editor makes fair and objective decisions regardless of commercial considerations and provides an honest and efficient review process.

3.3. Editors should evaluate the intellectual content of manuscripts regardless of an author’s race, gender, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, origin, nationality, or political preferences.

3.4. The editor guarantees the confidentiality of the peer review process and does not work with manuscripts for which he or she has a conflict of interest.

3.5. Editors resolve conflict situations arising during the editorial process and use all available means to resolve them.

3.6. The editor having convincing evidence of misconduct should coordinate with the publisher to arrange the prompt publication of a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or other correction to the record, as may be relevant.

**4. Duties of the Publisher**

4.1. The publisher should adhere to principles and procedures which encourage the observance of ethical obligations by editors, reviewers and authors in accordance with these requirements. The publisher should make sure that his potential profit does not affect the editors’ decisions.

4.2. The publisher should support the journal’s editors in their handling of complaints regarding the ethical aspects of published materials, and assist them in collaborating with other journals and/or publishers, if this enables the editors to fulfill their obligations.

4.3. The publisher should facilitate due diligence and introduce best practices in order to improve ethical recommendations, retraction, and error-correction procedures.

**5. Article retraction**

The editors and publisher of *Vestnik of Samara State University of Economics* consider an article retraction based on [COPE Retraction Guidelines](https://publicationethics.org/files/retraction%20guidelines_0.pdf), [ASEP Ethics Council rules for article retraction](https://rasep.ru/sovet-po-etike/pravilo-otzyva-retragirovaniya-stati-ot-publikatsii) and Commission of the Russian Academy of Sciences on combating falsification of scientific research/

An article may be retracted because of the following reasons:

* Clear evidence that findings are unreliable as the result of either errors or misconduct
* Multiple submission
* Plagiarism

An article may be retracted by its author(s) through a formal request with a

reasonable explanation for this decision. In other cases, the editors or publisher may conclude that retraction is appropriate after a careful consideration. The author (the corresponding author) is officially notified of the reasons for the article being retracted.

The retracted article is not removed from the journal webpage and retains its DOI, but its retracted status is clearly indicated, including the table of contents of the issue. The article’s PDF is replaced with an identical version with a watermark indicating on each page that it is “retracted.”

The retraction statement indicating the reasons and basis for the retraction is posted on the journal’s website and published in the next available issue of the journal.

An article retraction statement and the article’s PDF with a "retracted" watermark are sent to the National Electronic Library (elibrary.ru) and other bibliographic databases in which the journal is included. Information is also sent to the ASEP Ethics Council for inclusion into its database of retracted articles.