PUBLICATION ETHICS
of the journal “Rasplavy” (Melts)
(print ISSN 0235-0106)

The ethical standards applied to publications are designed to provide high-quality scientific publications. The editorial board of the journal "Rasplavy" adheres to publishing ethics and tries to rely on the following principles: shares commercial issues and intellectual and ethical standards; preserves the integrity of the academic word; makes sure that non-ethical articles were not published; always ready to publish additions, comments, corrections and apologies, if necessary, without plagiarism and deliberately false information.

Publications and authorship

1.1 The journal "Rasplavy" considers only the original material, i.e. articles that have not previously been published, including publication in another language. Articles will be reviewed if they based on materials previously published only as preprints or as abstracts of reports.
1.2 Extended versions of articles published in conference collections of articles will be considered, if it is indicated in the covering letter, the previous version is clearly quoted and discussed, there is significant new material and all necessary permits were obtained.
1.3 Attempts to artificially publication or incongruous division of research results in more than a single article can result in the rejection of the article or the request to merge of submitted manuscripts and correction of published articles. Attempting to republish the same or very similar article may lead to the rejection of the subsequent article.
1.4 Manuscripts submitted to the journal "Rasplavy" should not be sent to another journal during the review process and should be provisionally withdrawn to their submission to another journal. The authors, whose articles have been found to be sent simultaneously to another journal, can carry penalties.
1.5 If the authors used their previously published work or work that is currently under consideration as the basis for the submitted manuscript, they should cite previous articles and indicate a significant difference from the submitted manuscript. Reusing authors own words (in addition to describing methods) should be cited or indicated otherwise in the text. Repeated use of the author’s data or important formulations may require permission from the copyright holder, the authors are responsible for its obtaining.
1.6 Authors should not use words, numbers or ideas of other authors without indicating the appropriate source.
1.7 Identification of plagiarism of ideas and plagiarism of data is carried out as part of a scientific review, and as part of an editorial check on the website www.antiplagiat.ru, as well as upon the fact that readers have made appropriate statements after the publication of manuscripts.
1.8 If necessary, the journal "Melts" uses "Antiplagiat" system for detecting material which coincides with previously published manuscripts. Reviewers and editors can obtain information about the results of such verification upon request.

1.9 In case of multiple borrowings, the Editorial Board acts in accordance with the rules of the Committee on Publication Ethics COPE.
1.10 Plagiarism can exist in different forms - borrowing data, borrowing ideas, borrowing text, and self-plagiarism. Plagiarism in all forms is unethical and unacceptable.
1.11 If the borrowings of other authors are recorded without identification in the submitted document, the manuscript will be rejected or sent for revision.
1.12 The authors submitted manuscripts or published articles that have been found to contain fabricated or falsified results, including the manipulation of images, could carry penalties, and articles may be rejected.

Author's responsibility

2.1 The authors of the publication (co-authors) are those who have made a significant contribution to the formation of the concept of work, the development, execution or interpretation of the presented research. The participation of each author must be indicated.
2.2 All data in the article must be true and authentic.
2.3 Authors are required to participate in the process of reviewing the work, make text cuts and correct errors in time.
2.4 Authors should designate current or recently completed funding (including costs for article processing, literary editing, translation) and other expenses, goods or services that may affect the work.

Peer review

3.1 All manuscripts are subject to peer review and are expected to meet the standards of academic excellence. The journal "Rasplavy" welcomes IMRAD Standard. After reviewing an article at a meeting of the editorial board, if they meet the journal's profile and are approved, the article will be confidentially reviewed by three review experts whose personalities will remain anonymous for the authors (single blind review, the authors of the manuscript do not know the reviewers). The review period is 2-4 weeks, but it can be extended to 6 weeks by the reviewer request.
3.2 Articles are reviewed by members of the editorial board, as well as invited reviewers - leading experts in the relevant industry in Russia and other countries.
3.3 The editorial board, the chief editor, and the deputy editors make the decision on the choice of a reviewer for the examination of the article.
3.4 Reviewers have the right to seek advice from experts in narrow areas beyond the standard peer review. In order to attract outside experts, prior coordination with the editor-in-chief or the editorial board is necessary.
3.5 The judgments of all reviewers must be objective.
3.6 Reviewers should note the important published work in the field of research that was not referenced by the authors and report to the editorial board about the discrepancies found.
3.7 Editors and reviewers should refuse to participate in the review if there is a conflict of interest, for example, they:
– work or worked in the same institution with any of the authors;

– collaborating or collaborated with any of the authors;
– have recently published collaborative work with any of the authors, or the submitted manuscript is written in collaboration;
– have a close personal connection with any author;
– financially interested in the subject of work;
– cannot be objective when considering the work.

3.8 If there are other interests, including if the reviewer had previously discussed the manuscript with the authors, he should inform the editor confidentially. If a conflict of interest is identified, the review of the manuscript will be transferred to another expert.

3.9 In the case of conflict, the final decision is made by the editor in chief at a meeting of the editorial board.

3.10 Based on the review of the manuscript, the expert reasonably recommends one of the following options: the article is recommended for publication in this form; the article is recommended for publication after correcting the deficiencies noted by the reviewer; another expert must further review the article; the article cannot be published in the journal.

3.11 If the reviewer recommended correcting and finalizing the article, the editors send the text of the review (without the reviewer's name) to the author with a proposal to prepare a new version of the article based on the recommendations or to refute the comments in full or in part. Changes should not take more than 2 months from the moment of sending the e-mail to the authors.

3.12 The article, revised by the author, is resubmitted for review.

3.13 In case of failure of material improvement by the authors, they must, in writing or orally notify the editor about the removal of their article from the publication.

3.14 If the authors do not return the revised version after 3 months from the day the review was sent, even in the absence of information from the authors with refusal to finalize the article, the editors remove it from the register. In such situations, an appropriate notification is sent to the authors about the removal of the manuscript from registration due to the expiration of the deadline for revision.

3.15 If the author and reviewers have insoluble contradictions regarding the manuscript, the editorial board has the right to send the manuscript for additional reviewing.

3.16 Editors and reviewers should not ask authors to include references only in order to increase the citation of their own or joint work in the journal or in another journal with which they are associated.

Publisher’s responsibility

4.1 Publisher monitors compliance with ethical standards by all participants of a publication process.

4.2 The publisher is solely responsible for accepting and rejecting articles. The manuscript is accepted for consideration if it is truly authentic.

4.3 The publisher should not have a conflict of interest regarding the article that he accepts / rejects.

4.4 The publisher is obliged to preserve the anonymity of the reviewers and, in the case of involvement in the review process of a third party, the anonymity of the authors.
4.5 All possible irregularities and difficulties associated with the ethics policy of the publication should be reported to the editorial board and / or the publisher who control this area. Applicants must provide evidence of unethical behavior and will remain anonymous when necessary.
4.6 When processing a complaint about a possible violation, the publisher or the editorial board may ask authors to provide basic data and images, contact editors, and contact institutions or employers to ask for an investigation into the circumstances of a possible violation.
4.7 When an error is found in a published article, the publisher decides what actions need to be taken and can consult with the editors and employers of the authors.
4.8 Minor violations can be resolved in one of the following ways: informing the author or reviewer about possible misunderstanding of the application of standards; official warning letter about violation of standards; publishing an editorial describing of the misconduct; notifying the authors employer about the unethical behavior; etc.
4.9 If the publisher becomes aware of a serious violation of the ethics policy of the publication, the following sanctions may be applied: removal of the publication from the journal, refusal of the manuscript and any other manuscripts submitted by the author(s); ban on the manuscript submission for a period of 1 to 3 years; a ban on acting as an editor or reviewer; etc.
4.10 Errors made by the authors, can be corrected by publication of «corrigendum», but publisher errors by publication of «erratum».
4.11 All corrections and changes in the text of the work are coordinated with the author(s) by written notice.

Malpractice

5.1 Malpractice is intentional use of person’s official powers in violation of the interests of the official duty, based on the lucrative self-interest.
5.2 Protectionism, favoritism, cronyism in the selection of publications, as well as other abuse of official position on the part of the publishing house, the editorial board, are incompatible with the principles and norms of professional ethics.
5.3 Depending on the type of offense resulting from abuse of authority or abuse of authority, the violator may be subject to criminal, administrative, civil or disciplinary and material liability provided for by the current legislation of the Russian Federation and local regulations.
5.4 All malpractice cases are considered on an individual basis depending on the circumstances and the consequences caused by violation.

Document is prepared by
Secretary-in-charge of the journal “Rasplavy”
Nikitina E.V.