

### **Publishing policy and ethic norms**

The Editors of the «Vestnik Sankt-Peterburskogo Universiteta GPS MCHS Rossii» journal, maintain a high level of requirements for selection and accepting of the articles submitted by authors. These rules are determined by the scientific fields covered in the journal. They are regulated by the Quality Standards of Scientific Paper and Its Presentation adopted in the scientific community.

Drawing up the items of the publication ethics policy of the journal Vestnik Sankt-Peterburskogo Universiteta GPS MCHS Rossii Editors followed the recommendations of Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and the experience of international professional associations and research institutions and publishers.

An essential feature of professional scientific community is the acceptance of the moral code which sets the basic rules of behavior and the responsibilities of the scientific community members before each other and in relation to the public. Such a code is defined by the intention to ensure maximum benefit to the professional community and to limit the actions, which could serve the interests of individuals, as well as to ensure an author's intellectual property rights.

In addition to the aforesaid Editors set a list of ethical standards below. It should guide persons (editors, authors and reviewers) involved in the publication of research results in the field of mining and related industries and other fields of science considered in the journal.

The Editors believe that the rules presented below are approved by the majority of qualified researchers; they may also be of great help to students, graduate students and young scientists who are beginners in research activity. Scholars of authority may welcome the opportunity to once again return to the issues that are important to scientific practice.

### **Ethical Obligations of Editors of the Scientific and Technical Journal**

1. All submitted materials are carefully selected and peer-reviewed. An editorial board reserves the right to reject an article or return it as requiring improvement.
2. An editor should considerate all manuscripts offered for publication without prejudice, evaluating each on its merits without regard to race, religion, nationality, status, or institutional affiliation of the author(s). An editor may take into account relationships of a manuscript under consideration to others previously offered by the same author(s).
3. An editor should consider manuscript submitted for publication without delays.
4. The whole responsibility for acceptance or rejection of an article rests with the editor. Responsible and reasonable approach to the duty requires that the editor seek advice from reviewers, Doctor of Science of required specialty, as to the quality and reliability of manuscripts submitted for publication. However, manuscripts may be rejected without external review if considered by the Editors to be inappropriate for the journal.
5. The editor and members of the editor's staff should not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than those from whom professional advice is sought. After a positive decision has been made about a manuscript, it should be published in the journal and in the website of the journal.
6. It is acceptable to spread articles published in the journal or quotations over the Internet with precondition of giving references and links to the primary source. Publication and/or distribution of materials from the journal by third parties or organizations in print and electronic media are prohibited.
7. According to the international law of electronic media copyright, copying of materials published in electronic journal in full or in part is not allowed without the prior written permission of author(s) and Editors. In case of use of the published materials in context of other documents, references to the primary source are required.
8. An editor should respect the intellectual independence of authors.
9. Editorial responsibility and authority for any manuscript authored by an editor and submitted to the editor's journal should be delegated to other qualified person, such as a member of its Editorial Board.
10. Unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations disclosed in a submitted manuscript should not be used in an editor's own research except with the consent of the author. However, if such information indicates that some of the editor's own research is unlikely to be profitable, the editor could ethically discontinue the work. When a manuscript is so closely related to the current or past research of an editor as to create a conflict of interest, the editor should arrange for some other qualified person to take editorial responsibility for that manuscript.
11. If an editor is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance or conclusions of a report published in an editor's journal are erroneous, the editor should facilitate publication of an appropriate report pointing out the error and, if possible, correcting it. The report may be written by the person who discovered the error or by an original author.
12. An author may request that the editor not use certain reviewers in consideration of a manuscript. However, the editor may decide to use one or more of these reviewers, if the editor feels their opinions are important in the fair consideration of a manuscript. This might be the case, for example, when a manuscript seriously disagrees with the previous work of a potential reviewer.

### **Ethical Obligations of Authors**

1. Main duty of an author is to present an accurate account of the research performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance.
2. Whole responsibility for content of articles and for the fact of publication rests with author(s). Editors do not bear responsibility for probable damage caused by publication of a manuscript to authors or third parties. Editors have the

right to withdraw the article already published in case somebody's rights or generally accepted norms appear violated. Editors inform author(s) of the article, persons who gave recommendations and representatives of organization, where the research was held, about the fact of withdrawal.

3. An author should be aware that journal space is a limited resource and should use it wisely and economically.
4. A primary research report should contain sufficient detail and reference to public sources of information to permit the author's peers to repeat the work.
5. An author should cite those publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work and that will guide the reader quickly to the earlier work that is essential for understanding the present investigation. Except in a review, citation of work that will not be referred to in the reported research should be minimized. An author is obligated to perform a literature search to find, and then cite, the original publications that describe closely related work. For critical materials used in the work, proper citation to sources should also be made when these were supplied by a non author.
6. In submitting a manuscript for publication, an author should inform the editor of related manuscripts that the author has under editorial consideration or in press. Copies of those manuscripts should be supplied to the editor, and the relationships of such manuscripts to the one submitted should be indicated.
7. It is improper for an author to submit manuscripts describing essentially the same research to more than one journal of primary publication, unless it is a resubmission of a manuscript rejected for or withdrawn from publication. It is generally permissible to submit a manuscript for a full paper expanding on a previously published brief preliminary account (a "communication" or "letter") of the same work. However, at the time of submission, the editor should be made aware of the earlier communication, and the preliminary communication should be cited in the manuscript.
8. An author should identify the source of all information quoted or offered, except that which is common knowledge. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, should not be used or reported in the author's work without explicit permission from the investigator with whom the information originated. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, should be treated similarly.
9. An experimental or theoretical study may sometimes justify criticism, even severe criticism, of the work of another scientist. When appropriate, such criticism may be offered in published papers. However, in no case is personal criticism considered to be appropriate.
10. The co-authors of a paper should be all those persons who have made significant scientific contributions to the work reported and who share responsibility and accountability for the results. Other contributions should be indicated in a footnote or an "Acknowledgments" section. An administrative relationship to the investigation does not of itself qualify a person for co-authorship (but occasionally it may be appropriate to acknowledge major administrative assistance). Deceased persons who meet the criterion for inclusion as co-authors should be so included, with a footnote reporting date of death. No fictitious name should be listed as an author or coauthor. The author who submits a manuscript for publication accepts the responsibility of having included as co-authors all persons appropriate and none inappropriate. The submitting author should have sent each living co-author a draft copy of the manuscript and have obtained the co-author's assent to co-authorship of it.
11. The authors should reveal to the editor and to the readers of the journal any potential and/or relevant competing financial or other interest that might be affected by publication of the results contained in the authors' manuscript. All authors should not have any personal significant financial interest and employment or other relationship with entities that have a financial or other interest which can affect the results described by the manuscript.

#### **Ethical Obligations of Reviewers of Manuscripts**

1. As the reviewing of manuscripts is an essential step in the publication process, and therefore in the operation of the scientific method, every scientist has an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.
2. A chosen reviewer who feels inadequately qualified to judge the research reported in a manuscript should return it promptly to the editor.
3. A reviewer of a manuscript should judge objectively the quality of the manuscript, of its experimental and theoretical work, of its interpretations and its exposition, with due regard to the maintenance of high scientific and literary standards. A reviewer should respect the intellectual independence of the authors.
4. A reviewer should be sensitive to the appearance of a conflict of interest when the manuscript under review is closely related to the reviewer's work in progress or published. If in doubt, the reviewer should return the manuscript promptly without review, advising the editor of the conflict of interest.
5. A reviewer should not evaluate a manuscript authored or co-authored by a person with whom the reviewer has a personal or professional connection if the relationship would bias judgment of the manuscript.
6. A reviewer should treat a manuscript sent for review as a confidential document. It should neither be shown to nor discussed with others except, in special cases, to persons from whom specific advice may be sought; in that event, the identities of those consulted should be disclosed to the editor.
7. Reviewers should explain and support their judgments adequately so that editors and authors may understand the basis of their comments. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. Unsupported assertions by reviewers (or by authors in rebuttal) are of little value and should be avoided.
8. A reviewer should be alert to failure of authors to cite relevant work by other scientists, bearing in mind that complaints that the reviewer's own research was insufficiently cited may seem self-serving. A reviewer should call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper or any manuscript submitted concurrently to another journal.
9. A reviewer should act promptly, submitting a report in a timely manner.

10. Reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, except with the consent of the author. If this information indicates that some of the reviewer's work is unlikely to be profitable, the reviewer, however, could ethically discontinue the work.