

## **SNAME Journals Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement**

SNAME Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement follows the recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics Code of Conduct and Best-Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors ([Committee on Publication Ethics, 2011](#) as retrieved on November 15, 2020). All involved in the act of publishing of the Journal of Sailing Technology (JST), the Journal of Ship Production and Design (JSPD), or the Journal of Ship Research (JSR) is necessary to agree upon standards of expected ethical behaviour.

### **1. Editors' Responsibilities**

#### **1.1 Publication Decisions**

Editors will ensure that all submitted manuscripts being considered for publication undergo peer-review by at least two reviewers who are experts in the field. Editors are responsible for deciding which of the manuscripts submitted to the journals will be published. Editors will evaluate manuscripts without regard to the race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s). The decision to publish will be based on the validity of the reported study, its relevance to the journal's scope, and the importance, originality and clarity of the paper. Editors may confer with other members of the Editorial Board or reviewers in making this decision. Current legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism will be considered. Decisions to edit and publish are not determined by the policies of governments or any other agencies outside of the journals itself. Editors have full authority over the entire Editorial content of the journal and the timing of publication of that content.

#### **1.2 Confidentiality**

Editors and Editorial staff will not disclose information regarding a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, the reviewers and/or potential reviewers, other Editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

#### **1.3 Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest**

Unpublished materials disclosed in a paper submitted to the journal will not be used by Editors or members of the Editorial Board for their own research purposes without the explicit written consent of the author(s). Privileged information or ideas obtained by Editors as a result of handling the manuscript will be kept confidential and not used for their personal advantage. Editors will recuse themselves from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships/connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions connected to the papers; instead, they will ask another member of the Editorial Board to handle the manuscript.

## **1.4 Involvement and Cooperation in Investigations**

Editors will take responsive measures when ethical concerns are raised with regard to a submitted manuscript or published paper. Every reported act of unethical publishing behavior will be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication. Journal of Sailing Technology, and Journal of Ship Research Editors follow the COPE Flowcharts when dealing with cases of suspected misconduct. If, on investigation, the ethical concern is well-founded, a correction, retraction, expression of concern or other note as may be relevant will be published in the Journal.

## **2. Reviewers' Responsibilities**

### **2.1 Contribution to Editorial Decisions**

The peer-reviewing process is designed to assist Editors and Editorial Boards in making Editorial decisions, and may also assist the author(s) in improving the paper. Peer-review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication and lies at the heart of scientific endeavor. The Journal of Sailing Technology and the Journal of Ship Research share the view of many that all scholars who wish to contribute to the scientific process have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

### **2.2 Promptness**

Any selected referee, who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible, should notify the Editors and withdraw from the review process immediately so that alternative reviewers can be contacted swiftly.

### **2.3 Confidentiality**

All manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. The manuscripts and their contents must not be disclosed to or discussed with others except where explicitly authorized by the Journal Editor (who would only do so under exceptional and specific circumstances). This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

### **2.4 Standards of Objectivity**

Reviews must be conducted in an objective manner. Referees should express their views clearly and present supporting arguments so that authors may use them for improving the manuscript. Personal criticisms of the author(s) are always inappropriate and unacceptable.

### **2.5 Acknowledgement of Sources**

Reviewers should identify cases in which relevant published work referred to in the paper has not been appropriately cited in the reference section. Any statement that is an observation, derivation or argument that has been reported in previous publications should be accompanied by the relevant citation. Reviewers must notify the Editors of any substantial similarities or overlaps between the manuscript under review and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

## **2.6 Disclosure and Conflict of Interest**

Any invited referee, who has conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions connected to the manuscript and the work described therein, should immediately notify the Editors to declare their conflicts of interest and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in reviewers' own research without the express written consent of the authors. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for the reviewers' personal advantage. This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

## **3. Duties of Authors**

### **3.1 Reporting Standards**

Authors of original research reports should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Review articles should be accurate, objective and comprehensive, while Editorial 'opinion' or perspective pieces should be clearly identified as such. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

### **3.2 Data Access and Retention**

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data of their study together with the paper for editorial review and should be prepared to make the data publicly available if practicable. In any event, authors should ensure accessibility of such data to other competent professionals for at least ten years after publication (preferably via an institutional or subject-based data repository or other data center), provided that the confidentiality of the participants can be protected and legal rights concerning proprietary data do not preclude their release.

### **3.3 Originality, Plagiarism and Acknowledgement of Sources**

Authors will submit only entirely original works, and will appropriately cite or quote the work and/or words of others. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work should also be cited. Plagiarism takes many forms, from "passing off" another's paper as the author's own, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), to claiming results from research conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

### **3.4 Multiple, Redundant or Concurrent Publication**

In general, papers describing essentially the same research should not be published in more than one journal. Submitting the same paper to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Manuscripts which have been published as copyrighted material elsewhere cannot be submitted. In addition, manuscripts under review should not be resubmitted to copyrighted publications. In the event it is detected that a paper has been submitted to more than one journal, all versions/copies of that paper will be removed from consideration.

### **3.5 Authorship of the Paper**

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those, who have made significant contributions, should be listed as co-authors. All persons, who made substantial contributions to the work reported in the manuscript (such as technical help, writing and editing assistance, general support) but who do not meet the criteria for authorship, must not be listed as an author, but should be acknowledged in the "Acknowledgements" section.

The corresponding author ensures that all contributing co-authors and no uninvolved persons are included in the author list. The corresponding author will also verify that all co-authors have approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

### **3.6 Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest**

All authors should include a statement disclosing any financial or other substantive conflicts of interest that may be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed (including the grant number or other reference number if any).

### **3.7 Acknowledgement of Sources**

Authors should ensure that they have properly acknowledged the work of others, and should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately (from conversation, correspondence or discussion with third parties) must not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source. Authors should not use information obtained in the course of providing confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, unless they have obtained the explicit written permission of the author(s) of the work involved in these services.

### **3.8 Peer-review**

Authors are obliged to participate in the peer-review process and cooperate fully by responding promptly to Editors' requests for raw data, clarifications, and proof of ethics approval, patient consents and copyright permissions. In the case of a first decision of "revisions necessary", authors should respond to the reviewers' comments systematically, point by point, and in a timely manner, revising and re-submitting their manuscript to the Journal by the deadline given. In the case of a rejection, full copyright will revert to the original owner.

### **3.9 Fundamental Errors in Published Works**

When authors discover a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, it is the authors' obligation to promptly notify the Editors or publisher and to cooperate with the Editors to retract or correct the paper in form of an erratum.