

Editors' Responsibilities

1. **Publication Decisions:** The editors are responsible for deciding on accepting, rejecting or requesting modifications to the manuscript. In some instances, the editors may require multiple rounds of reviews and modifications. The editors communicate review result in a timely fashion. The editors reserve the right to edit, clarify or shorten the manuscript as deemed necessary.
2. **Review of Manuscripts:** Each editor must ensure that each manuscript is initially evaluated for originality, making use of appropriate software to do so. Following desk review, the manuscript is forwarded blind peer review to the review board who will make a recommendation to accept, reject, or modify the manuscript.
3. **Fair Review:** The editors must ensure that each manuscript submitted to *DesForM* is reviewed for its intellectual content without regard to the author's race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship or political philosophy. The decisions will be based on the paper's importance, originality, clarity, and relevance to the journal's scope.
4. **Confidentiality:** The editors must ensure that information regarding manuscripts submitted by the authors is kept confidential.
5. **Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest:** The editors shall not use unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript for his/her own research without the author's explicit written consent.
6. **Ethical Guidelines:** The editors shall ensure that all research material they publish conforms to internationally accepted ethical guidelines (COPE's guidelines).
7. **Proof of Misconduct:** The editors should not reject papers based on suspicions; they should have proof of misconduct.

Reviewers' Responsibilities

1. **Confidentiality:** Reviewers must keep all manuscripts received confidential.
2. **Acknowledgement of Sources:** Reviewers must ensure that authors have cited all relevant published work referred to in the paper in the endnotes and bibliography. Reviewers will bring to the editors' attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript and any other published paper they are aware of.
3. **Standards of Objectivity:** Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate.
4. **Supporting Argument:** Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.
5. **Plagiarism, Fraud and Other Ethical Concerns:** Reviewers should let the editors know if you suspect/find that a manuscript is a substantial copy of another work, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible.
6. **Relevant Work:** Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors.
7. **Conflicts of Interest:** Reviewers should not review manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative or other relationships, or

connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions associated with the paper(s).

8. **Promptness:** In the event that a reviewer feels it is not possible for him/her to complete review of manuscript within the stipulated time he/she should notify the editors in a timely manner and withdraw from the review process.

Authors' Responsibilities

1. **Publication guidelines:** Authors must follow the DeSForM submission guidelines.
2. **Cite sources appropriately:** Always cite your sources.
 - Direct quotation: place verbatim text from another source in quotation marks and include a citation to the original source
 - Paraphrase or summarize: include an in-text citation when summarizing information from another source, including ideas, processes, arguments, or conclusions
 - Data, research results, information, graphics, or tables: cite the original source when referring to, adapting, or reusing any information from another source
 - Note that the same rules apply to your own previously published work. When in doubt, cite, but only cite the latest relevant sources that legitimately contribute to your work
3. **Report data accurately:** Communicate your research findings fully and accurately.
Avoid:
 - Fabrication: inventing data or results
 - Falsification: manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data
 - or results
 - Image manipulation: inappropriate adjustment of an image, especially when that alters the scientific meaning of the image
4. **Publish original research:** Submit to one publication at a time. Your submission should contain original research that hasn't been published before and is not currently submitted anywhere else. Technical research is often published first as preliminary findings and then later as fully developed research. DeSForM supports this evolutionary publishing process provided that:
 - Both versions of the article undergo standard peer review
 - The later version contains substantially more technical information than the earlier version
 - The later version cites the earlier version and clearly indicates how the two versions differ
5. **Avoid plagiarism:** DeSForM defines plagiarism as the use of another's ideas, processes, results, or words without explicitly acknowledging the original author and source. Plagiarism in any form is unacceptable and is considered a serious breach of professional conduct, with potentially severe ethical and legal consequences. Follow proper citation practices to avoid plagiarism. All articles are checked for plagiarism before publication in the DeSForM repository.
6. **Multiple Submissions:** Authors must certify that the manuscript is not currently being considered for publication elsewhere. Submitting the same paper to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behaviour.

7. **Peer Review Process:** Authors must participate in the peer review process.
8. **Authorship:** All authors mentioned in the paper must have significantly contributed to the research. The author submitting the manuscript to the journal ensures that all contributing co- authors and no uninvolved person(s) are included in the author list.
 - Authors should discuss authorship when planning research, agree authorship in writing, and revisit the agreement through stages of the research.
 - Handle disagreements as they happen.
 - Negotiate disputes and misconduct dispassionately, using facts and guidelines.
 - Acknowledgements may be acceptable to a journal when contributions do not constitute authorship.
 - Authors should describe what each author contributed to the research project.
 - The order of authors should be decided jointly between the authors and make it clear the editors the reasons behind the author order.
 - All authors should be listed.
 - People should not be added as authors if they have not contributed significantly to the project.
 - Read the journal's instructions for authors as they can differ between journals.
9. **Data Access and Retention:** Authors should provide raw data related to their manuscript for editorial review and must retain such data.
10. **Authenticity of Data:** Authors must identify all sources used in the creation of their manuscript. Authors must state that all data in the paper are real and authentic.
11. **Conflict of Interest:** Authors must notify the editors of any conflicts of interest that may be construed to influence the manuscript.
12. **Fundamental Errors:** Authors are obliged to provide retractions or corrections of mistakes at any point in time if the author(s) discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in submitted manuscript.

Access to content

1. The publisher is committed to the permanent availability and preservation of scholarly research and ensures accessibility by partnering with organizations and maintaining our own digital archive.

Complaints and appeals

Complaints

Any complaints and appeals need to be addressed to the conference Chair, whose contact details are published on the DeSForM website and the Proceedings. Editors are committed to correcting the literature when needed and following through on requests from institutional investigations.

Filing a Claim

Any individual is entitled to make a formal claim that a violation of a policy has occurred. It is not necessary for a claimant to have any formal relationship (e.g., author, reviewer, program committee member) to the Work that is claimed to be in violation of DeSForM Publications Policy, nor is it required that the claimant be a member of DeSForM; however, it is necessary that the claim involves an DeSForM Work.

Any individuals submitting a formal claim that a violation has occurred must:

- identify themselves (i.e., anonymous reports are not considered),
- indicate whether there is or is not a formal relationship to the Work (e.g., authors of violated work, reviewers, or editors of violating Work),
- provide a detailed written description of the claim, and
- provide detailed evidence supporting the claim

DeSForM encourages the submission of the following additional information to aid in its investigation:

- any other information that would help DeSForM efficiently to investigate the claim

It is not sufficient for an individual simply to allege to DeSForM that a potential violation has occurred. DeSForM will not investigate potential violations without a complete claim being submitted, including substantiating evidence that, in DeSForM's sole discretion, is sufficient to warrant an official investigation by DeSForM. Without credible evidence to support claims, DeSForM will not investigate allegations. DeSForM does receive frivolous claims on a regular basis and claims that may be legitimate, but are not supported by evidence, making it impossible to come to objective and fact-based decisions. As a result, it is only possible for DeSForM, including its staff, volunteers, and investigators to investigate claims for which there is a reasonable likelihood of coming to objective fact-based decisions.

Please note that DeSForM will only process claims related to Works submitted and under consideration by DeSForM Publications or for Works published by DeSForM. Claims of violations in non-DeSForM publications should be directed to their publishers. Complaints against DeSForM members related to items not published by DeSForM may be referred to DeSForM's Chair for possible investigation and action.

Investigating Claims

Provided the minimum information required has been provided in writing, DeSForM will investigate claims of Publications Policy violations and publications-related ethical misconduct. DeSForM will take some or all of the steps outlined below based on the circumstances of each individual case. DeSForM reserves the right to close an active investigation if additional information is requested but not provided by the claimant.

Some or all of the investigation steps to be taken:

- Upon receipt of a claim that this Policy has been violated, DeSForM will review the submitted claim and supporting documentation. If any additional documentation is needed DeSForM will request that documentation from the claimant, who shall provide that documentation to DeSForM before the formal investigation can proceed.
- When DeSForM formally opens an investigation into a claim the Director of Publications will inform appropriate DeSForM Volunteers and Headquarters Staff. The

Director will then coordinate the investigation with the assistance of DeSForM's Intellectual Property & Rights Manager and in some cases with the assistance of a team of professional investigators retained by DeSForM to conduct investigations on its behalf. In all cases, the DeSForM Ethics + Plagiarism Committee and/or the DeSForM Publications Board will be involved in the decision-making process once formal investigations have been completed.

- For all submitted but not yet published Works, the Program Committee Chair(s) shall take the lead on the investigation and shall notify appropriate parties that a claim has been received and an investigation has been initiated. If the Program Committee Chair(s) are unwilling, unable, or conflicted with the claim, the Conference, Workshop, or Symposium General Chair(s) shall take the lead on the investigation and shall follow the same steps outlined here, as appropriate.
- A manual review of the materials will be conducted.
- Only after it has been determined that credible supporting evidence has been provided by the claimant(s), DeSForM will notify the accused that a claim has been submitted, but will keep the identity of the claimant confidential as outlined by policy. DeSForM will provide as much supporting documentation as possible to the accused without breaching confidentiality.
- Accused individuals will only be notified of allegations against them after DeSForM has determined that allegations are credible, based on the details of the allegation(s) and supporting documentation provided by the claimant(s). DeSForM does receive claims that are not investigated, and accused individuals will not be notified of such claims.
- Once notified, the accused will be allowed to respond to the claim in a timely manner and provide supporting documentation. The accused's response will inform the next steps to be taken by DeSForM.
 - If the accused denies the details of the claim DeSForM will continue to investigate.
 - If the accused admits that the violation occurred and waives the right to appeal DeSForM's decision, then DeSForM will move to the penalty phase of the case.
- A peer review of the claim by the DeSForM Publications Board Ethics & Plagiarism Committee? including one or more subject-matter experts will occur to help DeSForM evaluate the validity of the claim.
- Input will be solicited from the Editors or Program Chair (if conference proceedings) and referees of Works at issue.
- Consulting with DeSForM legal counsel; and/or
- Communicating with the individuals involved on both sides to update them on the status of the investigation and to inform both sides of decisions taken by DeSForM with respect to the claim(s).

Communicating Results of Investigations

Once a decision has been reached in relation to an allegation, that decision will be communicated to all parties immediately by the DeSForM Director of Publications or by the Program Committee Chair(s) or General Chair(s), as appropriate. Upon notification, the

investigative phase will be deemed to have ended, and there will be no further communication with any party by DeSForM unless there is an appeal to the DeSForM President.

Once a determination has been reached that decision will be communicated in writing to all affected parties by the DeSForM Director of Publications. For unpublished DeSForM Conference, Workshop, and Symposium related Works, the decision will be communicated in writing to all parties by the Program Committee Chair(s) or Conference Chair(s).

In all cases, if a violation has been found, all parties will be informed of the penalties and the actions to be taken.

Upon notification, the investigative phase will be deemed to have ended, and there will be no further communication with any party by DeSForM unless there is an appeal to the DeSForM President.

Confidentiality Rights of Stakeholders

All aspects of an investigation are treated with the utmost regard for confidentiality. The names and contacts of the person(s) making a claim and their relationship to the allegation will be kept strictly confidential and used only for the purpose and duration of the investigation.

However, to ensure timely and effective resolution, details of a claim may be circulated to individuals on a need-to-know basis. As part of the investigation, it may be necessary for DeSForM to contact current and/or past employers of the accused. Additionally, some institutions have specific requirements for their employees to disclose any pending legal/ethical matters. If either the claimant or accused's institutions contact DeSForM to request information regarding the investigation, it is DeSForM's policy to disclose that a claim has been received and to indicate whether a formal investigation is ongoing but to restrict the amount of information that is shared at DeSForM's discretion. If DeSForM is contacted with an official request to provide evidence, documentation, and/or testimony for a related judicial proceeding, DeSForM will comply with such a request.

Stakeholders Right of Appeal

All claimants and the accused have the right to appeal official decisions. All appeals must be in writing to the DeSForM Chair no more than 30 days from the date of notification, with a copy sent to the DeSForM Director of Publications. An appeal must contain new material that was not already evaluated by the Committee or substantive information that might lead the DeSForM President to issue a different decision than the one initially made.

If no appeal has been requested, the decision shall stand and the appropriate penalties shall be implemented.

In the event an appeal has been requested, the DeSForM President's decision shall be final and once communicated to the parties, the decision shall be carried out with both parties being notified of the final decision.

Appealing Editorial Decisions

DeSForM as a scientific publisher must make informed judgments about the correctness and relevance of manuscripts under consideration for publication. DeSForM relies on qualified volunteers to review manuscripts and serve on editorial boards and program committees to make these editorial decisions and to provide feedback to authors. In the vast majority of cases, this process works smoothly.

Should an author feel that the process was implemented incorrectly, the author should first follow the stated appeal procedure of the involved publication. If the concern is not resolved, the author may appeal the decision to the Publications Board Chair, whose decision can then, at the author's discretion, be appealed to the President of the DeSForM. The decision of the President is final.

At each stage of the appeal, the relevant DeSForM representative can at their discretion handle the appeal directly, or delegate this to an ad hoc committee named by the representative. The members of the ad hoc committee should not have any direct connection with either the manuscript under question or the associated publication. The decision by the representative, along with an explanation of the decision process, shall be communicated to the appellant and other involved parties in writing within a reasonable time frame.

DeSForM accords the editor(s)-in-chief or program chair final rights with regard to content. DeSForM stands behind the EiCs and program chairs on technical matters; appeals should base on serious violations of due process or ethical standards.

Volunteers will be assumed to have acted in an appropriate and professional manner unless and until it is shown through an investigation to be otherwise. DeSForM representatives will keep involved volunteers apprised of the process, and will always be cognizant that such investigations are difficult for all concerned.

If you would like to appeal the rejection of an article submitted to an DeSForM publication, please first contact the Editor(s)-in-Chief of the journal or magazine publication or the Program Committee Chair(s) of a conference publication. If you are unable to resolve the matter, please contact DeSForM's Chair.

Data sharing and reproducibility

DeSForM encourages, but doesn't require, authors to share the data and other artefacts supporting the results in the paper by archiving it in an appropriate public repository. Authors may provide a data availability statement, including a link to the repository they have used, in order that this statement can be published in their paper. Shared data should be cited. All accepted manuscripts may elect to publish a data availability statement to confirm the presence or absence of shared data. If you have shared data, this statement will describe how the data can be accessed, and include a persistent identifier (e.g., a DOI for the data, or an accession number) from the repository where you shared the data. You may use a Standard Templates for Author Use or draft your own.

Ethical oversight

The policy of DeSForM concerning the oversight on how the ethical principles are observed is built on mutual trust of the publication process participants and hope for compulsory observance of all the publication ethics principles, described in the DeSForM's Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement. We focus on the COPE definition, of Ethical oversight, namely "Ethical oversight should include, but is not limited to, policies on consent to publication, publication on vulnerable populations, ethical conduct of research using animals, ethical conduct of research using human subjects, handling confidential data and of business/marketing practices". Based on this definition, the editors of the conference works under the issue of observing the ethical principles.

DeSForM will be bound to consider the appeals from the Ethics and Oversight Committee (formed by the DeSForM Committee) for professional and scientific activity concerning the non-observance of the ethical principles by our authors. We are also ready to consider other appeals in case they are not anonymous and substantiated.

Intellectual property

Authors approach DeSForM and submit their works for consideration for publication. DeSForM publishes certain works in exchange for the author's agreement to license certain exclusive rights in the work to it as publisher. As part of the License to Publish Agreement, the author warrants and represents that the work does not infringe the copyright or violate any other right of any third party. All other intellectual property rights in addition to copyright are retained by the authors and are not the purview of DeSForM. DeSForM's publication of an article does not infringe the patent rights of any party because DeSForM is not practicing any invention by merely publishing an article. DeSForM's publication of an articles does not infringe any trademark rights of any party because its use of a title for a publication is a fair use.

Over its history, DeSForM has published hundreds of articles. While DeSForM has a clearly defined statement on the policies and ethics of authors submitting to its conferences, and while each article undergoes a rigorous peer review process, DeSForM, like every other publisher, cannot insure that every statement in every article that it publishes is correct or that no portion of the article has been improperly copied from a prior work. Ultimately, DeSForM must largely rely on the scientific community and authors to sort out the merits and the validity of the claims of each published work, as it and other publishers have done for many decades. In its role as publisher, DeSForM acts quickly and decisively when presented with an issue that falls within its legal scope of concern. For example, if a third-party claims that an article infringes his or her copyrighted material, DeSForM conducts a thorough examination of that claim and takes appropriate action. However, issues such as who was the first to invent a particular method or technology or whether or not a particular statement in a peer-reviewed, published article is accurate are issues that should be resolved among the claimant and the author and any questions about those issues should be directed to them. DeSForM does not mediate disputes between scientists.

Post-publication discussions and corrections

DeSForM encourages debate post publication by submitting a letter to the editors. Post-publication corrections will be published alongside the original article.

Corrected manuscripts will be published alongside the original manuscript, so readers can always find the most up-to-date version. All versions will be permanently available and linked to the same DOI.

DeSForM will be guided by the COPE guidelines when handling corrections, revisions or retraction of articles after publication.

**This Publication Policy and Malpractice Statement is based on COPE's guidelines:
COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts and infographics — General approach to publication
ethics for the editorial office**

— English. [https://doi.org/ 10.24318/cope. 2019.2.24](https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.24)

©2022 Committee

on Publication Ethics (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) □