

The eJMT Publication Ethics & Malpractice Statement

This statement is based mostly on the guidelines and standards developed by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). The duties and expectations of authors, reviewers, and editors of the journal are set out below. These guidelines are fully consistent with the COPE Principles of Transparency and Best Practice Guidelines and the COPE Code of Conduct. More details can be found at <https://publicationethics.org>

We encourage the best standards of publication ethics and take all possible measures against publication malpractices. Mathematics and Technology, LLC (<http://mathandtech.org>), as a publisher, takes its duties of guardianship over all stages of publishing extremely seriously and we recognize our ethical and other responsibilities.

Potential authors may send their manuscripts to the Editor-in-Chief (EIC) at any time for reviewing unless otherwise is notified. A decision notice (acceptance with minor revision, a major revision and a second review is needed, or a rejection) will be sent out by the EIC within 4 months from the time a manuscript is being submitted. All accepted papers will be compiled by the Managing Editor for publication. Issues will be published on the 15th of February, June and October of each year.

Editors' duties and responsibilities

The editorial board of eJMT consists of the Editor-in-Chief (EIC), Executive Editors (EE), Managing Editor (ME), and regular Editors. The following are expected from members of the editorial board:

- Acting as ambassadors for the journal
- Supporting and promoting the journal
- Seeking out the best authors and best work and actively encouraging submissions
- Reviewing submissions to the journal
- Accepting commissions to write editorials, reviews and commentaries on papers in their specialist area

The aim of eJMT is to publish quality articles in the areas of mathematics and technology. It is an open access and free journal so there is no conflict of interest financially between the publisher and the members in the editorial board. Editors should make decisions on which articles to publish based on quality and suitability for the journal and without interference from the journal owner/publisher.

Publication decisions

The Editor-in-Chief (EIC) is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. Publication decisions will be based on the importance of the work to researchers and readers and whether it fits the Aims and Scope of eJMT. The editorial board should also consider legal matters such as libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The EIC may confer with Executive Editors (EE) and other editors in making this decision.

The editorial board should evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

Peer review procedure

All articles submitted for possible publication in eJMT are subjected to *a double-blind peer review process*. Articles are first reviewed by the EIC. The EIC may reject an article out of hand either because it does not deal with the subject matter for the journal or because it is manifestly of a sufficiently low quality that it cannot be considered at all. Articles found suitable for review are then sent to two editors, who are also reviewers for eJMT, in the field of the paper. If the assigned editor feels that he or she needs additional assistance in reviewing an assigned paper, the editor may seek assistance from an external reviewer subject to approval by the EIC. In case an external reviewer is invited, the eJMT will acknowledge the external reviewer's name on the eJMT contents page:
<https://php.radford.edu/~ejmt/ContentIndex.php>.

Reviewers of a paper are unknown to each other. Reviewers are asked to categorize the paper as (a) publishable subject to minor revision, (b) needing major revision and a second review, or (c) not publishable. Reviewers' evaluations are expected include a detailed recommendation of what to do with the manuscript. Reviewers' comments are sent to an Executive Editor (EE) with expertise in the relevant area, or to the EIC, for final evaluation of reviewers' recommendations. The EIC will make the final decision and send his recommendation, along with reviewers' comments in their entirety, to authors, provided that the reviews contain no offensive or libelous remarks.

The EE or EIC should be ready to justify any important deviation from the process described here. In case a submission receives one positive and one negative comment, a third review will be conducted until it is clear to determine whether the paper is publishable or not.

Digital Archiving

The Editor-in-Chief will ensure digital preservation of access to the journal content by the Czech National Library within its WebArchive if and when eJMT ceases to operate.

Confidentiality

Editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, external reviewers, and the publisher. Editors will ensure that material submitted remains confidential while it is under review.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript should not be used in an editor's own research without obtaining an explicit written consent from the author. Information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. When manuscripts they are reviewing might have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers, editors or reviewers should recuse themselves, informing the EIC of the possible conflict. Editors or reviewers should require all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication.

Dealing with unethical behavior

In case unethical behavior is noticed, the eJMT editorial board will follow [the COPE flowcharts](#) to conduct further investigation. Possible unethical behavior may be identified and brought to the attention of the EIC or publisher at any time by any person. Whoever informs the EIC or publisher of such conduct should provide sufficient information and evidence in order for an investigation to be initiated. All allegations should be taken seriously and treated in the same way, until a successful decision or conclusion is reached. Every reported act of unethical publishing behavior must be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication.

The EIC and publisher will take reasonably responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper. Such measures will generally include contacting the author of the manuscript or paper and giving due consideration to the complaints or claims made, but may also include further communications to the relevant institutions and research bodies, depending on the seriousness of the misconduct. We summarize the following possible actions if unethical behavior is detected.

- A) Minor misconduct might be dealt with without the need to consult more widely. In any event, the author should be given the opportunity to respond to any allegations.
- B) Serious misconduct might require the board to take one or more of the following measures:
 - a. informing or educating the author or reviewer, where there appears to be a misunderstanding or misapplication of acceptable standards;
 - b. publication of a formal notice detailing the misconduct;
 - c. a formal letter to the head of the author's or reviewer's department or funding agency;
 - d. formal retraction or withdrawal of a publication from the journal, in conjunction with informing the head of the author or reviewer's department;
 - e. imposition of a formal embargo on contributions from an individual for a defined period.

Guides for authors

Publishing, submission, and acceptance dates for articles

Potential authors may send their manuscripts to the EIC at any time for reviewing unless otherwise notified. A decision notice (acceptance with minor revision, a major revision and a second review are needed, or rejection) will be sent out by the EIC within *four months* from the time a manuscript is received. All accepted papers will be compiled by the ME for publication. Issues will be published on the 15th of February, June and October of each year.

Authors may send a request to the EIC that a particular editor or reviewer should not review their submission if sufficient reasons can be provided and justified.

Appeals and complaints

- Appeals of editorial decisions, complaints about failures of process, and complaints about publication ethics should in the first instance be handled by the Editor-in-Chief responsible for the journal and/or the Editor who handled the paper. Please send queries to mathandtech@gmail.com.
- Complaints about scientific content, e.g. an appeal against rejection: Authors may appeal to the EIC to reconsider reviewers' decisions. The EIC may consult with editors to consider authors' arguments and reviewers' reports and decide whether (a) the decision to reject should stand, (b) an independent opinion is needed, or (c) the appeal should be considered. The complainant will be informed of the decision, with an explanation when appropriate. Decisions on appeals are final, and new submissions take priority over appeals.
- Complaint about processes or time taken to review: The Editor-in-Chief, together with the Managing Editor where appropriate, will investigate the matter. The complainant will be given appropriate feedback. Feedback is provided to relevant stakeholders to improve processes and procedures.
- In managing complaints about publication ethics, e.g., a researcher's, author's, or reviewer's conduct, the Editor-in-Chief or Managing Editor shall follow the guidelines published by COPE (<https://publicationethics.org/resources>). The Editor-in-Chief will decide on a course of action and provide feedback to the complainant. If the complainant remains dissatisfied with the handling of the complaint, he or she can submit the complaint to COPE. More information can be found at <https://publicationethics.org/facilitation-and-integrity-subcommittee>.

Reporting standards

Authors of papers 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. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable. Review and

professional publication articles should also be accurate and objective, and editorial opinion works should be clearly identified as such.

Data access and retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data in connection with a paper for editorial review, and should be prepared to provide public access to such data (consistent with the ALPSP-STM Statement on Data and Databases), if practicable, and should in any event be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

Originality and plagiarism

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works. Proper acknowledgements to other works must be given (this includes material that is closely copied (near verbatim), summarized, and/or paraphrased), quotation marks must be used for verbatim copying of material, and permissions must be secured for material that is copyrighted. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior. In general, an author should not submit for consideration in another journal a previously published paper.

Acknowledgement of sources

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, must not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, must not be used without the explicit written permission of the author of the work involved in these services.

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. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are

included on the paper and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

Suspected misconduct or disputed authorship

In case of suspected misconduct or disputed authorship, the eJMT editorial board will follow [the COPE flowcharts](#) to conduct further investigation.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

All authors should disclose in their manuscripts any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. Examples of potential conflicts of interest which should be disclosed include employment, consultancies, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. Potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed at the earliest stage possible. Readers should be informed about who has funded research and on the role of the funders in the research.

Fundamental errors in published works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his or her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the EIC or publisher and cooperate with the assigned editor to retract or correct the paper. If the EIC or the publisher learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error, it is the obligation of the author to promptly retract or correct the paper or provide evidence to the EIC of the correctness of the original paper.

Notes to reviewers (editors) or external reviewers

Contribution to editorial decisions

Peer review assists the EIC in making editorial decisions and, through the editorial communications with the author, may also assist the author in improving the paper. Peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication. Authors who wish to contribute to publications have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing. Reviewers are advised to comment on submissions regarding:

- a) unethical research design; insufficient detail on patient consent or protection of research subjects (including animals); inappropriate data manipulation or presentation;
- b) the originality of submissions.

Reviewers should also be alert to possible problems of redundant publication and plagiarism.

Promptness

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review, *within two months*, will be impossible should notify the EIC and excuse himself from the reviewing process.

Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Duration of appointment

The EIC will monitor the performance of peer reviewers (editors) and take steps to ensure that this meets high standards. The EIC will consult with Executive Editors to maintain a database of suitable peer reviewers and update this on the basis of reviewers' performance. The duration for an editor's appointment is three years and is renewable based on performance.

Suspected reviewer misconduct

In the case of suspected misconduct on the part of a reviewer, the eJMT editorial board will follow [the COPE flowcharts](#) to conduct further investigation.

Suggestions?

If you have any suggestions to improve the content of this document, please send those to mathandtech@gmail.com and include Publishing Ethics Guide in the subject line.