

SHS Web of Conferences Publishing Ethics Guidelines

- **Ethical Policy: Publishing**
 - [1. Journal policy on authorship and contributorship](#)
 - [2. Conditions for submission of an article - Plagiarism/self-plagiarism/duplicate submissions](#)
 - [3. Peer review process](#)
 - [4. Handling appeals / retractions and corrections](#)
 - [5. Conflict of interests, competing interests](#)
 - [6. Ethical oversight](#)
 - [7. Intellectual property](#)
 - [8. Options for post-publication discussions and corrections](#)
- **Ethical Policy : Business practices**
 - [1. Revenue sources](#)
 - [2. Advertising](#)
 - [3. Direct marketing](#)
 - [4. Metrics and Usage](#)

Ethical Policy: Publishing

SHS Web of Conferences follows the standards and guidelines provided by the [Committee on Publication Ethics](#) (COPE), especially those regarding misconduct and fraud, and how to act in such a case. COPE provides a code of conduct with best practices in publishing and flowcharts that describe the reasonable steps that publishers and editors shall take so as to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred. In the event that a journal's publisher or editors are made aware of any allegation of research misconduct the publisher or editors shall deal with allegations appropriately. *SHS Web of Conferences* will follow the recommendations on how to deal with misconduct along the lines described in the relevant section 'Dealing with Misconduct' of [The COPE Report 1999](#) (page 46).

SHS Web of Conferences also adheres to the [Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing](#) as defined by COPE and the [Directory of Open Access Journals](#) (DOAJ). In addition EDP Sciences adheres to the [Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association](#) (OASPA).

1. Journal policy on authorship and contributorship

1.1 Authorship

SHS Web of Conferences authors are invited to comply with the "[Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly work in Medical Journals](#)", which were established and made available by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE).

The ICMJE recommends that authorship be based on the following 4 criteria:

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND

2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Therefore all those individuals designated as *SHS Web of Conferences* authors should meet all 4 of the aforementioned criteria for authorship; and reciprocally, all those who meet all 4 of the aforementioned criteria for authorship should be identified as *SHS Web of Conferences* authors.

We would like to draw the attention of new researchers to this [COPE document](#) that may prove useful in case of conflicts around authorship.

1.2 Contributorship

Those contributors who do not meet all of the 4 authorship criteria should not be listed as authors, but they shall simply be acknowledged.

1.3 Corresponding author

It is the corresponding author's responsibility to ensure that all authors are aware of and approve the submission of a manuscript to *SHS Web of Conferences* and further specific responsibilities

- Manuscript correction and proofreading. Handling revisions and re-submission of revised manuscripts up to acceptance of the manuscript.
- Agreeing to and signing the Author Publishing Agreement on behalf of relevant co-authors.
- Act on behalf of all co-authors in responding to queries post publication, including questions relating to reuse of content, or the availability of data, materials, resources etc.

COPE provides many resources on authorship and authorship disputes. Anyone involved in editorial decisions is encouraged to familiarise themselves with these support resources. *SHS Web of Conferences* provides support to editors dealing with authorship disputes including dealing directly with COPE.

2. Conditions for submission of an article – Plagiarism/self-plagiarism/ duplicate submissions

SHS Web of Conferences will generally consider for publication novel and original content. Submission of a manuscript *SHS Web of Conferences* implies that the work has not been published and is not under simultaneous consideration for publication anywhere else.

Plagiarism consists of someone publishing some text, results, data, from another author, as if it were their own and without acknowledgement. Self-plagiarism describes the action of an author recycling their own text. Both acts are considered as breaching the rules of scientific publishing. *SHS Web of Conferences* takes any plagiarism very seriously and reserves the right to check any submissions through appropriate plagiarism checking tools. Submissions will be rejected if they contain suspected plagiarism. If plagiarism is discovered post-publication, *SHS Web of Conferences* will follow guidance outlined in the Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern section of these guidelines &4. If there is any suspicion of plagiarism, we expect our partners, readers, reviewers, and editors to raise these concerns with us.

For this reason, *SHS Web of Conferences* has adopted a random examination of the submitted manuscripts towards plagiarism or text recycling using the [Similarity Check](#) service from **Crossref**. This tool allows the Proceedings Editors to quickly identify even partial use of already published content, which cannot be re-published in this journal.

In case of doubt, and in order to avoid any forms of plagiarism or text recycling, authors are invited to visit relevant webpages of universities across the world dealing with this topic, as well as the websites of their own institutions if relevant.

Here are a few examples of useful pages:

- [Plagiarism.org](#)
- [MIT](#)
- [Stanford University](#)
- [University of Toronto](#)
- [Université Paris Saclay](#)

Duplicate and Redundant Publication

Duplicate (or Redundant) publication occurs when more than one paper presents the same intellectual material (e.g. assumptions, data, discussion, conclusion...) published by an author without fully cross referencing the overlap. While it is possible to republish a paper in another language, full and prominent disclosure of the paper's original source at the time of submission should always be provided.

Please note that it is possible to publish a longer research article whose parts have been previously published in *SHS Web of Conferences* as long as full disclosure of the situation (reference) is made at the time of submission. For submitting an extended version of the conference paper, the submission needs to be significantly different to the original conference paper, additional material and literature must be included and the submission should avoid self-plagiarism. It is the responsibility of the author to check and clear any possible copyright issues with the previous conference proceedings.

The authors should indicate that their contribution is an improvement, or extension to their previously published conference paper. The conference paper should be cited in the reference list and throughout the research article.

When authors submit manuscripts to our journals, these manuscripts should not be under consideration, accepted for publication or in press with a different journal.

More information on the topic of redundant publications can be found here [in COPE's Guidelines on good publication practice](#).

If an article is submitted containing some form of already published content without attribution, i.e. citing the original sources, or without having sought appropriate permission, *SHS Web of Conferences* will follow [these relevant COPE guidelines](#) to handle the case jointly with the proceedings Editors. (Please note that these [different COPE guidelines](#) will apply if plagiarism is suspected in a published article).

3. Peer review process

The Peer Review Process is a widely established validation method used in academia whereby a work is critically assessed by expert referees demonstrating both the right level of knowledge in the field of the work, while being fully independent from it. Peer Review is critical to maintaining the quality and standards of our publications. *SHS Web of Conferences* recommends the “single-blind” Peer Review Process where referees know the identity of the authors, but the authors do not know who the reviewers are.

All *SHS Web of Conferences* submissions undergo a fair, independent, objective and constructive Peer Review Process: only scientifically sound articles, deemed of high enough interest and originality, will be accepted for publication.

The proceedings Editor whose subject expertise is closest to the field of the submitted article, will handle the submission, starting by dispatching it to at least one independent reviewer. The reviewer is informed of the necessity to keep the manuscript confidential before acceptance and publication. The reviewer should have no conflict of interest (please see §5 below). The reviewers are asked to point out relevant published work, which is not yet cited.

Based on the referees' recommendation, the proceedings Editor will make a first decision for publication, (either acceptance, rejection or revision). Should a revised version of the article be submitted by the author, this will return to the proceedings Editor, who may choose at that point to send the revised version back to the original reviewer(s) for another round of review, or make a decision for publication on the work.

SHS Web of Conferences provides appropriate systems, training and guidance to facilitate rigorous, fair and effective peer review for its publications, while protecting the confidentiality of the users.

In addition, *SHS Web of Conferences*

- encourages editors and peer reviewers to be familiar with, and follow the relevant best practice guidelines on peer review “COPE's Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers” (<https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>).

- expects editors and referees to recognise signs of dishonest or manipulated peer review, and to raise any concerns immediately.

4. Handling appeals / retractions and corrections

SHS Web of Conferences authors have the right to appeal against a rejection decision made on their manuscript. In order for their formal appeal to be considered, authors should submit a solid, scientific rebuttal, or new facts/data in response to the comments made by the reviewers. Confidentiality of an appeal consideration will be kept at all times. Until a final decision is made towards their appeal, authors will not be allowed to submit their manuscript to another journal for fear of breaching the ethical rule of duplicate publication to several journals.

Appeals will not be considered if they do not comply with the content requirement described above or they contains offensive language.

The editors of *SHS Web of Conferences* will consider retractions, corrections or expressions of concern following [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#). If an author or the journal has made an error, the journal will publish an erratum. Retractions are usually reserved for articles where:

- there is clear evidence that the findings are unreliable, either as a result of major error or as a result of fabrication or falsification
- It constitutes plagiarism or redundant publication
- It contains content without authorisation for use, copyright has been infringed or other legal issue including conflict of interest
- It reports unethical research

If rather than a retraction, corrections are made to the article, these will be carried out in line with [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#).

In exceptional cases, an article may be removed completely from online publication when it is considered necessary to comply with our legal obligations. This includes, deformation, violation of personal privacy or confidentiality laws, is the subject of a court order, or may pose a serious health risk to the general public. In these cases, we will publish a notice that clearly states why the article has been removed.

5. Conflict of interests, competing interests

For *SHS Web of Conferences* to fully adhere to the [Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing](#), it is paramount that all authors, editors and reviewers declare any potential [conflict of interests](#) (or [competing interests](#)) that may interfere with the publication of an article – spanning from its preparation and interpretation, to its evaluation in order to ensure the journal is free from undue influence.

Authors should disclose all activities (financial, non-financial, legal, commercial...), ties, academic commitments (political, religious...), beliefs, and relationships (professional or otherwise) that might bias or be seen as affecting the work they have submitted for publication.

Likewise, reviewers should inform the proceedings Editors if they have a particular activity, or relationship with the authors or the study itself, which may prevent them to evaluate in full integrity the work they have been sent for peer review. In such cases, they will be removed from the reviewing process so as to allow the Editor to appoint alternative, impartial reviewers.

Last but not least, Editors are expected to declare any conflict of interests (or competing interests), which may alter their ability to fairly and objectively handle an article for *SHS Web of Conferences*. If they submit some work as author to the journal, the same requirement for transparency in disclosing their activities and relationships will apply.

SHS Web of Conferences will follow the following [COPE's](#) guidelines if a reviewer suspects an [undisclosed conflict of interest in a submitted manuscript](#) and if a reviewer suspects an [undisclosed conflict of interest in a published article](#).

6. Ethical oversight

All laws and regulations should be strictly followed. Authors are requested to indicate ethical declarations issued by their institution and concerning their research.

Reviewers should not breach the confidentiality of the peer review process and not disclose any information or results/data from the article they are evaluating for the journal to a third party or use it to their own advantage.

7. Intellectual property

Articles published in *SHS Web of Conferences* fall within the [EDP Sciences policy regulating EDP Sciences articles published in Open Access](#). As described [here](#), *SHS Web of Conferences* authors retain the copyright to their articles.

Information regarding the costs associated with publishing in the journal are provided case by case upon request by the proceedings Editors, and are calculated according to the publishing options and services requested.

Authors wanting to find out more about their rights to post an *SHS Web of Conferences* article - whether in its original (*preprint*), accepted or published (*Version of Record, VoR*) version - on a preprint server, a repository or a specific webpage are invited to read the relevant information available on the dedicated [Sherpa Romeo webpage](#).

8. Options for post-publication discussions and corrections

While every effort is made at all stages of the peer review and production processes in *SHS Web of Conferences* so as to publish articles, which are correct, complete and authoritative, cases might still occur where Errata should be published or articles retracted depending on the circumstances and significance of the reported error.

Ethical Policy: Business practices

1. Revenue sources

SHS Web of Conferences is an open access publication. The journal revenue is based exclusively on the payment of Article Processing Charges (APCs) by the Organizers of conferences, whose articles have been accepted for publication in the journal.

SHS Web of Conferences proceedings are judged solely on their scientific merit, irrespective of whether fees have been paid (or any waiver received). The payment of fees does not influence the acceptance of the proceedings submissions.

2. Advertising

Currently *SHS Web of Conferences* does not publish any advertisement to generate additional revenue.

If a change takes place in the future, the *SHS Web of Conferences* Advertising Policy will be recorded here. It will be a journal-specific, adapted version of the more general EDP [Sciences Advertising Policy](#).

3. Direct marketing

Professional marketing colleagues advise the journal team on how to provide the best visibility for *SHS Web of Conferences* proceedings and their high-quality scientific outputs. Special attention is paid to help the organizers to extend the visibility of their proceedings among the community after publication, but never at the expense of academic integrity of the content: https://www.webofconferences.org/doc_journal/woc/EDPS-author-toolkit-woc.pdf

Rules and regulations in place such as [GDPR law](#) and the [Advertising Standard Authority's Guidance on the Marketing of Publications](#) are strictly adhered to.

4. Metrics and Usage

We partner with third parties such as Altmetric and Crossref, to provide our users with metrics to illustrate the impact of journal content. We do not control or influence these third parties and are not responsible for the metrics and rankings they produce.