



Croatian Operational Research Review

scientific journal

Croatian Operational Research Society, as the main publisher of the **Croatian Operational Research Review** journal is committed to ensuring ethics in publication and quality of articles in this journal. The journal aims to publish only original scientific papers which contribute the area of operational research and related areas. Conformance to standards of ethical behavior is therefore expected of all parties involved: Authors, Editors, Reviewers, and the Publisher.

Our Publication ethics and malpractice statement is based on Committee on Publication Ethics ([COPE](#)) Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.

Publication ethics and malpractice statement

1. Publication and authorship

The manuscripts submitted for publishing in this journal undergo through a double-blinded review process, in which they are being evaluated by at least two independent reviewers. The final decision on the acceptance for publishing will be made by an editor of the journal, or by the editorial board in case when the editor needs consultations with the board.

Every manuscript submitted to this journal should be formatted and have a proper list of references to cited articles according to paper template available in [Author guidelines](#).

Readers should be informed about who has financially supported the research and on the role of the funders in the research.

The editorial board will not tolerate any plagiarism and fraudulent data.

Upon an article acceptance, the corresponding authors sign the **Consent to publish and copyright agreement** in which they agree to the policy of the journal regarding the rights for publishing, copyrights, and other issues. The authors are also obliged to confirm that their article has not been published or submitted for publishing in another publication.

2. Author's responsibility

Consent to participate in peer review process

When submitting an article for publishing in this journal, the authors are obliged to participate in peer review process.

Reporting standards

Authors' manuscripts of original research 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 are unacceptable.

Data Access and Retention

When submitting their article for publication in this journal, the authors confirm the statement that all data in article are real and authentic. Authors should be prepared 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. In addition, all authors are obliged to provide retractions or corrections of mistakes if any.

Originality and Plagiarism

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. The editorial board of the journal uses Ephorus software to detect plagiarism. If the plagiarism problem is detected, the editorial board will notify the corresponding author and prevent the work from being published in this journal.

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 and is unacceptable.

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.

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.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

All authors should disclose in their manuscript 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. Fundamental errors in published works When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

3. Peer review / reviewer's responsibility

Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.

Expertize and promptness

On being approached to review, the peer reviewers should only agree to review manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner. 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 editor and excuse himself from the review 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, and their judgments should be objective. 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.

Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

In addition, peer reviewers should be aware of all other detailed [COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](#) and use them in the review process.

4. Editorial responsibility

The editors of the journal have complete responsibility and authority to reject/accept an article. They are responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The editors may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. They can only accept a paper when reasonably certain. In case of any doubt, the editor may confer with other editors or the editorial board in making this decision.

In case when errors are found in a published article, the editors should promote publication of correction or retraction.

Fair play

An editor will at any time evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

Confidentiality

The editor and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

The editors are also obliged to preserve anonymity of reviewers.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author.

Editors should have no conflict of interest with respect to articles they reject/accept.

5. Publishing ethics issues

The Editorial board is obliged to monitoring/safeguarding publishing ethics in the review process.

In case of noticing any unethical behaviour in the review process, errors, or omissions, anyone should report it to the editor or the publisher who are responsible on solving the issue. In case of any suspicions of unethical behaviour appear, the procedure suggested in [Elsevier Publishing Ethics Resource Kit \(PERK\)](#) will be followed in order to reach a decision or conclusion. Main steps of the procedure are:

Identification of unethical behaviour

- Misconduct and unethical behaviour may be identified and brought to the attention of the editor or publisher at any time, by anyone.

- Whoever informs the editor 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 decision or conclusion is reached.

Investigation

- An initial decision should be taken by the editor, who should consult with or seek advice from the Editorial board or the publisher, if appropriate.
- Evidence should be gathered, while avoiding spreading any allegations beyond those who need to know.

Minor breaches

- Minor misconduct might be dealt with between the editor and the author, without the need to consult more widely. In any event, the author should be given the opportunity to respond to any allegations. If the author responds and is willing to correct the misconduct, the review process may continue.

Serious breaches

- In case of serious misconduct, the editor should notify the author, and withdraw the paper from the further procedure of the review process. If the paper is already published, the withdrawal notification should be published at the web page of the journal, sent to author, and in some serious cases the employers of the accused should be notified. The editor, in consultation with the Editorial board or the publisher, should make the decision whether or not to involve the employers, either by examining the available evidence themselves or by further consultation with a limited number of experts.

Outcomes of the investigation

The following outcomes of the investigation are possible regarding the editors' decision upon the conducted investigation:

- Informing or educating the author or reviewer where there appears to be a misunderstanding or misapplication of acceptable standards.
- A more strongly worded letter to the author or reviewer covering the misconduct and as a warning to future behaviour.
- Publication of a formal notice detailing the misconduct.
- Publication of an editorial detailing the misconduct.
- A formal letter to the head of the author's or reviewer's department or funding agency.
- Formal retraction or withdrawal of a publication from the journal, in conjunction with informing the head of the author or reviewer's department, Abstracting & Indexing services and the readership of the publication.
- Imposition of a formal embargo on contributions from an individual for a defined period.
- Reporting the case and outcome to a professional organisation or higher authority for further investigation and action.

Other responsibilities of the editors

The Editorial board is also responsible for maintaining the integrity of the academic record for the work published in this journal. It is also obliged to preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards in the articles published in this journal.

The Editorial board should always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed, and allow no plagiarism, or fraudulent data.

Open Access Statement

Croatian Operational Research Review is an open access journal which means that all content is freely available without charge to the user or his/her institution. Users are allowed to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of the articles in this journal without asking prior permission from the publisher or the author. This is in accordance with the BOAI definition of open access. The journal has an open access to full text of all papers through our [Open Journal System](#) and the [Hrcak database](#).