

Publication Ethics

1. Publication Ethics

The Journal of Information and Organizational Sciences (JIOS) upholds the highest standards of publication ethics and takes all possible measures against any publication malpractices.

1.1. Duties of the Editor

The editor is responsible for maintaining the integrity of the academic record, for having processes in place to assure the quality of the published material as well as for precluding business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards.

The editor selects reviewers for papers, decides on the required revisions and the acceptance of the paper in accordance with the reviewers' recommendation.

1.1.1. Publication Decisions

The editor is responsible for deciding which manuscripts submitted to JIOS will be accepted for publication. This decision is based on the reviewers' recommendation. The main selection criteria are the contribution's importance, originality and clarity, as well as the study's validity and its relevance. The decision will not be influenced by the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy. The editor may confer with reviewers while making this decision.

1.1.2. Confidentiality

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

1.1.3. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript will not be used in the editor's own research without the express written consent of the author.

1.2. Duties of Reviewers

1.2.1. Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Papers will be published in JIOS after a double-blind peer-reviewed process. Reviewers advise the editor. Reviewers do not know the author's identity and their comments to the editor are confidential and will be made anonymous before they are passed on to the author. The names of the reviewers remain strictly confidential, with their identities known only to the editor.

1.2.2. Promptness

Any selected reviewer 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 withdraw from the review process.

1.2.3. Confidentiality

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

1.2.4. Standards of Objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments, if necessary with explanation.

1.2.5. Acknowledgement of Sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. They should point out whether observations or arguments derived from other publications are accompanied by the respective source. Reviewers will notify track directors or the editor of any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

1.2.6. Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through the review process must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider 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 papers.

1.3. Duties of Authors

1.3.1. Reporting Standards

Authors of manuscripts 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 manuscript. A manuscript should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

1.3.2. Data Access and Retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data in connection with a manuscript for review and should be prepared to provide public access to such data, if practicable, and should in any event be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

1.3.3. 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. Plagiarism takes many forms, including the touting of material contained in another paper (of the same authors or some other author) with cosmetic changes as a new paper, copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), and claiming results from research conducted by others. In all its forms plagiarism constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

1.3.4. 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.

1.3.5. 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 or conference concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

1.3.6. 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 manuscript, 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 manuscript, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the manuscript and have agreed to its submission for publication.

1.3.7. Fundamental Errors in Published Work

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 editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

If the editor or the publisher learn 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 editor of the correctness of the original paper.

1.3.8. 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 paper should be disclosed.

1.3.9. Publisher's Confirmation

In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism the publisher, in close collaboration with the editors, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the paper in question. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum or, in the most severe cases, the complete retraction of the affected work.