Publication Ethics and Malpractice

Editorial board of RAD CASA Medical Sciences strongly promotes research integrity and aims to prevent any type of scientific misconduct, such as fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, redundant publication, and authorship problems. All submitted manuscripts are revised by Editorial Board Secretary and checked using Crossref Similarity Check (powered by iThenticate) or PlagScan screening system for potential plagiarism.

In resolving any potential scientific misconduct, article retractions or expressions of concern, RAD CASA Medical Sciences follows flowcharts provided by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and additionally consults COPE for any unclear cases (COPE flowcharts available here).

ETHICAL APPROVAL AND INFORMED CONSENT

When reporting trials on human subjects, authors should indicate whether the procedures were in accordance with the ethical standards set by the responsible human experimentation committee (institutional and national) and latest version of the Declaration of Helsinki given by World Medical Association. Ethical approval (institutional or national) should be obtained for every study that includes collection of additional patient sample of any biological material (more than those required for the medical evaluation).

All subjects should sign an informed consent form and this information should be provided in the manuscript. Signed informed consent forms should be archived by the authors. The authors have to provide a statement that they have received and archived all patient informed consent forms, as required during the manuscript submission process. It should be noted that informed consent to participate in the research does not imply consent to publish personal individual data (names, pictures, hospital identification). Therefore, for publication that includes any individual data, patient must give his written consent. This is especially applied when it is not possible to obtain anonymity of the data without distorting scientific evidence.

Regardless of the preserved anonymity, patients presented in case report articles should always sign informed consent. Case reports without patients’ consent are not eligible for publication in RAD CASA Medical Sciences. Specific types of case reports, extra-analytical mysteries, are not obliged to obtain informed consent as long as there are no patient’s personal data revealed. If there is need to publish patient’s rare diagnosis or specific demographic or personal data by which patient’s identity can be implied, than the authors must obtain patient’s signed informed consent.
In the spirit of promoting best practice guidelines given by COPE (available at: [https://publicationethics.org/core-practices](https://publicationethics.org/core-practices)), RAD CASA Medical Sciences will not consider for publication manuscripts in which best ethical practice is not ensured, i.e. Informed consent is missing and/or Ethical approval is omitted. To simplify the decision-making process on whether a type of study requires Informed consent and/or Ethical approval, authors are encouraged to consult the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Informed consent</th>
<th>Ethical approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>The material from patients/healthy donors is collected for research purpose.</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method/instrument validation</td>
<td>The use of residual material</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The material from patients/healthy donors is collected for research purpose.</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research showing standard clinical/laboratory practice or the advancement of the standard practice</td>
<td>If it does not include a new method or instrument</td>
<td>Not required (it is implied that the informed consent was previously given for the scope of the treatment)</td>
<td>Not required (it is considered that this is not research but clinical/laboratory practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence/epidemiological research</td>
<td>The use of residual material or retrospective data collection.</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Information System (database) data extraction</td>
<td>Retrospective data collection.</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory management</td>
<td>Studies that do not include human subjects but collect data for measuring quality indicators (i.e. turnaround</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>The participants are notified in the survey about the nature of the research and the future use of the data (publishing, etc.).</td>
<td>Not required (it is implied)</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey asking more intimate questions.</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preanalytical case report</td>
<td>Patient specific information are not presented (patient is not identifiable).</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Duties of the Editors-in-Chief

**Fair play**

Submitted manuscripts are evaluated for their scientific content and the quality of it, without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

**Confidentiality**

The Editor-in-Chief 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.

**Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an Editor’s own research without the explicit written consent of the author(s). Editors will
sustain from evaluating manuscripts in which they may have conflict of interest and pass them to another member of the editorial board.

**Publication decisions**

The editors ensure that all submitted manuscripts under consideration for publication undergo peer-review by a reviewer who is expert in the field. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for deciding which of the manuscripts submitted to the journal will be published, based on the validation of the work in question, its importance to researchers and readers, the reviewers’ comments, and such legal requirements as are currently in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The Editor-in-Chief may confer with other editors or reviewers in making this decision. The Editor-in-Chief acts independently in defining the content and the time of publication of the journal.

**Involvement and cooperation in investigations**

Editors (in conjunction with the publisher and/or society) will take responsive measures when ethical concerns are raised with regard to a submitted manuscript or published paper. Every reported act of unethical publishing behaviour will be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication.

**Duties of peer reviewers**

**Contribution to editorial decisions**

Peer review assists the Editor-in-Chief in making editorial decisions and, through the editorial communication with the author, may also assist the author in improving the manuscript.

**Promptness**

Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its timely review will be impossible should immediately notify the Editor-in-Chief so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

**Confidentiality**

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

**Standards of objectivity**
Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable. Referees should express their views clearly with appropriate 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 data 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 evaluating 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 connected to the submission. They should report any existing conflict of interest to the Editor –in-chief.

Duties of authors

Reporting standards

Authors reporting results 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 manuscript. 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.

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.

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. Parallel submission of the same manuscript to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. Notable exceptions from this rule include clinical guidelines.

Acknowledgement of sources
Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.

**Authorship of a manuscript**

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 named in an Acknowledgement section. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors (according to the above definition) and no inappropriate co-authors are included in the author list of the manuscript, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

**Hazards and human or animal subjects**

If the work involves chemicals, procedure or equipment that have any unusual hazards inherent in their use, the authors must clearly identify these in the manuscript.

**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 their interpretation in the manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. They can do so by filling the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest [http://www.icmje.org/conflicts-of-interest/](http://www.icmje.org/conflicts-of-interest/).

**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’s Editor-in-Chief or publisher and cooperate with them to either retract the paper or to publish an appropriate erratum.

**Peer review**

Authors are obliged to participate in the peer review process and cooperate fully by responding promptly to editors’ requests for raw data, clarifications, and proof of ethics approval, patient consents and copyright permissions. In the case of a first decision of “revisions necessary”, authors should respond to the reviewers’ comments systematically, point by point, and in a timely manner, revising and re-submitting their manuscript to the journal by the deadline given.
Duties of the Publisher

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

The Publisher and the Journal do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, gender, genetic predisposition or carrier status, or sexual orientation in its publishing programs, services and activities.

Access to journal content

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.
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