

## **Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice**

Our declaration on publication ethics and behaviour is based on the Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors in its revised form, which was approved by the COPE Council on 7 March 2011 (Committee on Publication Ethics 2011) as well as on the wording used by the EUROPEAN RESEARCH STUDIES JOURNAL.

### **1 Copyright Notice and Licensing**

In case of acceptance, the GdO will publish the author(s)' contribution in the journal Libellula and after a period of 1 year on the journal's website (<https://www.libellula.org/>). The author(s) may publish the contribution on his/her personal website or any other website if he/she provides a link to the mentioned volume of Libellula. Similarly, the GdO may publish the contribution in other databases and websites, provided that a link is provided to the mentioned volume of GdO.

The author(s) warrant that their contribution is original, except for extracts from copyright works that may be included with the permission of the copyright holder and author, that it does not contain any defamatory statements and does not infringe any copyright, trademark, patent, statutory or proprietary right of any party.

The author(s) take(s) responsibility for the publication of this material on behalf of all co-authors.

### **2 Editorial Board Code of Conduct**

Our editors adhere to the Code of Conduct and the COPE guidelines to advance knowledge in the journal's research areas. The editors ensure this by:

- 1) maintain and enhance the quality of manuscripts published in the journal and the integrity of the peer review process,
- 2) support the journal's authors and reviewers,
- 3) maintain and enhance the journal's reputation in collaboration with the journal's extended editorial team.

#### **2.1 Publication decisions**

The Editor is responsible for deciding which of the submissions to the journal will be published. The Editorial Board evaluates the manuscripts without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, nationality or political opinion of the authors. The decision is based on the significance, originality and clarity of the work, as well as the validity of the study and its relevance to odonatology. Applicable legal provisions regarding defamation, copyright infringement, and plagiarism should also be considered.

## **2.2 Confidentiality**

The Editor-in-Chief and the Editorial Board shall not disclose information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, the reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisors, and, if applicable, the Editor.

## **2.3 Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest**

Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted contribution may not be used by the editor or the editorial board for their own research purposes without the express written consent of the author.

## **3 Peer review**

### **3.1 General guidelines for peer review and editing**

All submissions considered for publication in our journal undergo a rigorous, proven, fair and unbiased peer review process by the scientific advisory board. Upon receipt, the submission undergoes an initial review by the editor-in-chief of the journal to determine whether it is acceptable and conforms to the journal's guidelines.

The Editorial Board then schedules peer review by independent experts, and solicits at least two reviews for each submission. Before rendering judgement, the Editors require sufficient amendments from the authors (and a second round of peer review if necessary).

The Editorial Board makes the final decision. We only publish articles that have been approved by highly qualified reviewers with expertise in a field appropriate to the article. Accepted articles are copy-edited.

### **3.2 Peer review process**

All submitted manuscripts are expected to meet current scientific standards. They are first reviewed by the editor and, if found suitable for further consideration, are peer-reviewed by independent experts.

No contribution is automatically rejected because it is too practice-oriented or too theoretical; technically adept contributions from all areas of odontology are welcome. Authors are obliged to present their scientific findings clearly and to stimulate broad academic debate on the topic covered in the article.

Authors may recommend potential reviewers. The editorial board checks for and excludes anyone with potential conflicts of interest. When first submitting their article, authors have the opportunity to indicate the names of potential reviewers who should not be considered for the review of the manuscript. As long as they do not hinder the editorial team's ability to provide an unbiased and complete evaluation of the article, the editorial team will comply with these requests.

All reviewers are subject to the following checks:

- They must not have any financial links with any of the authors;
- They should not be affiliated with the authors' institution;

- They have appropriate expertise.

Reviewers who agree to review a paper should:

- have the necessary expertise to assess the level of a contribution;
- provide high-quality reviews and be available to answer questions throughout the peer review process;
- adhere to moral and professional standards.

Once an invitation to review has been accepted, reviewers have 28 days to submit their reviews. Requests for extensions will be considered.

### **3.3 Decision of the editor**

After peer review, the editor-in-chief can decide whether to accept a manuscript after receiving at least two reviews. We assume that before making a decision, the editor-in-chief will consider the adequacy of the criticism of the selected reviewers and the author's response, as well as the overall scientific quality of the paper.

The editor in charge has the choice of accepting the work in its current form, accepting it with minor changes, rejecting it and refusing a resubmission, rejecting it but recommending a resubmission, asking the author for improvements, or requesting a second reviewer.

The Editorial Board may disagree with the recommendations of the reviewers. If they do so, they should provide an explanation as to why they do so, for the benefit of the authors and reviewers.

### **3.4 Impartiality of the editorial team**

All publications released by the GdO are peer-reviewed and evaluated by the editorial and scientific advisory boards; we expect that the responsible editor will decide solely on the basis of the appropriateness of the selected reviewers' critique and the author's response, as well as the overall scientific quality of the article.

## **4 Reviewer Responsibilities**

### **4.1 Promptness**

Any selected reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research presented in a manuscript, or who knows that a timely review will not be possible, should notify the editorial team and withdraw from the review process.

### **4.2 Confidentiality**

All manuscripts submitted for review are to be treated confidentially. They must not be passed on or discussed with others unless authorised by the editor.

### **4.3 Standards of objectivity**

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their opinions clearly and explicitly and support them with arguments.

### **4.4 References**

The reviewers should point out the instances where relevant published work referred to in the paper is not cited in the text. They should point out whether observations or arguments taken from other publications are accompanied by an appropriate citation. Reviewers will bring to the Editor's attention any significant similarity or overlap between the manuscript under review and any other published work of which they are personally aware.

### **4.5 Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and must not be used for personal gain. Reviewers should not review manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest due to competitive, collaborative or other relationships or connections to any of the authors, companies or institutions associated with the papers.

## **5 Duties of the authors**

### **5.1 Reporting standards**

Authors of original research papers should provide a precise account of the work performed and an objective discussion of its significance. The underlying data should be accurately represented in the paper. A paper must contain sufficient detail and references to enable others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

### **5.2 Data access and retention**

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data from their study with the paper for editorial review and should be prepared to make the data publicly available if possible. In any case, authors must ensure that these data are accessible to other competent professionals for at least ten years after publication (preferably through an institutional or subject-related data archive or other data centre), provided that the confidentiality of the participants can be maintained and that legal rights with regard to protected data do not preclude release.

### **5.3 Originality, plagiarism and citation**

Authors should only submit complete original works and cite the works and/or words of others in an appropriate manner. Publications that were crucial for the type of work submitted should also be cited.

#### **5.4 Multiple, redundant or simultaneous publication**

Works that describe essentially the same research should not be published in more than one journal. Submitting the same work to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

Manuscripts that have already been published elsewhere as copyright-protected material cannot be submitted. Furthermore, manuscripts that are peer-reviewed by the journal should not be submitted again to copyright-protected publications. However, by submitting a manuscript, authors retain the rights to the published material. In the event of publication, they allow their work to be used under a CC-BY-SA licence [<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>], which allows others to copy, distribute and transmit the work, as well as to adapt and use the work commercially.

#### **5.5 Authorship of the article**

Authorship should be restricted to those who have made significant contributions to the conception, design, execution or interpretation of the reported study. All persons who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors.

The corresponding author ensures that all contributing co-authors and no uninvolved persons are included in the list of authors. The corresponding author also checks that all co-authors have approved the final version of the article and agreed to its submission for publication.

#### **5.6 Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

All authors should make a statement disclosing any financial or other material conflict of interest that could be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

#### **5.7 Corrections and Retractions**

If an author discovers a serious error or inaccuracy in his or her own published work, he or she is obliged to notify the editor or publisher of the journal immediately and to co-operate with the editor to withdraw or correct the article in the form of an erratum.