

**FEDERAL STATE BUDGETARY ENTERPRISE
“ALL-RUSSIAN GEOLOGICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
OF A. P. KARPINSKY”**

APPROVED

Editor-in-Chief of the scholarly journal
Regional Geology and Metallogeny



(signature)

M. A. Tkachenko
(initials, last name)

February

2025

ETHICS RESEARCH PRINCIPLES

of the scholarly journal

REGIONAL GEOLOGY AND METALLOGENY

(“Regional'naya Geologiya i Metallogeniya” / “Regional Geology and Metallogeny”)

ISSN 0869-7892 (Print)

<https://reggeomet.elpub.ru/>

Saint Petersburg

2025

ETHICS RESEARCH PRINCIPLES

The Editorial Board and Editorial Council of the journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny* (thereinafter — editorial office) adhere to the International Code of Research Ethics specifically embedded in the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). In publishing, the editorial office follows international copyright protection rules, current statutory regulations of the Russian Federation, international publishing standards. In order to avoid malpractice in publishing (plagiarism, misinterpretations, etc.), to ensure high quality of research articles, public recognition of the author's research findings, each member of the Editorial Board and Editorial Council, author, reviewer, and representatives of the Publishing House and Printing House engaged in publishing ought to follow ethical standards, regulations, and rules, and take reasonable measures to prevent their violations.

Violation of research ethics principles

If the authors violate research ethics principles (plagiarism, concurrent submission, duplicate papers, etc.), the editorial office takes the following steps:

- If the violation is detected post factum, all the texts violating research ethics principles (when, for example, the editorial office receives duplicate, plagiarized papers, etc.) will be removed from the journal issues and its electronic copies on the website, in the Scientific electronic library, and other databases and information systems.
- The editorial office will appeal to the Committee on Publication Ethics for checking the author's (composite authors') all published materials over ten years. The detected ethics violations will force the editorial office to retract all the research articles from the journal, databases, and information systems; the research articles will not be cited.
- The editorial office will veto research paper submission from the author (composite authors), who has (have) violated research ethics principles, for one year.

1. The editorial office's responsibilities

- To foster members of the Editorial Board, Editorial Council, authors, reviewers, representatives of the Publishing House and Printing House to perform as per the given requirements.
- To follow the annual publishing plan. The research articles are published in order of submission priority, after filling the journal sections or its thematic issues.

Publication decision

- To be responsible for publicizing the authors' manuscripts. When accepting the manuscript for publication, to consider data credibility and scientific value of the paper.

The final decision whether to publish the research article primarily depends on the current law regulations of defamation, copyright, and plagiarism.

Decency

- To evaluate the intellectual content of manuscripts irrespective of the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, religious views, origin, citizenship, or political preferences.
- To present information about the research funding if the authors provide such in the manuscript.
- To send the manuscript for the authors to revise as per reviewers' comments; the authors should provide their updated manuscript (edited as per the reviewer's comments) and peer review report response.
- To upload the research article open access if it is accepted for publication; the authors retain the copyright.

Confidentiality

- To ensure confidentiality of any data that the manuscript authors have provided prior to publication. Unless necessary, not to disclose any information obtained from the manuscript authors to the third party prior to publication. Unless necessary, not to disclose any information to the third party except for the authors, reviewers, potential reviewers, and publisher. Only the reviewer's statement about the data incredibility and falsified information from the research paper evidences a confidentiality breach.
- Not to use the unpublished manuscript materials to advantage without the authors' written consent and not to disclose information from the paper for personal gain.

Publication supervision

- To take reasonable measures to detect and prevent publications of research articles, whose findings demonstrate improper conduct, to discourage, and not to close their mind to such violations.
- To always publish corrections, clarifications, refutations, and apologies when necessary. A corrigendum or erratum note in the published paper, which does not affect its integrity and scientific value, is posted on the journal's website as per the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics^{1, 2}.

¹ Visibility of corrections and retractions. COPE: [website]. Updated: 20.08.2024. <https://doi.org/10.24318/UBmyMDPA>.

² Corrigendum or erratum? COPE: [website]. Updated: 2023. <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/case/corrigendum-or-erratum> (accessed 03.02.2025).

- To obtain the authors' approval of some changes in the paper, which can hinder the author's message completeness (after literary and copy editing). To take measures to eliminate all the content, grammatical, stylistic, and other errors as found.

- To reject the authors' manuscript submission or send it for additional reviewing if the paper does not match the journal's subject area and (or) its originality is under 90 percent; if its content does not meet the criteria of a research rationale, novelty, and scientific merit of the obtained findings; if the authors miss the deadline of revising the manuscript and (or) there are no grounds for the authors disagreeing with the reviewer's comments.

- To cancel the manuscript registration if the authors refuse to revise it or voluntarily withdraw it from the journal in writing.

- To retract the paper if there are proofs of substantial errors that question the data unreliability: plagiarism, unreliable research findings, mistaken and falsified statements, fabrication, and data falsification. The papers are retracted as per the retraction guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics³.

2. Reviewers' responsibilities

Objectivity

- To perform a peer review of the authors' materials, thus the reviewer's opinion should be unbiased.

- To assess the manuscript in terms of the research rationale, novelty and scientific merit of the obtained findings, data description, data presentation, science sources citation, informative value of the abstract, assets of the research paper, limitations of the research paper.

- To state objective and essential comments and recommendations to increase scientific quality of the manuscript.

- To finally advise on the manuscript publication (recommend publishing the manuscript as a research article without changes or after making the reviewer's major revisions, require additional reviewing, after making the reviewer's minor revisions, cannot be published) on the basis of specific facts and produce evidence of their decision.

Confidentiality

- To consider the manuscript for peer review as a confidential document, which cannot be forwarded for examination and discussion to the third party unauthorized by the editorial office to do that.

³ Retraction guidelines. COPE: [website]. Updated 02.11.2019.
URL: <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/guideline/retraction-guidelines> (accessed 03.02.2025).

- To understand that the manuscript for peer review is the authors' intellectual property and relates to highly confidential information. Only the reviewer's statement about the data incredibility or falsified information from the manuscript evidences a confidentiality breach.

- Not to use the unpublished manuscript materials to advantage without the authors' written consent. Information or ideas obtained during the peer review and associated with potential benefits should remain confidential and not be used for personal gain.

- Not to disclose personal data, since the peer review report is confidential. Only the editorial office knows the reviewer's data.

Efficiency

- To ensure a blind peer review of manuscripts. It is important to follow the single-blind peer review policy when the reviewer knows the authors, but the authors do not know the reviewer.

- To notify the editorial office if the reviewer feels they are not qualified or objective enough to review the manuscript, or they do not have sufficient time to and ask to be excluded from the manuscript peer review.

Primary source recognition

- To draw the attention of the journal's Editor-in-Chief to the substantial and partial similarity of the assessed manuscript to another paper, as well as proofs of lacking references to the authors' this or other statements, inferences, or arguments.

- To mark published papers not cited in the research article.

Disclosure policy and conflict of interests

- Not to use manuscripts for personal gain.

- Not to apply knowledge about the content of the reviewed paper for their own benefit prior to its publication.

- Not to review a research paper if the reviewer feels, in their opinions, they are not qualified enough to assess the manuscript or they may not be objective when, for example, there is a conflict of interests with the author or organization (ambiguous circumstances, competing interests). The reviewer should inform the editorial office about these conditions and request to be excluded from the manuscript peer review.

3. The authors' responsibilities

Manuscript guidelines

- To be responsible for the manuscript content by providing credible research findings; a priori mistaken or falsified statements are unacceptable.

- To submit only true facts and information in the manuscript; to share sufficient information to be checked and provide other researchers with experiments to be reproduced;

not to fabricate or falsify data. The authors should obtain consent to use the materials the manuscript (co)authors do not own the rights to.

- To submit the manuscript as per the journal's rules and present it as requirements for its structure and layout suggest. There should be the research article metadata (title; (co)authors' first, patronymic, and last names; affiliation: organization, city and country; abstract, keywords, acknowledgments and funding (if available), contribution of the authors, conflict of interest; bibliographic entry for citation).

- To accompany the manuscript with the expert report on open access publication.

- To sign a license agreement after all the expert assessment stages completed. To provide their own personal data (without time limit) to store and process in different databases and information systems, to be included in analytical and statistical reports: first, patronymic, and last names; date of birth, passport details; degree and academic rank, honorary rank; position, full affiliation; office address (street, house number, locality, country, post index); identification numbers (ORCID, Scopus Author ID, ResearcherID, RSCI SPIN-code); contact telephone number, e-mail address; date of birth, passport details.

- To respect the work of the editorial office and reviewers, and timely revise the manuscript as per the reviewers' comments, or provide grounds for the authors disagreeing with the reviewer's comments.

- To inform the editorial office about the voluntary withdrawal of the manuscript from the journal in writing.

Data access and storage

- To provide primary data on request for reviewing. The authors should be ready to provide open access to such information if possible and always store the data after publication.

Originality and plagiarism

- To ensure that research findings in the manuscript are original. The manuscript should include references to the cited researchers and published sources of the borrowed content as per current statutory regulations of the Russian Federation. Excessive borrowings, as well as any plagiarism, specifically lacking quotations, periphrasis, or arrogating other researchers' findings are considered unethical and unacceptable. A quotation without a reference relates to plagiarism.

Duplication, excessive, and concurrent publications

- Not to approve concurrent submissions. If some elements of the manuscript have been published before, the authors have to cite an earlier paper and demonstrate how the new paper differs from the previous one.

- Not to submit the manuscript to this journal, which the authors have submitted to another journal and is currently pending; not to submit a research article previously published in a printed and (or) electronic edition.

Primary source recognition

- To recognize the contribution of each person who has therefore affected the research process; specifically, the manuscript should contain references to the publications, which were of importance in the research process.

- Not to use or provide private data without any written consent of the primary data source (for example, in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with the third party).

- Not to use information obtained from confidential sources, such as manuscript assessment or a grant, without any clear written consent from the authors' research article that pertains to confidential sources.

Publication authorship

- To list all the research contributors as the research article coauthors (to shape the research concept, develop and implement the research, or interpret the research findings). The coauthors cannot be people not involved in the research.

- To let all the coauthors approve the final research paper and agree to its publication layout.

- To follow ethical norms by criticizing or commenting on the third party's research.

Disclosure policy and conflicts of interest

- To disclose financial or other conflicts of interest regarded as affecting the research findings or inferences. The following is subject to mandatory disclosure: employment, consultancy, equity assets, fees, expert opinions, patent applications or registrations, grants, and other financial support. Potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed as early as possible.

Substantial errors in published papers

- To immediately inform the editorial office if the authors have discovered major or minor errors in the manuscript during its expert assessment or after its publication.

- To provide the editorial office with evidence of the original research article correctness or correct major errors at the earliest possible time if the third party has informed about them. Otherwise, the authors will have to withdraw the research paper.

4. The publisher's responsibilities

- To follow the principles and procedures that foster the journal's editorial office, reviewers, and authors to perform their ethical responsibilities. The publisher should be convinced

that the profit from advertising placement or reprint production has not affected the editorial office's decision to publish manuscripts.

- To support the editorial office handling claims about ethical aspects of the published materials and assist in collaboration with other scholarly journals and (or) publishing houses if this fact contributes to the editorial office's responsibilities.

- To facilitate proper research processes and implement industry-specific standards in order to improve ethical guidelines, withdrawal/removal and retraction procedures, as well as erratum and corrigendum.

- To sustain relevant law support (opinion and consultancy) if necessary.