



Ethical Guidelines for Authors

Content

All authors must declare they have read and agreed to the content of the submitted manuscript.

Ethics

Manuscripts may be rejected by the editorial office if it is felt that the work was not carried out within an ethical framework.

Inderscience Publishers adheres to the principles outlined by COPE – [Committee on Publication Ethics](#). Authors who are concerned about the editorial process may refer to COPE.

Competing interests

Authors must declare all potential competing interests involving people or organisations that might reasonably be perceived as relevant. [See Appendix for examples.]

Plagiarism

Plagiarism in any form constitutes a serious violation of the most basic principles of scholarship and cannot be tolerated. Examples of plagiarism include:

1. *Word-for-word copying* of portions of another's writing without enclosing the copied passage in quotation marks and acknowledging the source in the appropriate scholarly convention.
2. The use of a particularly *unique term or concept* that one has come across in reading without acknowledging the author or source.
3. The *paraphrasing or abbreviated restatement* of someone else's ideas without acknowledging that another person's text has been the basis for the paraphrasing.
4. *False citation*: material should not be attributed to a source from which it has not been obtained.

5. *False data*: data that has been fabricated or altered in a laboratory or experiment; although not literally plagiarism, this is clearly a form of academic fraud.
6. *Unacknowledged multiple submission* of an article for several purposes without prior approval from the parties involved.
7. *Unacknowledged multiple authors or collaboration*: the contributions of each author or collaborator should be made clear.
8. *Self-plagiarism/double submission*: the submission of the same or a very similar article to two or more publications at the same time.

Medical research

Medical writers, or anyone else who assisted in the preparation of the manuscript, should be acknowledged in the manuscript, either as an author, or in the Acknowledgements section, as per the guidelines of the [European Medical Writers Association](#). Medical writers should list their source of funding and/or employer as appropriate.

Experimental research on humans must have been approved by an appropriate ethics committee and comply with the [Helsinki Declaration](#).

Informed consent must be documented in cases where information or clinical photographs of human subjects are used. Signed copies of consent forms will be required before an article can be considered for review.

Authors from pharmaceutical companies or other commercial organisations that sponsor clinical trials should comply with the good practice described at [GPP2 – Good Publication Practice for Communicating Company-Sponsored Medical Research](#).

These guidelines also apply to companies or individuals that work on industry-sponsored publications, such as freelance writers, contract research organisations and communications companies.

Experimental research on animals must follow recognised guidelines as presented by the [British Society of Animal Research](#).

Appendix

Competing interests - examples

Examples of competing interests include but are not limited to financial, professional and personal interests such as:

- Research grants (from any source, restricted or unrestricted)
- Relationships (paid or unpaid) with organisations and funding bodies including nongovernmental organisations, research institutions or charities
- Membership of lobbying or advocacy organisations
- Personal relationships (i.e. friend, spouse, family member, current or previous mentor, adversary) with individuals involved in the submission or evaluation of an article, such as authors, reviewers, editors, or members of the editorial board of an Inderscience journal
- Personal convictions (political, religious, ideological, or other) related to an article's topic that may interfere with an unbiased publication process (at the stage of authorship, peer review, editorial decision making or publication)