

EDITORIAL POLICY

EDITORIAL PROCESS

Submitting a paper implies that the work described has not been published before (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture, review, or thesis); that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere; that its publication has been approved by all coauthors, if any.

The conference follows the Double-Blind Peer Review type (keeping the identity of both authors and reviewers hidden) to ensure an unbiased evaluation.

The main steps of the peer-review process are the following:

• **Abstract Submission**

The corresponding or submitting author submits an abstract (or two maximum) in electronic format to the conference email address, icams.ro@gmail.com, following the guidelines available on the conference website, <http://www.icams.ro/>, by the specified deadline.

• **Abstract Evaluation and Author Notification**

The abstracts received are evaluated by the Editor-in-Chief and decides whether the submission is in line with the requirements and topics of the conference. An email is then sent to the corresponding author(s) notifying them on the acceptance or rejection of the submission. Accepted abstracts count as registration for participation in the conference.

• **Full Paper Submission**

The corresponding or submitting author submits the full paper(s) in electronic format to the conference email address, icams.ro@gmail.com, following the guidelines available on the conference website, <http://www.icams.ro/>, by the specified deadline.

• **Anti-plagiarism Check**

The Editor-in-Chief performs an anti-plagiarism check regarding the fulfilment of the similarity criterion using anti-plagiarism software.

• **Editor-in-Chief's Evaluation**

The Editor-in-Chief performs the first evaluation of the paper regarding the fulfilment of the template requirements: presentation, length, structure, style, composition.

• **Reviewer Invitation**

If the paper meets the quality conditions, minimum two qualified reviewers are selected by the Scientific Committee, renowned scientists and considered experts in the subject the paper concerns, whose names are not disclosed without their consent, for each submitted paper.

• Reviewer's Evaluation

The review process is based on an evaluation form which assesses the scientific and technical standard of the papers submitted. The paper will be accepted for publication provided reviews are favourable. In case of diversified opinions of the reviewers, the Scientific Committee will make the final decision. The authors will be notified as soon as possible on the result of paper evaluation (Excellent, Acceptable – requires revision, Rejection).

• Editor-in-Chief's Decision

The Editor-in-Chief sends a final decision email to the corresponding or submitting author.

- If revisions are required, authors have to submit the revised paper for further reviews.
- If the paper is accepted, it is processed and the article proof is sent to the corresponding or submitting author before it is made into pages for final production. The checked article proof should be returned as soon as possible.

• Publication

Once the paper is accepted, the DOI code is generated and the final version of the paper is adapted according to the conference proceedings publishing template. The final version of the paper is archived in the conference proceedings database. When all papers have been processed in the above manner, the conference proceedings volume is published online as well as in physical format.

Publication Ethics & Malpractice Statement

Our Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement is based on the Best Practice Guidelines for Conference Proceedings Editors and the position statements developed by the Committee on Publication Ethics COPE's Best Practice Guidelines.

PUBLICATION ETHICS

Conformance to standards of ethical behavior is therefore expected of all parties involved: *Authors, Editors, Reviewers, and the Publisher.*

AUTHORS

The Author declares that the manuscript is original and in its present form has not been published elsewhere in any form, that it has not been submitted to any journal/proceedings and that it will not be submitted to any other journal/proceedings, if it is accepted for publication in the ICAMS Conference Proceedings;

- The Author is responsible for the research they have done and for the results described in the paper;
- If the article is a joint work of several authors (co-authors), the Author who submits the article declares that any person named as author (co-author) of the Article is aware about the requirements of this agreement and has agreed to being so named;
- The Author warrants that the article does not infringe upon any copyright, contains no libelous or otherwise unlawful statements, and does not otherwise infringe on the rights of others;

- The Author shall keep the copyright for this publication/article and may republish their texts as long as they clearly acknowledge ICAMS as the original publication and the only source for citation purposes;
- The Author licenses to the Publisher the right to distribute the Article as a part of ICAMS Conference proceedings or archive or any other issue managed by the ICAMS Scientific Committee;
- The Author has the rights to:
 - Distribute non-commercially individual hard copies of the article to the interested parties, with proper citation to the published source.
 - Use, after publication, part or all of the Article, providing a proper acknowledgement to the source and to the Publisher.

Reporting Standards

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

Data Access and Retention

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

Originality and Plagiarism

Manuscripts submitted are checked against plagiarism with **Anti-plagiarism System**. Authors should ensure that submitted work is original and has not been published elsewhere in any language, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted.

Applicable copyright laws and conventions should be followed. Copyright material (e.g. tables, figures or extensive quotations) should be reproduced only with appropriate permission and acknowledgement.

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 concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

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.

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

Hazards

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

Reporting of Research Involving Humans or Animals

Appropriate approval, licensing or registration should be obtained before the research begins and details should be provided in the report (e.g. Institutional Review Board, Research Ethics Committee approval, national licensing authorities for the use of animals).

If requested by editors, authors should supply evidence that reported research received the appropriate approval and was carried out ethically (e.g. copies of approvals, licenses, participant consent forms).

Researchers should not generally publish or share identifiable individual data collected in the course of research without specific consent from the individual (or their representative).

The appropriate statistical analyses should be determined at the start of the study and a data analysis plan for the pre-specified outcomes should be prepared and followed. Secondary analyses should be distinguished from primary analyses and those set out in the data analysis plan. Researchers should publish all meaningful research results that might contribute to understanding.

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 project should be disclosed.

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

EDITORS

Editors should evaluate manuscripts exclusively on the basis of their academic merit. An editor must not use unpublished information in the editor's own research without the express written consent of the author. Editors should take reasonable responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper.

Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.

Promptness

Any selected referee 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 excuse himself from the review process.

Confidentiality

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

Standards of Objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with 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 paper 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 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 papers.

Reviewer Misconduct

ICAMS Editors will take reviewer misconduct seriously and pursue any allegation of breach of confidentiality, non-declaration of conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial), inappropriate use of confidential material, or delay of peer review for competitive advantage. Allegations of serious reviewer misconduct, such as plagiarism, will be taken to the institutional level.

REVIEWERS

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviews should be conducted objectively, and observations should be formulated clearly with supporting arguments, so that authors can use them for improving the paper. Any selected referee 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 excuse himself from the review process. 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 connected to the papers.

Publication Decisions

The ICAMS Review Team is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The Review Team may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The Review Team may confer with other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

Fair Play

An editor at any time evaluates manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to the nature of the authors or the host institution including race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

Confidentiality

The editors 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. In the case of a misconduct investigation, ICAMS Scientific Committee may disclose material to third parties (e.g., an institutional investigation committee or other editors).

ICAMS Scientific Committee does not disclose reviewers' identities. However, if reviewers wish to disclose their names, this is permitted.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

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

Corrections

When genuine errors in published work are pointed out by readers, authors, or editors, which do not render the work invalid, a correction (or erratum) will be published as soon as possible. The online version of the paper may be corrected with a date of correction and a link to the printed erratum. If the error renders the work or substantial parts of it invalid, the paper should be retracted with an explanation as to the reason for retraction (i.e., honest error).

Ensuring the Integrity of the Published Record - Suspected Research or Publication Misconduct

If serious concerns are raised by readers, reviewers, or others, about the conduct, validity, or reporting of academic work, ICAMS Organizing Committee will initially contact the authors and allow them to respond to the concerns. If that response is unsatisfactory, ICAMS Organizing Committee will take this to the institutional level. In cases when concerns are very serious and the published work is likely to influence clinical practice or public health, ICAMS Organizing Committee may consider informing readers about these concerns, by issuing an expression of concern, while the investigation is ongoing. Once an investigation is concluded ICAMS Organizing Committee will publish a comment that explains the findings of the investigation. ICAMS Organizing Committee may decide to retract a paper if the Editorial Board is convinced that serious misconduct has happened even if an investigation by an institution or national body does not recommend it.

ICAMS Organizing Committee will respond to all allegations or suspicions of research or publication misconduct raised by readers, reviewers, or other editors. Cases of possible plagiarism or duplicate/redundant publication will be assessed by the journal. In other cases, ICAMS Organizing Committee may request an investigation by the institution or other appropriate bodies (after seeking an explanation from the authors first and if that explanation is unsatisfactory).

Retracted papers will be retained online, and they will be prominently marked as a retraction in all online versions, including the PDF, for the benefit of future readers.