

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

The International Conference
on Natural Hazards &
Infrastructure

2021 edition



Laboratory of Soil Mechanics

NATIONAL TECHNICAL
UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	3
2	Editors' Responsibilities	4
	Impartial, independent and confidential editorial process	5
	Publication decisions	6
	Appeals by Authors	6
	Research Integrity	7
	Corrections & Retractions	9
3	Peer-review process	10
	Promptness and objectivity	11
	Constructive comments	11
	Acknowledgement of sources and credits	12
	Relation to Prior Publications	13
	Confidentiality	13
	Reviewer misconduct	13
4	Author Responsibilities	14
	Reporting standards	16
	Plagiarism	16
	Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest	17
5	Consent-to-Publish Form	18

1

INTRODUCTION

The conference proceedings contain original research articles of high quality maintaining the highest standards of integrity and ethics. This document sets out the principles to which all the research articles published in the proceedings should adhere and is intended to provide useful guidance for authors, peer reviewers, editors and anyone seeking advice on dealing with research malpractice.

ICONHIC has zero tolerance for academic misconduct, including plagiarism, duplicate publication, falsification, fabrication and manipulation of data. Hence, prior to publication, all manuscripts are investigated thoroughly in terms of any potential unethical conduct and we take all possible measures against publication malpractices.

The following guidelines are based on Elsevier's [Publishing Ethics Resource Kit](#) and the COPE [code of conduct](#). Anyone who identifies research misconducts that possibly invalidate our principles should raise their concerns with the relevant editor, or email secretary@iconhic.com.



2/

Editors'

Responsibilities

2.1

Impartial, independent and confidential editorial process

Endeavouring to safeguard editorial independence, the Committee takes responsibility for establishing a review process that minimizes bias and for ensuring that no conflict of interest, fear, or any other corporate or political influence can compromise the review process. Manuscripts are evaluated in view of their scientific content only, without regard to the identity of the authors, their host institutions their nationality, gender etc.

Editors are expected to guarantee reviewer anonymity as well as material confidentiality taking all necessary actions for unpublished articles to be treated as confidential documents by all individuals involved in the editorial process. The Editors and editorial staff must not disclose any information about manuscripts to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, and potential reviewers, except for cases of misconduct investigations where confidential material may be disclosed to third parties.

Articles submitted by the Editors-in-Chief or a member of the Editorial Committee shall be handled by another editor.



2.2

Publication decisions

The Editors-in-Chief are ultimately accountable for acceptance or rejection of a paper. However, individual decisions may be delegated to other members of the committee depending on the specific topic of the publication and expertise. Editors are expected to oversee the timeliness of the process and, to their best ability, ensure that publication decisions occur within reasonable time frame.

The Editors-in-Chief should provide to the authors a written rationale for editorial decisions regarding a submitted article. This is naturally more important if the article is being rejected.

2.3

Appeals by Authors

Authors may appeal a rejection of their manuscript by the editors. In such case, the manuscript and all relevant information, including the identities of the referees, will be sent to a member of the Editorial Committee. This member can review the case on the existing record or seek additional expert opinion. In the latter case, a signed advisory opinion should be presented to the editors, which will be sent to the authors and/or referees along with a decision of acceptance or rejection.

If a member of the Editorial Committee has provided a referee report on a manuscript prior to appeal, another member will review the manuscript on appeal. If no suitable Board member is available, the editors may appoint an appropriate scientist to consider a manuscript under appeal as an ad-hoc Editor.

2.4

Research Integrity

If serious concerns are raised by readers, reviewers, or others, about the conduct, validity, or reporting of a paper, the editor-in-chief will initially contact the authors and allow them to respond to the concerns.

We strive to enhance research integrity and we foster honesty, transparency and excellence in all aspects of research. If serious concerns are raised by readers, reviewers, or others, about the conduct, validity, or reporting of a paper, the editor-in-chief will initially contact the authors and allow them to respond to the concerns. If that response is unsatisfactory, ICONHIC will take the issue to the institutional level and seek legal advice from the appropriate department of the National Technical University of Athens. In the unlikely case that concerns are very serious and the published work is likely to influence public safety, the ICONHIC may consider informing readers about these concerns, while the investigation is ongoing. Once an investigation is concluded the conference organizers will publish its results explaining the findings of the investigation. Retraction of the publication is possible according to the procedures described in the following paragraph.

The background image shows two men in a meeting. The man on the left is wearing glasses and a dark shirt, and the man on the right is wearing glasses and a patterned shirt. They are both looking towards the right. The image is overlaid with a semi-transparent blue filter. There are several white sticky notes and handwritten notes scattered around. One sticky note in the center says "REVIEW". Another sticky note on the left has some illegible handwriting. There are also some handwritten notes in white ink on the blue background, including a large "L" and some numbers like "1111".

“

ANY FORM OF **PLAGIARISM** IS UNACCEPTABLE AND IS CONSIDERED A SERIOUS BREACH OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, WITH POTENTIALLY **SEVERE ETHICAL AND LEGAL CONSEQUENCES.**

2.5

Corrections & Retractions

If an error is identified in a published article, the Editor-in-Chief will issue a corrected version, as soon as possible, which will replace the original in the ICONHIC Archives. If the error renders the work or substantial parts of it invalid, the paper shall be retracted with an explanation as to the reasons for retraction. Retractions are, in fact, reserved for extreme cases where the flaws compro-

mise the conclusions of the paper. If a retraction is made without the unanimous agreement of the authors, the approval of the Editorial Committee is required. To preserve the integrity of the proceedings, the retracted article is not removed from the program and the publication, but notice of retraction is issued.

3/

Peer-review process

Peer review is critical to maintaining quality of publications. It is a system based on trust: each party—the reviewer, the author, and the publisher—relies on the others to operate professionally, honestly, and confidentially. Reviewers are expected to provide constructive comments on the manuscript that

help the author(s) to revise the manuscript in higher standards.

ICONHIC provides reviewers with guidance for rigorous, fair and effective peer review and encourages them to act in accordance with [COPE's Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](#).

3.1

Promptness and objectivity

Reviews should be prompt, thorough and objective. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable. Referees should express their views clearly and support them with scientific arguments. Reviewers that feel unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or recognise conflict of interest are expected to notify the editor and withdraw themselves 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 article.

3.2

Constructive comments

Reviewers are expected to provide constructive comments with the intention to improve the quality of the manuscript. If the reported research is incomplete or insufficiently discussed, the reviewer should explain in detail what additional analyses or discussion would clarify the work submitted. Yet, reviewer suggestions should serve the purpose of supporting the conclusions rather than extending its scope.

3.3

Acknowledgement of sources and credits

Reviewers should identify missing citations to relevant earlier work and require that they be properly referenced in the manuscript. Moreover, credits for significant contributions by nonauthors should be properly acknowledged. Authors should make every effort to ensure that their citations to previously published work are comprehensive at the time of submission and may add citations to works published during the course of the review process during the revision process. They can make reference to unpublished work (i.e. preprints, preliminary reports etc.) or results that have been reported only orally at meetings (personal communication).



3.4

Relation to Prior Publications

ICONHIC aims to publish original research that contributes to the current state-of-the-art. The reviewer should bring to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and other publications of which he/she has personal knowledge.

3.5

Confidentiality

The reviewers should treat unpublished articles as confidential and refrain from using privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review for their own or another's advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others. They may receive permission to involve others in the reviewing process (e.g. students, early career researchers) but they are expected to include their names so that they are associated with the manuscript in our records and can also receive due recognition for their efforts.

3.6

Reviewer misconduct

ICONHIC 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.

4/

Author

Responsibilities

Submission of a manuscript is a representation that:

Originality



The manuscript presents the original work of the listed authors.

The manuscript is not already published and is not currently being considered for publication elsewhere.

Scientific Merit



The manuscript accurately reflects the scientific results.

Acknowledgements



All those who made significant contributions were offered the opportunity to be listed as authors.

All of the authors contributed significantly to the concept, design, execution, or interpretation of the research study.

Consent



The authors accept the established procedures for reviewing processes and publication decisions.

The authors agree to be accountable for concerns related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work.



4.1

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. The 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.

4.2

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as “the use of someone else’s prior ideas, processes, results, or words without explicitly acknowledging the original author and source”. Any form of plagiarism is unacceptable and is considered a serious breach of professional conduct, with potentially severe ethical and legal consequences.

We reserve the right to check all submissions through appropriate plagiarism checking tools. Submissions containing suspected plagiarism, in whole or part, will be rejected. If plagiarism is discovered post publication, we will follow our policy outlined in the Corrections & Retractions section of these guidelines. We expect our readers, reviewers and editors to raise any suspicions of plagiarism, either by contacting the relevant editor.

At the same time, we are struggling to deal with the malpractice of self-plagiarism, which concerns the somewhat vague concept of copying one's own work. While this is a topic of ongoing debate, we expect our authors to keep the reproduction of previously published figures, tables, and text material to a minimum and properly reference preceding publications. In order to reproduce figures, tables, etc., from another publication, authors must show that they have complied with the copyright or licensing requirements of the paper's publisher.

4.3

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 acknowledged.

5/

Consent-to-Publish Form

We request the corresponding author to fill out the Proceeding's Consent to Publish Form with all the required information, and his/her signature on the last page. It is critical that the corresponding author includes correct information; doing so will prevent delays in notifications to authors. Please note that only the copyright owner(s) of the paper, or an authorized representative, can sign the Proceeding's Consent-to-Publish Form. If one of the following cases applies, you may not be authorized to sign the copyright form, and you may need to request the appropriate copyright owner(s) or organization representative to sign the form:

- You created the paper within the scope of your employment, and your employer is the copyright owner (Work made for Hire).
- You created the paper jointly with coauthors. In this case, only one signature is required if all authors work for the same company, the copyright rests with the employer rather than the individual authors, and anyone authorized by the employer may authorize the copyright transfer. When the authors work for different employers, a separate copyright transfer form must be signed by an authorized agent for each employer (Joint Authorship).
- You created the paper under an independent contractor form.
- You received a grant, or other means of financial support by an institution, that funded your paper.





Contact

www.iconhic.com
secretary@iconhic.com
tel: +30 2106721798