

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

1. Publication Ethics

Based on the statements by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Code of Conduct guidelines and the recognized publication ethics. *Chinese Journal of Cancer Research (CJCR)* adheres to the principle of upholding high standards of publishing ethics, and practices this commitment by providing transparent and standardized services, and providing correct advice when finding academic misconduct in authors' articles. *CJCR* firmly opposes plagiarism in any form. Authors submitting articles to *CJCR* should affirm that the article contents are original. They should also warrant that the article has neither been published elsewhere in any language fully or partly, nor is it under review for publication anywhere.

1.1 Definitions of academic misconduct

Academic misconduct refers to dishonesty, misbehavior and moral abnormality in academia, or the phenomenon that someone plagiarizes the research results of others, corrupts academic atmosphere, impedes academic progress, violates scientific spirit and morality, abandons the principle of truth and honesty in scientific experimental data, causes a severe negative impact on science and education, and greatly damages the academic image.

- 1) Plagiarism: It is the dishonest representation of another author's (or one's own) unpublished work or scientific research results (inclusive of texts, graphics, images, and ideas) as one's own (new) work or results in articles to be published;
- 2) Fabrication: It is the false making of materials, data, results or resumes (titles) for being recorded or reported;
- 3) Falsification: It is the action of manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record, or falsifying the description of the process and intentionally altering the actual situation;
- 4) Abuse of peer review privileges: It is in the process of peer review to intentionally ignore and conceal negative results, or conceal and modify data, exaggerating positive value;
- 5) Inappropriate authorship mainly includes
 - (1) Excluding those with substantial contributions to the research in the manuscript from the byline;

(2) Listing those without substantial contributions to the research in the manuscript in the byline;

(3) Listing a person in the byline without the person's consent;

(4) The ranking of authors being not in line with their actual contributions to the manuscript.

Editors and reviewers should reject any form of bribes and articles concerned to avoid reviews and manuscripts that receive preferential treatment.

2. Publication Malpractice Statement

The editors, authors, and reviewers of *CJCR* should perform the following responsibilities, and adhere to other guidelines and requirements of *CJCR*.

2.1 Editors' Responsibilities

1) The editor should ensure the confidentiality of reviewers and peer review, and deliver the review comments to the authors objectively and impartially;

2) The editor should maintain the transparency of academic research and records, preclude professional needs from cooperating ethical standards, and always be willing to publish retractions, rectifications, and erratum when required.

3) The editor should assess manuscripts for their scientific quality and intellectual content and should avoid any biased decisions based on race, gender, geographical origin, or religion of the author(s). The editor should evaluate manuscripts objectively, based on their academic merit, and free of any commercial or self-interests.

4) The editor should not disclose any information on submitted manuscripts before the publication of the manuscript.

5) The promotion of research rectitude must be preserved. If at any stage the publisher suspects any kind of misconduct in research, it should be investigated promptly in detail with the appropriate authority; and if any suspicious act of misconduct is observed during the peer review, it should be resolved with diligence.

2.2 Authors' Responsibilities

1) Please ensure that all the writings in the manuscript must be original and free of any kind of plagiarism. The work should not have been published elsewhere or submitted to any other journal(s) at the same time. Any potential conflict of interest must be clearly acknowledged. Other work used (individual/company/institution) must be properly acknowledged. Permission must be obtained for any content used from other sources.

2) Please download the Author Instruction to check and correct your format and abstract, and prepare an electronic edition of your manuscripts. Manuscripts that do not conform to the standards of *CJCR* will not be accepted.

3) Please ensure that the authors' address, telephone number, E-mail address, and other contact information are clear. Each manuscript should have a corresponding author, and the corresponding author and the first author can be the same person.

4) As you complete the steps above, please download the Copyright Transfer and print it. After it is signed by all authors, please send the scanned files to *CJCR*. If there is no signed Copyright Transfer Statement, the manuscripts will not be accepted!

CJCR arranges preliminary reviews and uses Crossref Similarity Check (powered by iThenticate) software (<https://www.crossref.org/documentation/similarity-check/>) for manuscripts that fulfill the submission steps above. Submitted articles are screened and compared to previously published sources. Manuscripts revealing a high proportion of similarity to single or multiple published sources will be examined carefully, and the Chief Editors reserve the right to approach authors for an explanation (as per the COPE recommendations of procedures to follow in the event of suspected plagiarism in a submitted manuscript).

2.3 Reviewers' Responsibilities

Manuscripts that have passed preliminary reviews are evaluated under peer review with the double-blind system (the author and the reviewer do not know each other's identity). The peer review complies with the following specifications.

Peer review experts should abide by the following specifications:

1) Review whether the manuscript has reached the publication level, whether there is any innovation, and whether the experiment and demonstration are reasonable, etc. Whether or not it can be published, write out review comments and point out the innovation, suggestions on revision or reasons why the manuscript cannot be published;

2) Point out what statements in the manuscript need a further reference to published research results, during which the expert should not exaggerate his or her own academic contribution and force authors to cite the content;

3) Consider not only academic value but also the academic code of ethics. For suspected academic misconduct, the expert should report it to the editorial office. Depending on the seriousness of the misconduct, the editorial office should ask instructions from the executive deputy editor-in-chief and the editor-in-chief on whether to initiate an academic ethics investigation or to send back manuscripts due to moral abnormality;

- 4) Keep the content of manuscripts confidential before publication.
- 5) Notify the journal editor about any financial or personal conflict of interest and decline to review the manuscript when a possibility of such a conflict exists.

3. Problem-solving principles and procedures

3.1 Conflicts of interest

1) Editorial office's solution

If a reviewer is found to have a conflict of interest with the author, editors should terminate the peer review immediately and choose another appropriate expert to conduct the review.

2) Invited anonymous reviewer's solution

If a reviewer thinks there is a possible conflict of interest and the objectivity of the review is affected, the reviewer can reject the review;

Conflicts of interest include:

- (1) The content of the manuscript is so close to the current research conducted by the reviewer that it is difficult to review it without disturbance;
- (2) The manuscript strongly supports or opposes anonymous reviewer's academic views, which makes the reviewer feel difficult or inconvenient to review it fairly;
- (3) The discussion in the manuscript involves the anonymous reviewer's reputation or economic interests.

3) Solutions used when reviewers cannot judge conflicts of interest

- (1) The reviewer does not review the manuscript and contacts the editorial office to explain the situation;
- (2) The reviewer contacts the editorial office to explain the possible conflicts of interest and takes the advice of the office;
- (3) The reviewer conducts the review normally, but the reviewer should attach a statement of a conflict of interest to the review comment, and it is up to the editorial office to decide whether to adopt the review comment.

3.2 Reviewers find manuscripts violate academic ethics

During the review, if a reviewer doubts that a manuscript violates academic ethics, especially plagiarism, the improper quotation from the work of others (inclusive of reviewers), ignorance of the quotation from the work of others (inclusive of reviewers) or redundant publications, the reviewer should report it to the editorial office. Depending on the seriousness of the misconduct, the editorial office should ask instructions from the executive deputy

editor-in-chief and the editor-in-chief on whether to make the author resubmit the manuscript after a revision or to retract the publication.

3.3 Solutions to problems occurred before or after publication

3.3.1 Before publication

Before publication, when improper peer review or academic misconduct is found, the editorial office convenes a meeting of the editorial board to evaluate the seriousness of the problem and to make a decision on the manuscript based on the result. Decisions are mainly publication after revision, conducting another peer review, and retracting the publication with an announcement released.

3.3.2 After publication

After publication, when improper peer review or academic misconduct is found, the editorial office convenes a meeting of the editorial board to evaluate the seriousness of the problem and to make a decision on the manuscript. Decisions mainly include: filing the problem-free record, releasing a corrigendum statement after revision, conducting an after-publication academic review, and retracting the publication, terminating the publication, and releasing an announcement.

Updated on August 1st, 2024