

SNAME Journals Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

SNAME Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement follows the recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Code of Conduct and Best-Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors ([Committee on Publication Ethics, 2011](#) as retrieved on November 15, 2020). All involved in the act of publishing of the Journal of Sailing Technology (JST), the Journal of Ship Production and Design (JSPD), or the Journal of Ship Research (JSR) are required to agree upon standards of expected ethical behaviour.

The statement has been checked against updated guidelines from COPE, in particular [Ethics toolkit for a successful editorial office](#) (2022, retrieved July 9, 2023) and [Guidelines for managing the relationships between society owned journals, their society, and publishers](#) (2018, retrieved Jul 9, 2023).

1. Editors' Responsibilities

1.1 Publication Decisions

Editors will ensure that all submitted manuscripts being considered for publication undergo peer-review by at least two (2) single anonymized reviewers who are experts in the field, with due regard for their publication record, research and industry experience. Authors may suggest reviewers, however, the Editors make an independent decision on reviewers based on expertise in the field. At completion of the review process, reviewers may elect to be named to authors. Regardless of the information used to select reviewers, all reviewers must consider actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interests. Reviews are not published with the article.

Editors are responsible for deciding which of the manuscripts submitted to the journals will be published. Editors will evaluate manuscripts without regard to the race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s). The decision to publish will be based on the validity of the reported study, its relevance to the journal's scope, and the importance, originality and rigour of the paper. Editors may confer with other members of the Editorial Board or reviewers in making this decision. Editors may go back to reviewers multiple times with revisions made by authors providing the reviewer agrees to this and it is required to check the validity of the revision. Current legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism will be considered. Decisions to edit and publish are not determined by the policies of governments or any other agencies outside of the journals itself. Editors have full authority over the entire Editorial content of the journal and the timing of publication of that content.

1.2 Confidentiality

Editors and Editorial staff will not disclose information regarding a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, the reviewers and/or potential reviewers, other Editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

1.3 Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a paper submitted to the journal will not be used by Editors or

members of the Editorial Board for their own research purposes without the explicit written consent of the author(s). Privileged information or ideas obtained by Editors as a result of handling the manuscript will be kept confidential and not used for their personal advantage. Editors will recuse themselves from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships/connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions connected to the papers; instead, they will ask another member of the Editorial Board to handle the manuscript.

1.4 Involvement and Cooperation in Investigations

Editors will take responsive measures when ethical concerns are raised with regard to a submitted manuscript or published paper. Every reported act of unethical publishing behavior will be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication. Journal of Sailing Technology, Journal of Ship Research and Journal of Ship Design and Production Editors follow the COPE Flowcharts (see [Flowcharts | COPE: Committee on Publication Ethics](#) , retrieved July 9 2023) when dealing with cases of suspected misconduct. If, on investigation, the ethical concern is well-founded, a correction, retraction, expression of concern or other note as may be relevant will be published in the Journal.

1.5 Paper correction and retraction

In the event that papers require corrections or retraction, the lead author will be contacted, requesting change within a time of 60 days. The corrected paper will be reviewed by new reviewers. **A section** in the corrected paper will detail the corrections.

1.6 System of complaints

In the event of disagreement, reviewers and authors are able to communicate directly with the chief editor during the review process by return email. Readers, reviewers and authors are able to communicate directly with the governing professional society SNAME through <https://www.sname.org/contactus>.

2. Reviewers' Responsibilities

2.1 Contribution to Editorial Decisions

The peer-reviewing process is designed to assist Editors and Editorial Boards in making Editorial decisions, and may also assist the author(s) in improving the paper. Peer-review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication and lies at the heart of scientific endeavor. The Journal of Sailing Technology, Journal of Ship Research and Journal of Ship Design and Production share the view of many that all scholars who wish to contribute to the scientific process have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

Further guidance to reviewers is provided once the review task has been accepted. Reviewers are able to communicate directly with the editorial team to discuss aspects such as research or publication misconduct. This forms part of the routine check for plagiarism or malpractice. In the event of

suspicion, a full investigation will be undertaken.

2.2 Promptness

Expected time for review will be made clear upon first acceptances of the review task. Any selected reviewer, who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible, should notify the Editors and withdraw from the review process immediately so that alternative reviewers can be contacted swiftly.

2.3 Confidentiality

All manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. The manuscripts and their contents must not be disclosed to or discussed with others except where explicitly authorized by the Journal Editor (who would only do so under exceptional and specific circumstances). This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

2.4 Standards of Objectivity

Reviews must be conducted in an objective manner. Reviewer should express their views clearly and present supporting arguments so that authors may use them for improving the manuscript. Personal criticisms of the author(s) are always inappropriate and unacceptable.

2.5 Acknowledgement of Sources

Reviewers should identify cases in which relevant published work referred to in the paper has not been appropriately cited in the reference section. Any statement that is an observation, derivation or argument that has been reported in previous publications should be accompanied by the relevant citation. Reviewers must notify the Editors of any substantial similarities or overlaps between the manuscript under review and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

2.6 Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

Any invited reviewer, who has conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions connected to the manuscript and the work described therein, should immediately notify the Editors to declare their conflicts of interest and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in reviewers' own research without the express written consent of the authors. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for the reviewers' personal advantage. This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

3. Duties of Authors

3.1 Reporting Standards

Authors of original research reports 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. Review articles should be accurate, objective and comprehensive, while Editorial 'opinion' or perspective pieces should be clearly identified as such. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

3.2 Data Access and Retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data of their study together with the paper for editorial review and should be prepared to make the data publicly available if practicable. In any event, authors should ensure accessibility of such data to other competent professionals for at least ten years after publication (preferably via an institutional or subject-based data repository or other data center), provided that the confidentiality of the participants can be protected and legal rights concerning proprietary data do not preclude their release.

3.3 Originality, Plagiarism and Acknowledgement of Sources

Authors will submit only entirely original works, and will appropriately cite or quote the work and/or words of others. An author agreement from each author will be signed and collected at the time of submission explaining copyright and a statement of originality from the lead author. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work should also be cited. Plagiarism takes many forms, from "passing off" another's paper as the author's own, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), to claiming results from research conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. The content produced by AI platforms does not represent original author generated work.

3.4 Multiple, Redundant or Concurrent Publication

In general, papers describing essentially the same research should not be published in more than one journal. Submitting the same paper to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Manuscripts which have been published as copyrighted material elsewhere cannot be submitted. In addition, manuscripts under review should not be resubmitted to copyrighted publications. In the event it is detected that a paper has been submitted to more than one journal, all versions/copies of that paper will be removed from consideration.

3.5 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. All persons, who made substantial contributions to the work reported in the manuscript (such as technical help, writing and editing assistance, general support) but who do not meet the criteria for authorship, must not be listed as an author, but should be acknowledged in the "Acknowledgements" section.

The corresponding author ensures that all contributing co-authors and no uninvolved persons are

included in the author list. The corresponding author will also verify that all co-authors have approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication. Guidelines on handling authorship disputes for authors can be found at [How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers](#), 2003 (retrieved July 9, 2023)

3.6 Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

All authors should include a statement disclosing any financial or other substantive conflicts of interest that may be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed (including the grant number or other reference number if any). This information must be provided at the time of submission either in an introductory letter and/or as part of the paper.

3.7 Acknowledgement of Sources

Authors should ensure that they have properly acknowledged the work of others, and should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately (from conversation, correspondence or discussion with third parties) must not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source. Authors should not use information obtained in the course of providing confidential services, such as reviewing manuscripts or grant applications, unless they have obtained the explicit written permission of the author(s) of the work involved in these services.

3.8 Peer-review

Authors are obliged to participate in the peer-review process and cooperate fully by responding promptly to Editors' requests for raw data, clarifications, and proof of ethics approval, patient consents and copyright permissions. In the case of a first decision of "revisions necessary", authors should respond to the reviewers' comments systematically, point by point, and in a timely manner, revising and re-submitting their manuscript to the Journal by the deadline given. In the case of a rejection, full copyright will revert to the original owner.

3.9 Fundamental Errors in Published Works

When authors discover a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, it is the authors' obligation to promptly notify the Editors or publisher and to cooperate with the Editors to retract or correct the paper in form of an erratum.

3.10 Copyright and license arrangements

Copyright transfer will be set as per the Author Agreement signed by all contributing authors prior to publication.