

CHELONIAN CONSERVATION AND BIOLOGY ETHICS POLICY

Researchers

The entire publishing process begins with the researchers. Researchers should seek to minimize any adverse effects of their research. In conducting research, they should comply with all applicable standards, rules, and laws enacted to protect researchers or study organisms. This includes obtaining Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) permits, collection permits, export and import permits, etc. Authors using human, animal or fetal tissue in their experiments should refer to their university/institution's policies on those subjects

General Journal Information

Chelonian Conservation and Biology is a biannual peer-reviewed journal of turtle and tortoise research, management, and conservation. The journal is international in scope, with submitting authors based on all continents except Antarctica.

Chelonian Conservation and Biology considers articles based on original research that covers any aspect of turtle and tortoise research, with a preference for conservation or biology. Manuscripts dealing with conservation biology, systematic relationships, chelonian diversity, geographical distribution, natural history, ecology, reproduction, morphology and natural variation, population status, husbandry, community conservation initiatives, and human exploitation or conservation management issues are of special interest.

1. Exceptions may be made for invited review articles or synthesis articles that provide an overview of a given area of research. Author(s) should propose the subject of a review article to the Executive Editor prior to submission.
2. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology* occasionally accepts Commentaries, but does not publish book reviews.

Both full-length original research articles and shorter notes and field reports are welcome. Notes should be no longer than 4000 words and full-length original articles no longer than 12,000 words. Authors seeking exceptions to these standards should contact the Executive Editor prior to submission.

FOR AUTHORS

All manuscripts shall be submitted for peer-review to the Executive Editor, who will assign them to a Handling Editor (either an Editor or Associate Editor as detailed in the inside front cover of a recent issue).

Use the following criteria to determine who should be included as an author. An author must have

1. Made an important contribution to the conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data in the study.
2. Drafted or revised the manuscript critically for intellectual content.
3. Approved the final version of the submitted manuscript.

People who meet all three criteria should be included as authors. Those who do not meet all three criteria should not be included as authors, but can be mentioned in the acknowledgments section of the manuscript.

In addition, each author should:

1. Take responsibility for at least one component of the work.
2. Have access to the raw data and figure files for his/her component of the work.
3. Be able to identify who is responsible for other components.
4. Be confident in their co-authors' ability and integrity.

One author, usually the corresponding author, must be thoroughly familiar with the original data for the entire study and be responsible for the integrity of the entire work. However, if the paper, or part of the paper, is found to be faulty or fraudulent, all co-authors share responsibility.

By submitting a manuscript for consideration for publication, the corresponding author acknowledges that all authors meet the qualifications listed above. The corresponding author understands that s/he acts on behalf of all the other authors.

Authors' names cannot be added or removed without their agreement. No author can be named on a manuscript unless s/he has approved the final version of the manuscript. Any disputes regarding the list of authors (additions, removals, or change in order) will be taken up with the host institution of the Corresponding Author.

Conflict of Interest

Any potential conflict of interest in connection with the submitted manuscript must be disclosed whether it is personal or financial. All funding sources supporting the work and all institutional or corporate affiliations must be disclosed in the manuscript. At the time of submission, authors of research articles are required to disclose to the editorial office any potential conflict of interest (e.g., consultancies, stock ownership, employer/employee relationships, patent-licensing arrangements or any other potential conflict). Authors who have commercial associations must state that they accept full responsibility for the conduct of the trial, had full access to all the data, and controlled the decision to publish. Such information, unless already disclosed in the submitted article, will be held in confidence while the paper is under review. If the article is accepted for publication, information on the potential conflict of interest must be noted by the author in the manuscript file in the Acknowledgments section of the paper.

Duplicate Publication, Plagiarism or Fraud

When submitting a paper, the corresponding author should disclose in the cover letter any related manuscripts that have been submitted or are in press with another journal.

Taking material from another's work and submitting it as one's own is plagiarism and is not permitted.

Taking material, including tables, figures, data, or extended text passages from the authors' own prior publications is considered duplicate publication or self-plagiarism and is not permitted.

Fabricating a report of research or suppressing or falsifying data to agree with one's conclusions is fraud. This includes altering figures in such a way as to obscure, move, remove or introduce information or features.

Presentation of Images

Technology and applications have made it easier to manipulate data. All images and figures submitted with a manuscript for peer review are evaluated based on the following guidelines.

1. Submitted images should only represent those originally-captured.
2. Authors should **not**:
 - Move, remove, introduce, obscure or enhance any specific feature within an image.
 - Adjust contrast, color balance or brightness unless applied to the entire figure.
 - Quantitatively compare samples from different gels/blots. If this is unavoidable, authors must state in the legend that all samples were derived at the same time and processed in parallel. If gels, blots, or fields are grouped or rearranged, then authors must insert spaces or dividing lines to indicate these changes and disclose the arrangement in the figure legend.

Repetition and Republication

Repetition of control experiments using animal models should not violate the U.S. Animal Welfare Act and Public Health Service Policy requirements, as well as standards in other countries, for use of the minimum number of animals needed to accomplish the science. Reuse of control data in animal studies may not be considered duplicate publication when the methodology and conditions are identical.

Republishing data to make a direct, illustrative comparison with new findings may be allowed when the purpose of republication is not simply to expand or reinforce a line of argument but to allow for an explicit comparison that would be much harder for the reader to make otherwise. The amount of reuse should represent a small fraction of the total information presented in the paper. The reused information would include appropriate citations of the earlier work.

Republication of data for purposes as stated above must be clearly identified as such at the time of submission, and must be accompanied by a detailed scientific justification in the manuscript as well as in the cover letter to the Executive Editor. The Executive Editor will make the final decision as to whether the reuse of data is scientifically appropriate.

If an author reuses images, tables or a significant amount of material from another author or previously published article, permission from the copyright holder is required at the time of submission.

Prior Publication

Material published by the author before submission in the following categories is considered prior publication:

1. Articles published in any publication, even online-only, and/or non-peer-reviewed publications.
2. Articles, book chapters and long abstracts containing original data in figures and tables, especially in proceedings publications as well as posters containing original data disseminated beyond meeting attendees.
3. Widely circulated, copyrighted or archival reports such as the technical reports of IBM or the institute reports of the US Army.

Master's theses and Doctoral dissertations that are made available in institutional repositories are not considered prior publication. Data portions of submitted papers that have appeared on a website will be permitted, with the proviso that the author informs the Executive Editor at the time of submission that such material exists so that the Executive Editor can determine the suitability of such material for

publication. Failure to do so will result in an automatic rejection of the manuscript. After the article is published in the journal, the data should be removed from the author's website.

Authors with concerns about possible prior publication that do not fall clearly into one of these categories should contact the Executive Editor and forward the material for examination.

Authors submitting manuscripts to preprint servers must be sure to retain the copyright to their work, which can then be transferred to the publisher when a later version of the work is accepted at the *Chelonian Conservation and Biology*.

FOR EDITORS AND REVIEWERS

Handling Editors and reviewers should not make decisions on papers for which they may have a potential conflict of interest, personal or financial. Reviewers who are collaborating with the author, or who are working on similar research, should decline to review a paper for which they have a conflict. A Handling Editor should have the Executive Editor, another Editor or Associate Editor make a decision on a paper for which s/he has a conflict.

When anyone from the *CCB* editorial team submits a paper to *CCB*, the paper will be automatically assigned to a different *CCB* Editor that has no conflict of interest, who will handle all aspects of the peer review of the paper. The *CCB* editorial team member acting as an author will have the same access to his/her manuscript during the peer review process as any other author.

Editors and reviewers will treat manuscripts under review as confidential, recognizing them as the intellectual property of the author(s).

Reviewers may not purposefully delay publication of another person's manuscript to gain advantage over that person.

Reviewers have a responsibility to report suspected duplicate publication, fraud, plagiarism, or concerns about animal or human experimentation to the Handling Editor. A reviewer may recognize and report that s/he is reviewing, or has recently reviewed, a similar or identical paper from another journal by the same or different author(s).

When the suggestion of plagiarism, fraud, etc. is brought to the Handling Editor's attention, the Handling Editor will relay this information to the Executive Editor, who will investigate. If the misconduct is confirmed, the Handling Editor will reject the paper and write a letter/email to the author explaining why the paper was not suitable for publication.

Misconduct Discovered in a Published Article

The Executive Editor will investigate the allegation. If it appears there has been professional misconduct, the Executive Editor or Handling Editor will notify the corresponding author, asking for an explanation in a nonjudgmental manner.

If the author's explanation is unacceptable and it seems that serious unethical conduct has taken place, the Executive Editor will contact the corresponding author's host institution as appropriate, and consult with the person/people designated as being responsible for oversight of academic integrity.

After deliberation, the appropriate person/people will determine what action should be taken:

1. A Host Institution representative may be authorized to send the author a letter of reprimand and remind the author of the Institution's publication policies. The author may be required to publish an apology in the journal to correct the record.
2. If the infraction is severe enough, the offending author's institution will be asked to investigate.
3. If, through the author's actions, the Institution has violated the copyright of another journal, the appropriate Institution representative will be asked to write a letter of apology to the other journal.
4. In cases of serious misconduct, *Chelonian Conservation and Biology* will ban the author(s) from future submissions to and/or serving as a reviewer for the journal.
5. In the most serious cases of fraud, *Chelonian Conservation and Biology* may decide to retract the article. If that occurs, a retraction notice will be published in the journal and will be linked to the article in the online version. The online version will also be marked "retracted" with the retraction date.

SOURCES

This policy document is adapted from several sources, including:

1. 65_ FR 76260-76264: Fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research or reporting research results:
http://www.dol.gov/_sec/regs/fedreg/notices/2003023248.htm
2. American Physiological Society Ethics Policy: <http://www.the-aps.org/mm/Publications/Info-For-Authors/Ethical-Policies>
3. Authorship and Contributorship section of the International Conference for Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) uniform Requirements for Manuscripts:
<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/>
4. COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics): <http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines>
5. Council of Science Editors:
<http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3331>
6. Ecological Society of America: http://www.esa.org/esa/?page_id=857
7. IOS Press: <http://www.iospress.nl/service/authors/ethics-policy/>
8. *Journal of Cell Biology*: <http://jcb.rupress.org/site/misc/ifora.xhtml>
9. *Nature*: <http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/bioethics.html>
10. The Office of Research Integrity: <http://ori.dhhs.gov/>
11. Retraction Watch: <http://retractionwatch.wordpress.com/>
12. Society for Neuroscience: <http://www.sfn.org/Member-Center/Professional-Conduct/SfN-Ethics-Policy>
13. Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles: <http://www.ssarherps.org/pages/ethics.php>
14. US Federal Policy on Research Misconduct
<http://www.aps.org/policy/statements/federalpolicy.cfm>
15. Wiley-Blackwell: <http://www.jp.blackwellpublishing.com/bw/publicationethics/>
16. World Association of Medical Editors: <http://www.wame.org/resources/ethics-resources/publication-ethics-policies-for-medical-journals/>