

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

Editorial Definition

Publishing Title: **Proceedings of the Conference on Production Systems and Logistics**

ISSN: 2701-6277

Frequency of publication: Annual / every nine month, according to the schedule of the Conference (CPSL)

Editors:

Dr.-Ing. David Herberger (herberger@cpsl-conference.com)

M.Sc. Marco Hübner (huebner@cpsl-conference.com)

Conference Website: www.cpsl-conference.com

Publishing Partner:

publish-Ing.com in cooperation with Leibniz Information Centre for Science and Technology and University Library (TIB Hannover)

Editorial Office Address:

Institute for Production and Logistics Research GbR Herberger & Hübner

Senator-Burda-Straße 31a, 77654 Offenburg Germany

E-mail: info@cpsl-conference.com

USt-IdNr.: DE324911115

Copyright and Licence

Publication type: Open Access

All papers of the proceedings are made available to the public under the following Creative Commons license for an unlimited period of time:

Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Germany

Link to summary and binding version of the license text:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/de/>

Introduction

As a new aspiring conference journal, publication ethics and the prevention of malpractice in science are at the heart of our operation. We promote the best standards of publication ethics and take all possible measures against publication malpractice. We (IPLR GbR, represented by the editors David Herberger and Marco Hübner) take our responsibilities over all stages of publication very seriously and are aware of the importance of that. All parties involved in our publication process (editors, authors, reviewers and publishers) must agree on ethical standards of conduct. Therefore, the mutual agreement on the following principles of publication ethics form the foundation of publishing with the Conference on Production Systems and Logistics.

Our publication ethics and publication malpractice statement is based on the COPE Code of Conduct and Best-Practice Guidelines. More details can be found here:

<https://publicationethics.org/>

EDITORS' DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Publication decisions

The editors are responsible for deciding which of the submitted papers will be published. The editors will evaluate contributions without regard to race, nationality, gender, religious belief, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, or political belief. The Editors' decision to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based only on the paper's importance, originality and clarity, and the study's relevance to the aim of the journal. Applicable legal provisions relating to libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism should also be taken into account. This decision is based on the expert opinions provided by selected reviewers.

Confidentiality

The editors and all editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted contribution to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisors and the publisher. Editors will ensure that submitted material remains confidential during the review process.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted article may not be used by the publisher or members of the editorial board for their own research purposes without the explicit written consent of the author. Original content, information or ideas received by editors while editing the paper will be kept confidential and will not be used for their personal benefit. Editors will withdraw from editing papers where they have conflicts of interest due to competitive, collaborative, or other relationships with any of the authors, companies, or institutions associated with the papers; instead, they will ask another member of the editorial board to edit the paper or refrain from accepting the paper in the case of an unresolved conflict of interest.

Peer review process

All papers are subject to a peer review process by two reviewers who are expert in the field. The editor may reject a paper outright, either because it does not address the journal's topic or because it is obviously of such low quality that it cannot be considered for peer review. Articles that are suitable for review are then sent to experts in the field of the article. The reviewers are asked to rate the paper as publishable immediately, publishable with minor changes and improvements, or publishable with major changes and improvements (an additional review is necessary in this case). The reviewers may classify the paper as unpublishable only after a second review process, when the author has had the opportunity to implement the reviewers' comments from the first review. The reviewers' assessments always include an explicit recommendation on what should be done with the paper. After the review process the reviewers' comments are then forwarded to the author. Editors should be prepared to justify any important deviation from the procedure described. Editors should not reverse publication decisions unless serious problems are identified.

Involvement and cooperation in investigations and handling of unethical publishing

Editors in close coordination with the publisher (Leibniz Information Centre for Science and Technology and University Library (TIB Hannover)) will take responsive measures when ethical concerns are raised in regard to a submitted or published paper. Any reported case of unethical publishing behavior will be investigated, even if it is discovered years after publication. Editors follow the COPE [Flowcharts](#) when addressing cases of suspected misconduct. If the investigation reveals that the ethical concerns are substantiated, a correction, retraction, or statement of concern is published in the journal.

Archiving and access to the journal

By handing over the papers to our publishing partner the Leibniz Information Centre for Science and Technology and University Library (TIB Hannover), the editors ensure preservation of access to the journal content. The TIB Hannover is a renowned institution and is committed to the continuous availability and preservation of scientific research and ensures accessibility to the journal. This access is guaranteed independent of the availability of the CPSL website or any associated websites. The publications will continue to be available even if the CPSL would cease to exist.

REVIEWERS' DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Contribution to editorial decisions

The peer review process assists the editors in making decisions and can help the authors to improve their work through communication with the editor. Peer reviews are an essential part of formal scientific communication and are at the heart of the scientific method. In addition to report upon ethical issues and deviation from good scientific practice, reviewers are asked to treat authors and their work as they would like to be treated and to observe good peer review manners.

Promptness

Any selected reviewer who does not feel qualified to review a paper, or who is not in a position to review a paper or knows that a rapid review is not possible, should inform the editors so that a decision can be made on how to proceed.

Confidentiality

Any papers 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. Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted paper may not be used for the reviewers' own research without written permission of the original authors. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and may not be used for personal gain.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted paper may not be used for the reviewers' own research without the authors' written consent. Privileged information or ideas obtained through the review process must be kept confidential and must not be used for personal gain. Reviewers should not review papers in which they have conflicts of interest arising from competitive, collaborative or other relationships or affiliations with any of the authors, companies or institutions associated with the papers.

Standards of objectivity

Reviews must be conducted objectively. Personal criticism in any form is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. Reviewers must contact the editors before agreeing to review a paper in which they have potential conflicts of interest due to competitive, collaborative, or other relationships with any of the authors, companies, or institutions associated with the paper.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should point out cases where relevant published work referred to in the paper has not been cited in the reference section. They should point out whether observations or

arguments derived from other publications are cited with the relevant source. Reviewers inform the editors of any significant similarities or overlaps between the paper under review and another published work of which they have personal knowledge.

AUTHORS' DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Reporting standards

Contributors should provide an accurate description of the work done and an objective discussion of its significance. The underlying data should be presented accurately in the paper. A paper should include sufficient detail and references to allow others to reproduce the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate information constitutes unethical behaviour and is unacceptable. Authors alone are responsible for ensuring that the content of their article is truthful and scientifically appropriate. Articles should be accurate and objective.

Data access and retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data of their findings in conjunction with a paper for editorial review and should be prepared to provide public access to these data where practicable, and in any case should be prepared to retain these data for at least 10 years after publication (preferably via an institutional or subject-based data repository).

Originality, plagiarism and acknowledgement of sources

Authors agree to submit only entirely original works and to cite the work and/or words of others in an appropriate manner. Authors should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the submitted work. Plagiarism of any kind constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable. Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Information obtained privately, in conversations, correspondence or discussions with third parties may not be used or disclosed without the explicit written permission of the source. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, e.g. peer review of papers, may not be used without the explicit written permission of the author of the work included in those services.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

An author should generally not publish papers describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same paper to more than one journal without proper referencing constitutes unethical publishing behaviour. Submissions that have already been published elsewhere as copyrighted material may not be submitted. In addition, papers that are peer-reviewed by the journal should not be resubmitted to copyrighted publications. In general, an author should not submit an already published paper to another journal for review.

Copyright remains with the authors so that they can decide whether to republish their text. Nevertheless, the first publication must be cited in the second publication.

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 submitted paper. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. The corresponding author ensures that all contributing co-authors and no uninvolved persons are included in the list of authors and also ensures that all co-authors have agreed to the final version of the paper and consent to its submission for publication.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

All authors should disclose in their paper any financial or other material conflicts of interest that could be construed as influencing the results or interpretation of their paper. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. Potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed at the earliest possible stage. Readers should be informed about who funded the research and the role of the funders in the research.

Peer Review

All authors are required to participate and fully cooperate in the peer review process by promptly responding to editors' requests for raw data, clarifications and copyright permissions. In the event of an initial "revision required" decision, authors should respond systematically, item by item, and promptly to reviewers' comments, revise their manuscript, and resubmit it according to the submission timeline.

Fundamental errors in published works

If an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his or her own published work, it is his or her duty to notify the editor or publisher of the journal immediately and to cooperate in withdrawing the work or correcting it in the form of an erratum. If the editor or publisher learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error and informs the author thereof, the author is obliged to withdraw or correct the work immediately or to provide the editor with proof of the accuracy of the original work.