

Ethical Guidelines for Publication in *International Journal of Pest Management*

- **The ethical obligations of Editors of Scientific Journals**
 - Editors shall give unbiased consideration to all manuscripts, judging each on its merits without regard to the race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the Author(s).
 - Editors shall make best efforts to process manuscripts with speed and efficiency.
 - Editors shall take sole responsibility for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript. Although the Editor may seek guidance via peer review, she or he may reject a manuscript without review if considered inappropriate for the journal.
 - Editors shall make their best efforts to keep the peer-review process confidential.
 - Editors shall make their best efforts to avoid conflicts of interest.
 - If an Editor is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance of a published article is erroneous, the Editor must facilitate publication of an appropriate correction or in the extreme, withdraw the article.

- **The ethical obligations of Authors who publish in Scientific Journals**
 - Authors shall strive to present an accurate account of the research performed, and offer an objective discussion of its significance.
 - To the extent possible, the article shall contain sufficient detail about procedures to permit the author's peers to replicate the work.
 - Authors shall cite all relevant references.
 - Authors shall identify significant risks that arose in conducting the research.
 - Authors shall attempt to declare conflicts of interest.
 - Authors shall avoid fragmented or piecemeal publication (i.e., the separation of a single article into a series of articles that overlap substantially in content).
 - Authors must not submit the same or similar manuscripts to any other Journal or publication medium while they are under review with *International Journal of Pest Management*.
 - Although an experimental or theoretical study may sometimes justify criticism of the work of another scientist, personal criticism is inappropriate.
 - A "co-Author" is defined as any person who has made a significant scientific contribution to the work reported, and who shares responsibility and accountability for the results.

- **The ethical obligations of Reviewers of Scientific Journals**
 - Reviewers are expected to give unbiased consideration to all manuscripts, judging each on its merits without regard to the possible race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).
 - Reviewers shall make their best efforts to process manuscripts with reasonable speed and efficiency.
 - Reviewers shall judge the quality of the manuscript, its experimental and theoretical work, its interpretations, and its exposition as objectively as possible, with due regard to the maintenance of high scientific and literary standards..
 - Reviewers shall keep the manuscripts and the peer review process confidential.
 - Reviewers shall respect the proprietary rights of the Authors of manuscripts they review.
 - Reviewers shall inform Editors about conflicts of interest.
 - Reviewers should explain and support their judgments; any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported must be accompanied by the relevant citation, and unsupported assertions must be avoided.
 - Whilst the review of a manuscript may justify criticism, even severe criticism, under no circumstances is personal or malicious criticism of the author appropriate or acceptable.

Additional Ethical Guidelines and Laws: In addition, Editors, Authors and Reviewers are expected to conform to the ethical guidelines of their professional bodies and the laws of their country in relation to data protection and any other pertinent issues that the research and publication may create.