

Ethical obligations of editors

1. All published materials are carefully reviewed. The Editorial Board can reject or request modifications to the manuscript. The author is obliged to modify the manuscript according to remarks of reviewers or the Editorial Board.

2. The editor should ensure that each manuscript submitted for publication is reviewed without regard to race, religion, nationality, and position or affiliation of the author (authors). The editor may, however, take into account the relationship under consideration at the moment of the manuscript with other previously submitted work by the same authors.

3. The editor should review manuscripts submitted for publication as quickly as possible.

4. The editor is responsible for the acceptance or rejection of the manuscript. Responsible and balanced approach to the implementation of these responsibilities usually means that the editor takes into account the recommendation of the reviewer, who is the doctor of sciences of the corresponding scientific field of quality and authenticity of the manuscript submitted for publication. However, manuscripts may be rejected without review if the editor considers that they do not correspond to the journal profile.

5. The editor and editorial review board should not provide to others any information related to the content of the manuscript under consideration, except for those involved in professional assessment of the manuscript. After a positive decision of the editor a manuscript is published in the journal and posted to relevant electronic resources.

6. While it may be distributed via electronic networks of any journal articles or extract of them, the extension of this link to the source is obligatory. It is prohibited to publish and/or distribute the materials to the third parties or organizations in print and electronic media.

7. In accordance with international law regarding copyright on electronic information resources, website materials, e-journal or project may not be reproduced in full or in part, in any form (electronic or printed) without the prior written consent of the authors and the editorial office of the journal. Using published materials in the context of other documents, the link to the original source is necessary.

8. The editor should respect the intellectual independence of the authors.

9. Responsibilities and rights of the editor of any manuscript authored by an editor should be delegated to another qualified person.

10. Unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations disclosed in a submitted manuscript can be used by the editor in their own investigations only under consent of the author. If the manuscript is so closely related to current or past research of an editor, there may be a conflict of interests. Thus, the editor should ensure that any other qualified person has assumed the editorial responsibility for this manuscript.

11. If the editor is presented compelling evidence that the main content or conclusions of the work,



published in the journal, are erroneous, the editor should alert, the publication indicating the error and, if possible, correcting it. This message can be written by the person who discovered the error or by the independent author.

12. The author may wish that the editor does not use certain reviewers in review of a manuscript. The editor may decide to use one or more of these reviewers, if he feels that their opinions are important in the fair review of a manuscript. Such a decision can be made, for example, in the case when there are serious contradictions between this manuscript and the previous work of a potential reviewer.

Ethical obligations of authors

1. The basic duty of the author is to present a detailed report on the current study, as well as an objective discussion of its significance.

2. Authors of the manuscripts are fully responsible for the content of the articles and the facts included in their publication. The Editorial Board is not liable to the author and / or third parties and organizations for possible damage caused by the publication of the article. The editors can withdraw an already published manuscript if it becomes clear that the publication process has violated someone's rights or norms of scientific ethics. Upon withdrawal, the Editorial Board informs the author, who presented the manuscript, and the organization where the work was performed.

3. Journal space is a limited resource, so the author must use it wisely and sparingly.

4. The primary message of the results of the study should be sufficiently complete and contain all necessary references to sources of information available to the experts in this area so that they could repeat the work. If necessary, the author should make a reasonable effort to provide other researchers with samples of unusual materials that cannot be obtained any other way. This removes any potential copyright infringement and limits the application of these materials in order to protect the legitimate interests of the authors.

5. The author should cite those publications that have had a decisive impact on the content of the submitted work, as well as those that can quickly introduce the reader to the earlier work essential for understanding this study. With the exception of inspections, is necessary to minimize the citation of works that are not directly related to this post. The author is obliged to perform a literature search to find and cite the original publications that describe studies closely related to this manuscript. It is also necessary to specify properly the sources of important materials used in this work, if these materials have not been received by the author.

6. The manuscript should clearly identify any hazards and risks associated with the ongoing research.

7. It is necessary to avoid fragmentation of research reports. The scientist who performs an



extensive research of the system or group of related systems should organize a publication so that each message will report completely on every aspect of the overall study.

8. When preparing the manuscript for publication the author should inform the editor of related manuscripts, presented in print or accepted for publication. Copies of these manuscripts should be submitted to the editor and must be their connection with the manuscript submitted for publication.

9. The author should not submit manuscripts describing essentially the same results to more than one journal of primary publication, unless it is a re-submission, rejected by the journal or withdrawn by the author of the manuscript. It is permissible to submit a manuscript of a full article expanding on a previously published short preliminary report (message) on the same job. However, when submitting such manuscripts, the editor should be notified about the earlier message, and that prior notice must be cited in the manuscript.

10. The author must explicitly indicate the sources of all quoted or submitted information, except for common knowledge. Information obtained privately in conversation, in correspondence or in discussion with third parties, should not be used or reported in the author's work without clear permission of the researcher from whom the information was obtained. The information, obtained in the provision of confidential services, for example, while reviewing manuscripts or projects submitted for grants, should be treated the same way.

11. Experimental or theoretical study may sometimes serve as a basis for criticism of the work of another researcher. Published articles, as appropriate, may contain such criticism. Personal criticism, however, cannot be acceptable under any circumstances.

12. The co-authors of a manuscript should be all those who have made significant scientific contributions to the submitted work and who share responsibility for the obtained results. Other contributions should be marked in the notes or an "Acknowledgments" section. Administrative relations with the research as such are not a basis for qualification of the person concerned as a co-author (but in some cases it may be appropriate to note significant administrative assistance). Deceased persons who meet the above criteria should be included in the number of authors, and the note must indicate the date of their death. A participant or collaborator cannot be indicated by fictitious names. The author, representing the manuscript for publication, is responsible for ensuring that all those, and only those, individuals who meet the criteria of authorship have been included in the list of co-authors. In an article written by several authors, one of the authors who submits to the Editorial contact information and documents should maintain correspondence with editors and take responsibility for agreeing with other authors on its publication in the journal.

13. Authors should inform the editor on any potential conflict of interests, such as consulting or financial interests of any company that could influence the publication of the results contained in this manuscript. Authors should ensure that there is no contractual relations or considerations of ownership,



which could affect the publication of information contained in a submitted manuscript.

Ethical obligations of reviewers

1. Reviewing manuscripts is an essential step in the publication process and, thus, in the implementation of the scientific method as such, each scientist is obliged to perform a certain part of the work to peer review.

2. If the selected reviewer is not confident that his qualification corresponds to the level of research presented in the manuscript should reject it promptly.

3. The reviewers should objectively evaluate the quality of experimental information, theoretical information, interpretation, presentation, and reveal of high scientific and literary standards of the manuscript. The reviewer should respect the intellectual independence of authors.

4. The reviewer should consider the possibility of a conflict of interest in the case, when the reviewed manuscript closely relates to the current or published work of the reviewer. If there is any case of this, the reviewer should reject the manuscript without review and report a conflict of interest.

5. The reviewer should not evaluate a manuscript of an author or co-author with whom he has personal or professional connection, and if this relationship can affect the judgment about the manuscript.

6. The reviewer should treat a manuscript as a confidential document. It should not be shown to others or discussed with other colleagues except in special cases, when a reviewer needs special consultation.

7. Reviewers must adequately explain and argue their judgments so that editors and authors may understand the basis for their comments. Any statement, observation, conclusion or argument should be accompanied by appropriate references.

8. The reviewer should mark any cases of insufficient quoting by the authors from the works of other scientists relevant to this work. Note, that by not properly citing research, the reviewer may appear biased. The reviewer should inform the editor regarding any substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published articles or manuscript submitted concurrently to another journal.

9. The reviewer needs to provide timely feedback.

10. Reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, if there is no consent from the author. However, when the information indicates that some of the reviewer's own research may prove unsuccessful, the termination of this work by the reviewer does not contradict ethical standards.

