

## **PUBLICATION ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE STATEMENT**

### **GENERAL STATEMENT**

The Jordan Journal of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering (JJMIE) follows the highest standards of publication ethics and it takes all measures necessary to prevent publication misconduct. This statement is based on Committee on Publication Ethics' (COPE) Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.

Our editorial board does not accept any type of plagiarism. This means that works replicating another author's work without acknowledging him/her shall be automatically disqualified. All authors submitting their papers to JJMIE affirm that their papers are their own creations and have not been copied in whole or in part from other works.

The JJMIE hold no responsibility for plagiarism. If a published paper is found later to be extensively plagiarized and is found to be a duplicate or redundant publication, a note of retraction will be published, and copies of the correspondence will be sent to the authors' head of institute.

Each paper is reviewed anonymously by at least two independent reviewers to ensure the final high standard and quality of the journal. The Editor-in-Chief, Editorial Boards and the Reviewers are the body to ultimately decide which papers are publishable in JJMIE. Their decision is based on a number of factors: compliance with formal requirements, possession of permits to reprint/republish excerpts in the papers, relevance of the paper in terms of scientific research in Mechanical and Industrial sciences field, use of scientific procedures and methods, language quality etc.

Unpublished papers shall be returned to the author with a formal statement justifying the refusal. In the reviewing process, the reviewers help the author improve the paper to match the respective requirements, objectify the research findings etc. The papers received/reviewed by the reviewers are treated with confidentiality.

- **EDITORIAL POLICY**

The publication of an article in a peer reviewed journal is an essential model for our JJMIE. It is necessary to agree upon standards of expected ethical behavior for all parties involved in the Jordan Act of Publishing and Printing (No.38 year 2012): the author, the journal editorial, the peer reviewer and the publisher.

- **DUTIES OF EDITOR –IN-CHIEF AND EDITORIAL BOARD**

The editorial board of JJMIE is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The Editor-in Chief may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism.

The Editor-in-Chief and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in Editor-in-Chief's own research without the express

written consent of the author.

- **DUTIES OF AUTHORS**

Authors of reports of original research 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. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted.

An author should not in general publish articles describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. In general, an author should not submit for consideration in another journal a previously published paper. Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.

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. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors.

The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

The author intends not to use any copyrighted material for the publication or, if not possible, to indicate the copyright of the respective object.

The copyright for any material created by the author is reserved. Any duplication or use of objects such as images, diagrams, sounds or texts in other electronic or printed publications is not permitted without the author's agreement.

All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. Potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed at the earliest stage possible.

All manuscripts reporting the results of experimental investigation involving human subjects should include a statement confirming that each subject or subject's guardian obtains an informed consent, after the approval of the experimental protocol by a local human ethics committee or IRB. When reporting experiments on animals, authors should indicate whether the institutional and national guide for the care and use of laboratory animals was followed.

- **REVIEW PROCESS**

After preliminarily editors' evaluation, the articles which are considered suitable for possible publication will be transferred to the review stage. In this stage at least two referees will be invited to review the article submission. When their reports have been completed, the author will be informed of the editor's decision considering the papers' final acceptability for publication in the *JJMIE*.

Reviewers evaluate manuscripts using several criteria including: originality of the works, scholarly relevance, professional relevance, completeness of the works, acknowledgement of the works of others by references, organization of the manuscripts, and clarity in writing, tables, graphs and illustrations.

Decisions regarding publication of submitted manuscripts are based on the recommendations of members of the editorial review board. Reviewers' comments are made available to authors. Manuscripts submitted for possible publication will be judged primarily on their substantive content, but writing style, structure, and length are also considered see (**Instructions to Authors**).

- **DUTIES OF REVIEWERS**

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself/herself from the review process.

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.

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other

published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.