Publication ethics and publication malpractices statement

The publication ethics and policies for publishing in the 27th IAHR International Symposium on Ice are based on Elsevier privacy and policy (https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies/publishing-ethics). This proceeding seeks the attention of the editor and reviewers as well as authors to this instruction.

Editor’s responsibility

Publication decisions

The Editor has the full responsibility and control over the decision making for the submitted articles. The Editor considered the outline, questions and proposed solutions of the studies and identify the relations to the proceeding. The Editor may also contribute with the Reviewers for faultfinding and plagiarism. The Editor needs to clarify the reasons for exclusion of the articles in question, and the researchers needs to underwrite these decisions.

Peer review and fairplay

The Editor surveys the peer review process to be impartial, without prejudice and non-fraudulent, asking for two separate Reviewers to review each article. In case of any conflict in the decisions, further Reviewer or reviewers will be joining the reviewing process. The Editor verifies the peer review process to be based on merely their intellectual properties, regardless of gender, sex, citizenships, political and religious beliefs as well as orientation of the authors. The Editor should appraise transparent and a thoughtful as well as thorough peer review process, making sure the Reviewers are acknowledged by the peer review process. The editor verifies the peer review process in terms of enhance transparency, to function merely electronically through the proceeding website for entire correspondences between the Reviewers and the Authors.

Confidentiality

The Editor ensures to confidentiality of the submitted articles, and included ideas, as well as the related correspondences. In any circumstances of malfeasance, the Editor is excused for providing the Editors of other journals for further investigation. Editor guarantees to not misuse and exploit the submitted articles for own work, unless the Author has provided written agreement.

Conflict of interest

In case of arising any new conflict of Editor’s interest, the Editor provides declaration to the symposium scientific committee. The editor ensures to not involve in decision making on own or colleagues’ articles. The editor implements the Elsevier’s policy in case of conflict of interest to the Authors and Reviewers.

Safeguard of the published record

In case of any suspected misconduct, the Editor ensured to take measures by applying plagiarism and contacting the related authors to address the objection to the respective claim. The Editor may also
include contacting relevant research bodies and institutions, on condition of having true evidence of misconduct, the Editor arranges a correction to the publication.

**Reviewers’ responsibility**

**Contribute to Editor’s decisions**

Peer Reviewers are the cooperative in the Editor’s decision making and are considered as one of the key roles in the formal correspondences during the peer review process. In case of any lack of qualification in reviewing an article, the Reviewers are required to inform the Editor.

**Confidentiality**

Reviewers must keep the submitted articles and the author’s ideas as confidential. Reviewers must not start correspondences with Authors without the consent of the Editor. If the Editor encourages discussion between the Reviewers, must ensure the confidentiality. Reviewers must not take advantage of the submitted articles in own work, unless a written consent is provided from the Authors.

**Similarity considerations**

Reviewers are asked to consider potential similarities between the articles under their revision with the already published works to the extend of their knowledge.

**Objectivity and Conflict of interest**

Reviews should consult the Editor in case of any conflict of interest arises, due to cooperation, competition and other types of connection with the Authors of the articles or relative institutions. If Reviewers suggest citation for an article, it must bring mere scholar benefits to the article and not to the purpose of promoting the Reviewers or their associates’ work.

**Authors**

**Reporting standards**

The articles should be objective and provide enough data and in detail description of the work, providing opportunity for future studies to replicate the work. Intentionally providing any kind of false data or statement are not acceptable.

**Data access and record retention**

Authors are possible to be required to provide support data in the review process. Authors are needed to accept the open access policy of the proceeding, in case of Editorial decision on public access data related to the conference.

**Originality of the resources and citations**

The Authors need to use their original work and provide decent citations in case of using other Authors’ publications or works. If the Authors’ work is inspired by previous works or publications, it must be cited in their articles. Plagiarism by the Authors in any kind is prohibited.
Confidentiality
Information from confidential documents only is used in the case of written consent from the Authors or involved parties.

Authorship
Authorship must be limited to people who have made significant input to the article. Correspondence Author must make sure about the list of the Authors to include proper co Authors (who made input in the article), and the order of the list is approved by the Authors. Correspondence Author also needs to assure the Authors have read the final version of the article. Each Author is responsible for the questions related to the quality and integrity of the article are investigated and addressed.

Declaration of competing interest
Authors should make known any relationship (financial and personal) that can be considered as bias in their work. Authors should also make known any financial support for the study. Authors need to disclose any conflict of interest at an earlier stage.