

Ethical standards for 22nd Australasian Fluid Mechanics Conference AFMC2020

Obligations of Editors

1. The primary responsibility of an editor is to ensure an efficient, fair and confidential review process of manuscripts submitted for publication, and to establish and maintain high standards of technical and professional quality. Criteria of quality are: originality of approach, concept and/or application; profundity; and relevance to the engineering profession.
2. An editor who authors or co-authors a manuscript submitted for consideration to the Theme with which that editor is affiliated, shall not review that work
3. Unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a submitted manuscript are confidential and shall not be used in the research of an editor or associate editor or otherwise disseminated except with the consent of the author and with appropriate attribution.
4. If an editor is presented with convincing evidence that a manuscript or published paper contains plagiarised material, incl. previously published work, or falsified research data, the editor shall forward such evidence to the Scientific Committee Chair, for investigation by the Scientific Committee of the Conference Organisation.

Obligations of Authors

1. An author's central obligation is to present a concise account of the novel research, work or project completed, together with an objective discussion of its significance and it should contain detail and reference to public sources of information sufficient to permit the author's peers to repeat the work or otherwise verify its accuracy.
2. The submitted manuscript shall not contain plagiarised material, incl. previously published work, or falsified research data.
3. Fragmentation of research papers shall be avoided.
4. Scholarly criticism of a published paper may sometimes be justified; however, personal criticism is never appropriate.
5. Only persons who have significantly contributed to the research or project and paper preparation shall be listed as co-authors. The corresponding author attests to the fact that any others named as co-authors have contributed significantly to the research, have seen the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication
6. Manuscripts with an obvious commercial intent will not be accepted.
7. In submitting a manuscript, the authors guarantee that at least one co-author shall register and present in person the paper incl. participate to the Live discussion of the presentation. If no co-author participates in the conference and presents the paper, the manuscript will be withdrawn from the proceedings.

Obligations of reviewers

1. A reviewer shall objectively judge the quality of a manuscript on its own merit and shall respect the intellectual independence of the author(s). Personal criticism is never appropriate
2. If a reviewer feels inadequately qualified or lacks the time to fairly judge the work reported, the reviewer shall return the manuscript promptly to the editor.
3. A reviewer shall avoid conflicts of interest and/or the appearance thereof. If a manuscript submitted for review presents a potential conflict of interest or the reviewer has a personal bias, the reviewer shall return the manuscript promptly without review, and advise the editor.
4. A reviewer shall treat a manuscript received for review as a confidential document and shall neither disclose or discuss it with others except, as necessary, to persons from whom specific advice may be sought; in that event, the identities of those consulted shall be disclosed to the editor.
5. Reviewers shall explain and support judgments adequately so that the editor and author(s) may understand the basis for their comments. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument has been previously reported shall be accompanied by the relevant citation.
6. A reviewer shall not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, except with the consent of the author and with appropriate attribution.

7. If a reviewer has convincing evidence that a manuscript contains plagiarised material, incl. previously published work, or falsified research data, the reviewer shall notify and send the evidence to the Editor who will forward this to the Chair of the Scientific Committee for further investigation.

