

# Statement of Publication Ethics and Malpractice

## EuroMed Academy of Business (EMAB) Conference Book of Proceedings

### 1. Background

The Annual Conference of the EuroMed Academy of Business aims to provide a unique international forum to facilitate the exchange of cutting-edge information through multidisciplinary presentations on examining and building new theory and business models for success through management innovation. The conference attracts hundreds of leading scholars from leading universities and principal executives and politicians from all over the world, every year.

The conference has established itself as **one of the major conferences of its kind in the European-Mediterranean (EuroMed) region**, in terms of size, quality of content, and standing of attendees. Many of the papers presented contribute significantly to the business knowledge base and practice. Its Book of Proceedings is highly recognized and approved for inclusion in the Conference Proceedings Citation Index (Thompson Reuters), as well as indexed by the Web of Science. Many manuscripts that are published in the conference book of proceedings are instrumental in producing successful international research grant applications and teaching programs, and are frequently precursors of high ranking journal publications.

In pursuant of academic excellence, novelty in theoretical and practical contribution of the manuscripts that are published in the conference book of proceedings and academic rigor are antecedents of the conference's current reputation. In order to sustain and strengthen this reputation, the "Statement of Publication Ethics and Malpractice" of the conference book of proceedings is instrumental in ensuring that the publication process maintains its high standards, in terms of the quality of the manuscripts and all relevant ethical matters.

### 2. Commitments of the Conference Track Chairs and any other Associated Editorial Board Members

#### *Approach and Professionalism*

The role of Track Chairs is central to maintaining the high status and quality of the conference proceedings. Track Chairs propose Reviewers for the submissions to their track and coordinate the review process with a view for it to progress as smoothly as possible, so that the acceptance/rejection decisions are announced to authors not later than the predetermined deadline. At the same time, Track Chairs have an additional responsibility in monitoring and assuring the quality of feedback provided to authors by the reviewers, which in turn improves the quality of the manuscript. The EMAB conference pursues quality not only in end results, but in the process as well; and Performing track chair duties with due to professionalism adds value not only to the conference, but to the academic profession as a whole.

Track Chairs make sure that it is clear to the reviewers that submitted manuscripts should be assessed objectively, fairly, professionally, open-mindedly and on time, and that authors deserve to be treated with respect, regardless of their work evaluation. Track Chairs assure that the reviewers provide comments pointing out strengths of the papers under review. Expressions

like: “*the topic is very interesting*” and/or “*the paper has good potential*”, and/or “*the paper suggests important contribution to the field*”, or “*good theory development*” etc. are encouraged. In addition, they should point out aspects to be improved with several suggestions in this respect.

### *The Process*

Track Chairs select appropriate Reviewers and get confirmation from them that they accept to perform reviews according to the EMAB guidelines. Once this is done, reviewers’ names, affiliations, contact details and expertise are sent to the Conference Secretariat.

Once the Conference Secretariat receives the reviewers’ details, an email is sent to the proposed Reviewers with specific guidelines, copying the Track Chairs in this communication.

Authors are requested to submit their manuscripts online. They are expected to submit the authors’ title page and actual paper as two separate attachments so that the anonymity of the review process is safeguarded. Following submission, the review process coordinator forwards the manuscripts to the Track Chairs for processing. The identity of the authors is undisclosed so that a blind review is ensured.

As soon as the manuscripts are received, the Track Chairs make sure that they are forwarded for evaluation to at least two Reviewers; the most appropriate in terms of expertise relevance. It is imperative that together with the manuscript under evaluation, reviewers receive the appropriate manuscript assessment review form (specific assessment forms for extended abstracts and full papers), as well as the “guidelines to reviewers”.

Reviewers understand that the quality of the book of proceedings, the image of the conference and the reputation of the EuroMed Academy of Business, to a large extent, rest upon the quality of their reviews. One of the greatest services of Reviewers is contributing to the quality advancement of submitted work. Track Chairs assure that submitted manuscripts are objectively, fairly and professionally assessed and reviewers’ personal biases in their comments and judgments are avoided.

The deadline for review report submission is clearly indicated to reviewers (not more than three weeks from receiving the manuscript) and the process is closely monitored.

As soon as all review reports for a manuscript are received, Track Chairs are expected to:

- (a) check that reviewers provide constructive and helpful comments and feedback;
- (b) revert back to reviewers that did not provide valuable comments as indicated earlier, asking them to enhance and/or improve on their evaluation;
- (c) once satisfied with the review, to email the reviewers with a link to upload the Review forms;
- (d) forward back to the review process coordinator good quality reviews, and all related documents (manuscript and review reports), together with their own acceptance/rejection recommendation;
- (e) inform the review process coordinator if they notice any issue related to copyright, plagiarism and libel;

- (f) provide their own recommendation based on the feedback provided and the manuscripts' originality, significance, coherence, clarity, validity and relevance to the conference's aim and scope.

The Track Chairs, the Review Process Coordinator and the Conference Secretariat ensure the confidentiality of the contents of all manuscripts to avoid any issue that might origin any conflict of interest.

### **3. Commitments of the Reviewers**

#### *Approach and Professionalism*

The quality of the conference and the reputation of the EuroMed Academy of Business, to a large extent, rest upon the review process. Reviewing for the conference proceedings is a solemn activity that significantly contributes to the quality advancement of the submitted manuscripts.

All submitted manuscripts are objectively, fairly and professionally assessed, and reviewers' personal biases in their comments and judgments are avoided. Specifically, the Reviewers should ensure that:

- (a) authors deserve to be treated with respect, regardless of the evaluation of their work.
- (b) comments are as constructive as possible and highlight the way in which manuscripts can be improved and developed further;
- (c) manuscripts' weaknesses are identified but it is also important for authors that the strengths of their manuscripts are acknowledged;
- (d) recommendations are unbiased and manuscripts should be judged on the grounds of scientific rigor and how well they stimulate thinking and discussion;
- (e) comments empathize with authors whose native language is not English and encourage authors to seek professional editing assistance for proof reading the manuscript;
- (f) comments should be based on the theoretical development of a submission, the technical correctness of the methodology, the overall value added of the research and theoretical and practical contributions.

#### *The Process*

The following issues are important in reviewing a manuscript for the EuroMed Academy of Business Conference Book of Proceedings:

- (a) timeliness is of utmost importance and reviewers must submit their review within a maximum of three weeks;
- (b) the Reviewers revert a structured review by separating and numbering comments. Where appropriate, Reviewers cite specific page numbers, tables, and figures in their review from the manuscript, in order to highlight any specific issue;
- (c) the Reviewers ensure that the norms, values and integrity of the "double-blind" peer review process are upheld, during and after the review process.

For all manuscripts that the reviewers will evaluate, they will consider the following issues, as more specific criteria for structuring their evaluations:

- (a) aim, objectives and hypotheses of the study;
- (b) conceptual/theoretical development;
- (c) literature review and any perceived gap or problem;
- (d) methodological rigor;
- (e) empirical evidence;
- (f) analysis of results;
- (g) discussion and synthesis of results;
- (h) correlation between the aim/objectives/hypotheses, literature, methodology, results and recommendations;
- (i) contribution to the field of study (theory and practice);
- (j) logical organization and readability;
- (k) linkages between the proposed paper title, abstract, objectives and the paper content.

In general, the Reviewers:

- (a) contribute to the editorial decision for their assigned manuscripts, based on their field-specific expertise;
- (b) immediately inform the respective track chair if the assigned manuscript is not related to their specific field of research or if they are not able to conduct the review at any particular time;
- (c) avoid any personal criticism, in order to ensure the review comments are provided following to the specific objective(s), and provided to the manuscript, but not to the author(s);
- (d) maintain the confidentiality of all assigned manuscripts and they will not disclose the contents of the manuscripts to any third party;
- (e) ensure that all arguments, observations and discussions in the assigned manuscripts appropriately cite the source of information/relevant references;
- (f) notify the respective track chair, if the reviewers acknowledge any plagiarism and/or any copyright issue;
- (g) make sure that the EMAB manuscript guidelines are followed.

#### **4. Commitments of the Authors**

##### *Author responsibilities*

The submitting/corresponding Author should communicate with all listed co-authors and ensure, prior to submission that:

- (a) any person who is listed as an author should have significantly contributed to the development of the manuscript;
- (b) all co-authors have accepted the final version of the manuscript and provide their permission to the submitting author to submit the paper for evaluation to the conference;
- (c) the source of all arguments, discussions, data and any other content of the manuscript that are not produced by the authors should appropriately be cited in the in-text reference, as well as in the list of reference.
- (d) no inaccurate and misleading information, data, observation, statement is provided;
- (e) submitting the same manuscript simultaneously to two or more publication venues, such as journal, book, conference proceedings is not accepted;

- (f) already published manuscripts, in any form, cannot be submitted;
- (g) authors need to disclose any existing and potential conflicts of interests, related to their manuscripts;
- (h) any source of research funding, financial and any form of support in the development of the manuscript and its underlying study should be acknowledged;
- (i) any inaccuracy, error or any other issue related to their published work, that occurred at a later stage, should immediately be communicated to the respective track chair and the publisher, in order to rectify the issue;
- (j) accessibility to raw data of the study can be provided upon request for at least seven years after publication;
- (k) no third party materials are included in their manuscript, unless the permission and/or copyright issues are explicitly cleared and supplied to the publisher.

### **Acknowledgement**

In developing this statement, the following documents were consulted:

- the EuroMed Academy of Business Guidelines for Track Chairs;
- the EuroMed Academy of Business Guidelines to Reviewers;
- the Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement of the PsychOpen;
- the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)' Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines For Journal Editors ([http://publicationethics.org/files/Code\\_of\\_conduct\\_for\\_journal\\_editors\\_Mar11.pdf](http://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf)).