

NAFE Operating Procedure (OP) No. 14C

NAFE Journal: Responsibilities of, Obligations of and Guidelines for Authors, the Journal Editor, Technical Review Committee Chair, and Technical Reviewers

A. Responsibilities of, Obligations of and Guidelines for Authors

1. An author's central obligation is to present a concise and accurate account of the investigation or analysis elements at issue as well as an objective discussion of the author's opinions and findings. Authors should recognize that publication of their paper in the NAFE Journal will invite critique by adverse parties. Authors must avoid professional conflicts of interest; such conflicts of interest include (but are not limited to) revealing details of settlements, or revealing enough details of a case that the identity of individual persons could be reasonably deduced.
2. Any unusual or potentially hidden hazards inherent in the analysis used in an investigation should be identified in a paper reporting the work.
3. In submitting a manuscript for publication, an author should inform the Journal Editor of related manuscripts or papers that the author has under editorial consideration or in press. Copies of those documents should be supplied to the Journal Editor, and the relationships of such documents to the one submitted should be indicated.
4. It is improper for an author to submit manuscripts describing essentially the same investigation to more than one journal, unless it is a resubmission of a manuscript or paper rejected for or withdrawn from publication. It is generally permissible to submit a manuscript for a full paper expanding on a previously published brief preliminary account (a "communication" or "letter") of the same work. However, at the time of submission, the Journal Editor should be made aware of the earlier communication, and the preliminary communication should be cited in the manuscript.
5. An author should identify the source of all information quoted or offered, except that which is common knowledge. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, should not be used or reported in the author's work without explicit permission from those parties with whom the information originated. Information obtained in the course of confidential services should be treated similarly.
6. An investigation may sometimes involve criticism of the work of another investigator. When appropriate, such criticism may be offered in a proposed paper. However, in no case is personal criticism considered to be appropriate.

7. The co-authors of a paper should be those persons who have made significant technical contributions to the work reported and who share responsibility and accountability for the results. Authors should appropriately recognize the contributions of technical staff and data professionals. Other contributions should be indicated in a footnote or an “Acknowledgments” section. An administrative relationship to the investigation does not of itself qualify a person for co-authorship (but occasionally it may be appropriate to acknowledge major administrative assistance). Deceased persons who meet the criterion for inclusion as co-authors should be so included, with a footnote reporting date of death. No fictitious name should be listed as an author or coauthor. The author who submits a manuscript for publication accepts the responsibility of having included as co-authors all persons appropriate and none inappropriate. The submitting author should have sent each living co-author a draft copy of the manuscript and have obtained the co-author’s assent to co-authorship of it.

8. The corresponding author must reveal to the Journal Editor, Technical Reviewers and to the readers of the Journal any potential and/or relevant competing financial or other interest (of all authors) that might be affected by publication of the authors’ paper – apart from the benefits that may result from the article’s recognition by the technical community. Conflicts of interest must be clearly stated at the time of manuscript submission and will be included in the published paper. In addition, all authors must declare any employment or other relationship (within the past three years) with entities that have a financial or other interest in the results of the paper (to include paid consulting, expert testimony, honoraria, and membership of advisory boards or committees of the entity). The corresponding author must advise the Journal Editor at the time of submission either that there is no conflict of interest to declare, or should disclose potential conflicts of interest that will be acknowledged in the published article.

9. Plagiarism is not acceptable in NAFE Journals. NAFE Journals adhere to the U.S. National Science Foundation definition of plagiarism as “the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit” (45 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 689.1). Authors shall not engage in plagiarism - verbatim or near-verbatim copying, or very close paraphrasing, of text or results from another’s work. Authors shall not engage in self-plagiarism (also known as duplicate publication) - unacceptably close replication of the author’s own previously published text or results without acknowledgement of the source. NAFE applies a “reasonable person” standard when deciding whether a submission constitutes self-plagiarism/duplicate publication. Material quoted verbatim from the author’s previously published work must be placed in quotation marks. In contrast, it is unacceptable for an author to include significant verbatim or near-verbatim portions of his/her own work, or to depict his/her previously published results or methodology as new, without acknowledging the source. (Modeled with permission from Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics: Authorial Integrity in Scientific Publication)

10. Upon acceptance of an abstract, Authors agree to work with the Journal Editor, Technical Review Committee Chair, and Technical Reviewers (as necessary) while the Author creates the draft manuscript, presentation, completed manuscript, and final paper. The identity of each Technical Reviewer of a manuscript shall not be disclosed to the other Technical Reviewers of that manuscript; each review shall be independent.

11. Images should be free from misleading manipulation.

B. Responsibilities of, Obligations of and Guidelines for the NAFE Journal Editor

1. The Journal Editor shall ensure that unbiased consideration is given to all author submittals offered for publication, judging each on its merits without regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s). The Journal Editor may, however, take into account subjects of a manuscript immediately under consideration in relationship to others subjects previously or concurrently offered by the same author(s).

2. The Journal Editor shall not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than those from whom professional advice is sought. However, a Journal Editor who solicits or otherwise arranges beforehand the submission of manuscripts may need to disclose to a prospective author the fact that a relevant manuscript by another author has been received or is in preparation. The NAFE Board of Directors (BOD) may request information from the Journal Editor about the identity of Technical Reviewers for in-process Journals, but such information shall remain confidential within the BOD. Any communications with Technical Reviewers by BOD members shall be through arrangement with the President. The identity of each Technical Reviewer of a manuscript should not be disclosed to the other Technical Reviewers of that manuscript; each review should be independent. All record of the identity of a manuscript's Technical Reviewers shall be destroyed upon publication of the final paper. The Journal Editor may disclose titles and authors names for papers that have completed technical review and are in the process of publication, but no more than that unless the author's permission has been obtained.

3. If a Journal Editor is presented with evidence that the main substance or conclusions of a published paper are erroneous, the Journal Editor should facilitate the Technical Review Committee Chair's evaluation of the need for publication of an appropriate commentary pointing out the error and, if possible, correcting it. The report may be written by the person who discovered the error or by an original author.

4. The Journal Editor is to consider an author's request to not use certain Technical Reviewers. However, the Journal Editor may decide to use one or more of these Technical Reviewers, if the Journal Editor feels their opinions are important in the fair consideration of a manuscript. In such a situation, the Journal Editor shall confirm that the Technical Reviewer does not have a

conflict of interest with the manuscript or its author and can perform their task in a fair and professional manner.

C. Responsibilities of, Obligations of and Guidelines for the Technical Review Committee Chair

1. The Technical Review Committee Chair shall ensure that unbiased consideration is given to all author submittals offered for publication, judging each on its merits without regard to the race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).
2. The responsibility for reviewing, acceptance or rejection of an abstract rests with the Technical Review Committee Chair, in conjunction with the input of selected Technical Reviewers, if so delegated.
3. The responsibility for reviewing, acceptance or rejection of a manuscript (based on an approved abstract) rests with the Technical Review Committee Chair, in conjunction with the input of the selected Technical Reviewers. Responsible and prudent exercise of this duty normally requires that the Technical Review Committee Chair recommends (to the Journal Editor) multiple Technical Reviewers, chosen for their expertise and good judgment, as to the quality and reliability of manuscripts submitted for publication. However, manuscripts may be rejected without external review if considered by the Technical Review Committee Chair to be inappropriate for presentation or the Journal. The rationale(s) for rejection shall be provided to the author(s) through the Journal Editor. If so requested by the Technical Review Committee Chair, the NAFE President may approve the use of a single Technical Reviewer for individual manuscripts; otherwise, a minimum of two Technical Reviewers shall be used for each manuscript.

D. Responsibilities of, Obligations of and Guidelines for Technical Reviewers

1. A chosen Technical Reviewer who feels inadequately qualified to judge the analysis reported in a manuscript shall return it promptly to the Technical Review Committee Chair. Should a Technical Reviewer receive a manuscript at a time when circumstances preclude prompt attention to it, the unreviewed manuscript should be returned in a timely manner to the Technical Review Committee Chair.
2. A Technical Reviewer of a manuscript should judge objectively the quality of the complete manuscript and supporting information, with due regard to the maintenance of high engineering and literary standards.
3. A Technical Reviewer should not evaluate a manuscript authored or co-authored by a person with whom the Technical Reviewer has a personal or professional connection if the relationship would bias judgment.

4. A Technical Reviewer should treat a manuscript sent for review as a confidential document. It should neither be shown to nor discussed with others except, in special cases, to persons from whom specific advice may be sought; in that event, the identities of those to be consulted shall be disclosed to the Technical Review Committee Chair in advance. The identity of each Technical Reviewer of a manuscript should not be disclosed to the other Technical Reviewers of that manuscript; each review should be independent.

5. A Technical Reviewer should be alert for the failure of authors to cite relevant work by others. A Technical Reviewer should call to the Journal Editor's attention any substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and other published papers known to the Technical Reviewer.

6. Technical Reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, in their practice, except with the consent of the author. In some cases, it may be appropriate for the Technical Reviewer to write the author, with copy to the Journal Editor, about the Technical Reviewer's work in that area.

Portions of this document are reprinted in part with permission from "Ethical Guidelines to Publication of Chemical Research," Copyright 1985, 1989, 1995, 2001, 2006, 2010, 2012 American Chemical Society.