

PUBLISHING POLICY OF THE JOURNAL

On ethics and unfair practices

The management (editor) of the International Scientific and Practical Journal "Technical and Agrarian Sciences" adheres to certain rules for the selection and acceptance of articles submitted by the authors. These rules are determined in accordance with the scientific fields covered in the journal.

The management (editors) of the International Scientific and Practical Journal "Technical and Agrarian Sciences" in developing the policy of publication ethics were guided by the recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and the experience of foreign professional associations, other Azerbaijani and foreign research institutes and their publishers.

An important feature of the professional scientific community is the adoption of a moral code that defines the basic rules of conduct and obligations of members of the scientific community in relation to each other and society. Such a code is determined by the desire to maximize the benefit of the professional community and limit actions that may serve the interests of individuals, as well as protect the intellectual property rights of the author.

Ethical responsibility of the journal's leaders (editors).

1. All submitted materials are carefully selected and reviewed. The editors reserve the right to reject the article or return it in need of revision. The author is obliged to improve, revise and refine the article, taking into account the comments of the reviewers and the management of the editorial board (editors).
2. The editorial board (editor) is obliged to impartially consider all manuscripts submitted for publication, regardless of race, religion, nationality, status and institutional affiliation of the author (authors), and evaluate each manuscript on its merits.
3. The editorial management (editor), as far as possible, should immediately review the manuscript submitted for publication.
4. The entire responsibility for accepting or rejecting an article lies with the editor. A responsible and reasonable approach to their duties requires the editor to seek advice from reviewers, doctors of sciences, professors (in exceptional cases, doctors of philosophy and associate professors) regarding the quality and reliability of manuscripts submitted for publication. However, manuscripts may be rejected without review if the editorial board(s) deem them unsuitable for the journal.
5. The editor and members of the editorial board should not disclose the peer-reviewed manuscript to anyone other than those who are contacted for professional advice. After the manuscript is accepted, it must be published in the journal and on the journal's website.
6. The editor must respect the intellectual independence of authors.
7. Editorial responsibility and authority for any manuscript written by an editor and submitted to an editorial journal must be delegated to another qualified person as a member of its editorial board.
8. If the editor is presented with substantial evidence that the main content or conclusions of a report published in the editorial journal are incorrect, the editor should assist in the publication of the relevant report by pointing out the error and, if possible, correcting it. The report may be written by the person who discovered the error or by the original author.
9. The author may ask the editor not to use certain reviewers when reviewing the manuscript. However, the editor may decide to involve one or more of these reviewers if the editor believes that their opinions are important to an objective review of the manuscript. This can happen, for example, when a manuscript strongly contradicts a potential reviewer's previous work.

10. It should be taken into account that the decision to index a journal in the databases of world scientific periodicals and other indexing resources does not depend on the editorial board of the journal and is not part of the publication process.

By submitting an article for publication, the author agrees that the indexing of the journal in any databases and other indexing resources of world scientific periodicals can be changed in the process of publishing the issue along with the published author's article.

The editorial management (editors) guarantees the placement of up-to-date information about the indexing of the journal.

Ethical obligations of authors

1. The main responsibility of the author is the correct presentation of the study, as well as an objective discussion of its significance.

2. The author should be aware that journal space is a limited resource and should be used wisely and economically.

3. In the original research report, the author should provide enough details and references to publicly available sources of information so that his colleagues have the opportunity to repeat the work. To protect the legitimate interests of authors and limit the scope of use of materials, they should make reasonable efforts to provide, upon request of other users (authors) with appropriate material transfer agreements, unusual samples of materials that are not available elsewhere.

4. The author should cite sources that influence the nature of the work presented and help the reader quickly jump to previous publications necessary to understand this study. With the exception of reviews, references to works that will not be cited in published studies should be kept to a minimum. It is the responsibility of the author to search the literature to find and then cite original publications that describe closely related work. Critical remarks used in the work should be pointed to the appropriate reliable sources, if they are not provided by the author.

5. Any unusual hazards encountered during the course of the study should be clearly identified in the manuscript report.

6. Breakdown of research reports should not be allowed. A scientist who has done extensive work on a system or group of related systems should organize publication so that each report details a particular aspect of the overall study.

7. When submitting a manuscript for publication, the author must inform the editorial board (editor) about the presence of related manuscripts in the editorial office or in print. Copies of these manuscripts should be submitted to the editor (editor) indicating the relationship of such manuscripts to the submitted manuscript.

8. Except in cases of resubmission of a rejected or withdrawn manuscript, it is not acceptable for an author to submit manuscripts describing essentially the same study to another journal with the original publication. It is generally acceptable to submit a manuscript of a full article that expands on a previously published short essay (in "news" or "letter" form) of the same work. However, at the time of submission, the editorial board (editor) should be informed about the previously sent news and the original information should be indicated in the manuscript.

9. The author must indicate the source of all cited or alleged information, except for generally known opinions. Information obtained privately, such as conversations, correspondence, or discussions with third parties, should not be used or reported in the work of the author without the express permission of the researcher who is the source of the information. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as peer review of manuscripts or grant applications, should be treated in the same way.

10. Experimental or theoretical research can sometimes justify criticism, even harsh criticism of the work of another scientist. Sometimes such criticism can be given in published works. However, personal criticism is by no means considered appropriate.

11. The co-authors of the article should be all persons who have made an important scientific contribution to the work on the report and who share responsibility for the results. Other

contributions should be noted in the notes or in the Acknowledgments section. An administrative relationship with a study does not in itself imply co-authorship (although it may sometimes be appropriate to acknowledge significant administrative assistance). Deceased persons who meet the criteria for inclusion as co-authors must be included with the date of death in that order. A pseudonym must not be listed as the author or co-author. The author submitting a manuscript for publication undertakes to include all eligible and relevant persons as co-authors.

12. Authors should inform the management of the journal (editor) and readers of any potential and/or relevant competing financial or other interests that may be affected by the publication of the results contained in the author's manuscript. All authors should not have significant personal financial interests, as well as employment or other relationships with organizations with financial or other interests that could affect the results described in the manuscript.

Ethical responsibilities of experts (reviewers)

1. Because reviewing manuscripts (giving them feedback) is an important step in the publication process and therefore in the application of the scientific method, it is the responsibility of every scientist to review a sufficient amount of work.

2. A selected reviewer who does not consider himself qualified enough to evaluate what is presented in the manuscript should immediately return it to the editor.

3. The person carrying out the examination of the manuscript (reviewer) must objectively evaluate the quality of the manuscript, its experimental and theoretical essence, interpretation and presentation, respect the intellectual independence of the authors, taking into account the protection of high scientific and literary standards.

4. When a peer-reviewed manuscript is closely related to the current or published work of an expert (reviewer), he should take into account the occurrence of a conflict of interest. In case of doubt, the expert (reviewer) must notify the management of the editorial office (editor) about the conflict of interest and immediately return the manuscript without reviewing.

5. When the author or co-author of a manuscript is a person who has a personal or other professional relationship with an expert (reviewer), if these relationships may affect the evaluation of the manuscript, the manuscript should not be evaluated by this expert (reviewer).

6. The expert (reviewer) must treat the manuscript sent for review as a confidential document. The manuscript should not be shown or discussed with anyone other than those from whom specific advice can be obtained; in a special case, the identity of those consulted should be disclosed to the editorial board (editor).

7. Experts (reviewers) must adequately explain and substantiate their opinion so that editors and authors can understand the basis of their comments. Any statement that any observation, conclusion or argument has been previously published must be accompanied by a citation from the relevant source. Unsubstantiated claims by reviewers (or denials by authors) are of little value and should be avoided.

8. The expert (reviewer) should ensure that the authors do not cite the relevant works of other scientists, remembering that the reviewer's complaints about insufficient citation of their own research can be regarded as selfish. The reviewer should draw the editor's attention to any significant similarity between the manuscript in question and the published article or any manuscript submitted simultaneously to another journal.

9. The expert (reviewer) must act promptly, providing a timely opinion on the reviewed manuscript.

10. Reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished data, arguments, or comments in a peer-reviewed manuscript, except with the consent of the author.

Actions taken in cases of violation of the law

If there is any doubt that the expert (reviewer) accepted the ideas or information of the author:

The workflow is based on the "What to do if you suspect that a reviewer has misappropriated an author's idea or information" section of the COPE framework.

1. This work can only be considered if documentary evidence from the author and / or other sources is submitted, such as publication, abstract, meeting report, copies of slides, application for a grant. After examining the evidence (or contacting an appropriately qualified expert to do so) and deciding on the credibility of the author's and/or other sources' claims, the following steps should be taken.
2. If the accusation is confirmed, the expert (reviewer) and the institution of which he is a member are sent a request to start an investigation.
3. Relationships such as work in the same department, personal relationships and other conflicts of interest between the accused and the named reviewer will also be explored.
4. If the fault of the expert (reviewer) is proved, he will be permanently deleted from the database of the publisher.
5. If the borrowed idea or information has been published elsewhere, the relevant publication sources will be asked to adopt a policy of retraction or retraction of published material.

If there are any doubts about ethical issues related to the submitted manuscript:

The procedure is based on the COPE concept "What to do if you suspect an ethical problem".

1. Such doubt may arise, for example, in the absence of ethical agreement/concerns when it comes to patient protection/animal experiments, etc.
2. The author will be required to provide relevant information (eg ethics committee certification or a copy of informed consent documents).
3. In the absence of relevant documents:
 - the manuscript will be rejected and will not be published in the journal;
 - for investigation, the case was transferred to the institution to which the author belongs.

Advertising policy of the publication

Announcements placed on the pages of the journal must be directly or indirectly related to the subject of the journal, that is, contain information about goods, technologies and services in areas related to the subject of the journal.

Ads are not integrated with the main content of the articles and are placed in places on separate pages / tabs.