



The Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

University of Latvia and Professional association initiative goal is to promote scientific scholarship; scientific knowledge dissemination in the world and to enhance our knowledge/information spreading/exchanging as well as seeking to create an academic environment that fosters growth in knowledge and understanding of the project management new directions. The aim of the publication is to discuss results of scientific research in project management issues, to establish new contacts and networking between professionals involved in project management as well as enhance the capacity of project managers. Articles submitted can include reviews, objective descriptions, research reports, opinions/debates, methods, or any other type of clear and well supported writing that it believes is of value to science and humanities. All manuscripts submitted will be reviewed by program committee members and the valuable articles will be considered for the publication after the review.

University of Latvia and Professional association of project managers is dedicated to follow the best practices on ethical matters, errors, retractions and to deliver the highest standards of publication ethics. We uphold the best standard and take all possible measures against publication malpractices. All articles not in accordance with publication ethics and malpractice statement standards will be removed from the publication if malpractice is discovered at any time even after the publication. We are checking all articles in a double-blind review process.

The editorial board (program committee) is responsible for, among the other, for deciding which of the research articles submitted to the journal should be published and preventing publication malpractice. Unethical behavior is unacceptable.



1. Editors' Responsibilities

Publication Decisions: Editors (program committee members - reviewers) are accountable for everything published in the journals and strive to meet the needs of readers and authors. Editors' decisions to accept or reject an article for publication are based on the review result and editorial boards' (program committee) reviews and articles' importance.

Review of Manuscripts: The editors ensure that each manuscript is initially evaluated by the editor, who may make use of appropriate means, to examine the originality of the contents of the manuscript and ensure the quality of the material they publish, recognizing that journals and sections within journals will have different aims and standards.

Fair Review: Editors will strive to ensure that review at their journal/proceedings is fair, unbiased and timely. The editor ensures that each manuscript received is evaluated on its intellectual contents without regard to authors' gender, race, religion, citizenship, etc.

Confidentiality: The editors and editorial staff (program committee) must not disclose any information about submitted manuscripts to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers and the publisher. The editor must ensure that information regarding manuscripts submitted by the authors is kept confidential.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest: Editors will require reviewers to disclose any potential competing interests before agreeing to review a submission.

2. Reviewers' Responsibilities

Each reviewer is obliged to use review form as stated in the [annex 1](#) of this document.

Confidentiality: Manuscript reviewers, editors and editorial staff must not disclose any information regarding submitted manuscripts. All submitted manuscripts are to be treated as privileged information. Editors should provide guidance to reviewers on everything that is expected of them including the need to handle submitted material in confidence.

Acknowledgement of Sources: Reviewers must ensure that authors have acknowledged all sources of data used in the research. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editors' attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published article of which they have personal knowledge.

Standards of Objectivity: Review of submitted manuscripts should be conducted objectively. The reviewers will express their views clearly with supporting arguments. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate.

Promptness: If a reviewer believes that it is not possible for him/her to review the manuscript



within the designated guidelines or within stipulated time, he/she should notify the editors, so that the accurate and timely review can be ensured.

Conflict of Interest: All reviewers should have no conflict of interest with respect to the research, the authors and/or the funding bodies.

3. Authors' Responsibilities

Each author or co-author is obliged to fulfill and sign authors' guarantee form as stated in the annex 2 of this document.

Reporting Standards: Authors should precisely present their original research, as well as objectively discuss its significance. Manuscripts are to be edited in accordance to the submission guidelines of the papers.

Originality: Authors must certify that their work is entirely unique and original, except for review articles.

Redundancy: Authors should not concurrently submit articles describing essentially the same research. Submitting the same article to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Acknowledgement of Sources: Authors should acknowledge all sources of data used in the research and cite publications that have influenced their research.

Authorship of the Article: Authorship should be limited only to those who have made a significant contribution to conceiving, designing, executing and/or interpreting the submitted study. All those who have significantly contributed to the study should be listed as co-authors. The corresponding author should also ensure that all the authors and co-authors have seen and approved the final submitted version of the manuscript and their inclusion as co-authors.

Data Access and Retention: Authors should retain raw data related to their submitted articles, and must provide it for editorial review, upon request of the editors.

Fundamental Errors in Published Works: When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her submitted manuscript, the author must immediately notify the editors.

4. Change or Modification of Published Article

Withdrawal: The published articles will be withdrawn if the author(s) noticed significant errors. Before processing the withdrawal request, the editorial board will talk with the author(s) sufficiently. If the article is agreed to be withdrawn, the following should follow: The article in journal database should be removed; the link in online publication site should be removed; Withdraw announce will be shown in this article online location.

Replacement: The articles published can be replaced if the author(s) send an updated article. Before accepting the replacement request, the editorial board should talk with author(s)



sufficiently, and at least 2 reviewers should check the changes. After an update, the old version should be kept separately, and if someone wants to check the old version, the editor can send all the information and files to him/her.

Removal: The published articles will be removed if reviewers, readers, librarians, publishers or other subjects noticed a significant errors or plagiarism. Before removing an article, editorial board should talk with authors sufficiently, and should provide enough time to have authors' explanation. If the article is removed, then it follows: The article in journal database should be removed; the link in online publication site should be removed; the announce will be shown in this article online location.

5. Penalties

Double Submission: If double submission was found or noticed from other sources, the editorial board should check the status. If the double submission was confirmed as intentional thing, then the following actions must be imposed: Review process will be terminated; The reason should be sent to reviewers, editorial board (program committee) and authors; All authors' in this case could be subject for further exclusion of any article publishing for 3 years based on program committee decision.

Double Publication: If double publication is found or noticed from other sources, editorial board (program committee) should check the status. If the double publication is confirmed as intentional thing, then the following actions will be carried out: This should be reported to editorial board (program committee) and author(s); This should be sent to the publisher who published same (or very similar) article; Article will be removed; All authors' in this case could be subject for further exclusion of any article publishing for 3 years based on program committee decision.

Plagiarism: If plagiarism is found or noticed from other sources, editorial board (program committee) should check the status. If the plagiarism is confirmed as intentional thing, then the following actions will be carried out: This should be reported to editorial board (program committee) and authors; This should be sent to publisher who published same or similar article; Article will be removed; All authors' in this case could be subject for further exclusion of any article publishing for 3 years based on program committee decision.

All the editors, authors and reviewers within the University of Latvia and Professional association of project managers agree upon standards of proper ethical behavior and accept the responsibility for fulfilling the following duties and responsibilities.

© University of Latvia

© Professional association of project managers

Project Management Development – Practice and Perspectives: ISSN 2256-0513

Emils.Pulmanis@lu.lv, info@pvpa.lv



Conference
International Scientific Conference on Project Management in the Baltic Countries

SCIENTIFIC REVIEW FORM

<i>TITLE OF PAPER</i>

ITEMS	ASSESSMENT	COMMENTS
Scientific Review		
Does paper contributes to the project management discipline?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Are the specific aims and corresponding hypotheses, problem formulation clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Has an appropriate literature search been performed such that that the rationale for the study has been adequately presented?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Is the question or hypothesis being tested providing important knowledge to the field?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Are there adequate preliminary data in the literature (or from the investigator) to justify the research?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Does paper achieves quality of the organization (logical flow) and the quality of the communication (readability, clarity, grammar)?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Does paper research design, including sampling, data collection and appropriate data analysis (if applicable)?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Are the proposed tests or measurements appropriate to answer the scientific questions?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Does quality of conclusions and recommendations (implications and suggestions for further research) complies with paper content?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Does paper have high probability to stimulate (scientific and practical) debate at the conference?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	



Reviewer's overall assessment

Please check one of the following:

- Paper is acceptable for publishing in its present format.
- Paper is acceptable for publishing with minor corrections
- Paper is NOT acceptable for the publishing

Reviewer's other comments/questions



SECTION TWO - REVISED SCIENTIFIC REVIEW

Reviewer's assessment

Please check one of the following:

- All scientific review issues and comments have been satisfactorily resolved.
- Some scientific review issues have **not** been satisfactorily resolved. Author/s must do corrections for disputing the reviewer's recommendations.

Unresolved Issues



General Instructions for Reviewers

Make sure the article you have been asked to review truly matches your expertise

The project coordinator who has approached you may not know your work intimately, and may only be aware of your work in a broader context. Only accept an invitation if you are competent to review the article.

Avoid a potential conflict of interest

A conflict of interest will not necessarily eliminate you from reviewing an article, but full disclosure to the editor will allow them to make an informed decision. For example; if you work in the same department or institute as one of the authors; if you have worked on a paper previously with an author; or you have a professional or financial connection to the article. These should all be listed when responding to the editor's invitation for review.

In comments to the Author

The comments to the author should not include any statements that indicate to the author your judgment as to the acceptability of the paper for publication. These comments should be stated in a constructive and helpful way. The reviewer should discuss the shortcomings and/or strengths of a study. Include in your critique your judgment of 1) originality and scientific importance, 2) adequacy and length of the title, 3) adequacy of the abstract, 4) introduction, rationale and clarity of hypothesis, 5) adequacy of experimental design and methods, 6) quality of data and presentation of results, including figures, 7) appropriateness of the authors' interpretation of their data, 8) length and appropriateness of the discussion, and 9) inclusion of recent and appropriate references. If possible, make specific recommendations for revisions.

Ethical responsibilities during the Review process

1. Confidentiality - The reviewer should maintain confidentiality about the existence and substance of the manuscript. It is inappropriate to share the manuscript or to discuss it in detail with others before publication. There are some exceptions, if approved by the editor. One example is that the reviewer may ask a colleague to collaborate on a review. However, your collaborator on the review should also agree to maintain confidentiality, and the editor should be informed of the participation of this additional person.

2. Reviewer Conduct -. Reviewers must not use knowledge of the work, before its publication, to further their own interests. Knowledge of the content of confidential manuscripts should not be used for any other purpose unrelated to the reviewing of the manuscript.

3. Reporting Concerns - The reviewer also has the responsibility of noting any ethical concerns, not limited to but including suspected duplicate publication, fraud, plagiarism, or ethical concerns about the use of animals or humans in the research being reported.



**AUTHOR'S GUARANTEE FORM
CONCERNING THE PAPER PRESENTED FOR PUBLICATION**

(date – month - year)

Author(s),

First name, last name

guarantee(s) that the article

Title of the article

hereinafter referred to as "Paper", presented at "International Scientific Conference on Project Management in the Baltic Countries" (ISSN 2256-0513) is an original paper and

- 1) it was written by the Author(s) indicated in the Paper;
- 2) the material of the Paper was not published in any other publication;
- 3) the material of the Paper is not and will not be presented for publication to any other publication;
- 4) the Paper does not contain statements, which do not correspond to reality, or material, which may infringe upon the intellectual property rights of another person or legal entity, and upon the conditions and requirements of sponsors or providers of financial support;
- 5) all references used in the Paper are indicated and, to the extent the Paper incorporates text passages, figures, data or other material from the works of others, the undersigned has obtained any necessary permits;
- 6) permit shall be granted to distribute the Paper in any format;
- 7) undertakes to indemnify and hold harmless the publisher of the conference proceedings and third parties from any damage or expense that may arise in the event of a breach of any of the guarantees set forth above;
- 8) the Author(s) shall bear legal responsibility for correctness of the data provided in the Author's Guarantee Form in accordance with the laws of the Republic of Latvia.

If the Paper is not accepted for publication in the conference proceedings this guarantee form becomes null and void, and the Paper is not returned to the Author(s).

Authors:

_____ (name, family name)	_____ (signature)	_____ (date)
_____ (name, family name)	_____ (signature)	_____ (date)
_____ (name, family name)	_____ (signature)	_____ (date)