

Editorial Policy

Last update August 2016

BioNanoMaterials (BNM) endorses editorial policy recommended by the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(Cope\)](#) and the [International Committee of Medical Journal Editors \(ICMJE\)](#).

1. Authorship

According to the recommendations of SCOPE and ICMJE the authorship of the work should fulfill the following criteria:

- Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data of the work.
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content.
- Final approval of the version to be published.
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

In addition to being accountable for the parts each author has done, the corresponding author identifies by submission which co-authors are responsible for specific parts of the work. Those authors who do not meet the criteria should be acknowledged.

2. Addition or Removals of Authors

The authors' request for addition or removal of an author should be properly justified. Please note that a change in authorship (order of listing, addition or deletion of a name, or corresponding author designation) after submission of the manuscript will be implemented only after receipt of signed statements of agreement from all parties involved (all listed authors and the author to be removed or added).

3. Submission

Each manuscript submission declares that the manuscript (or one with substantially the same content, by any of the authors) has not been previously published in any language anywhere and that it is not under simultaneous consideration by any other journal. Further all co-authors must have agreed to its publication and have given the corresponding author the authority to act on their behalf in all matters pertaining to publication. The corresponding author is responsible for informing the co-authors of the manuscript status throughout the submission, review and production process.

4. Peer review procedure

Submitted manuscripts will be reviewed in a two-step procedure. Firstly, the Editor-in-Chief decides whether the manuscript fulfils the substantive and formal criteria for the further review process. The decision is based on the following criteria:

Relevance: the content conforms to the scope and goals of BNM.

- Originality/topicality: the content is sufficiently important and topical to worthy to be published in BNM.
- Formal correctness: the formal criteria have been met.
- Ethical Guidelines: national and international ethical standards for studies with human subjects are fulfilled (where applicable).

In case that the criteria have not been met, the manuscript is being rejected without peer review. The authors have the opportunity to resubmit the manuscript after basic revision. If all criteria have been met, the manuscript is being undergone a blind peer reviewing process. The reviewers are not being informed about names and affiliated institutions of the authors.

Selection of reviewers

The Editors-in-Chief invites experts in the appropriate subject area and request them to undertake a double blind peer review. Manuscripts will be evaluated by at least two reviewers. The reviewer will make an objective, impartial evaluation of the scientific merits of the manuscript. Reviewers work according to the scope of BNM. Their evaluation and commentary will be made according to the following criteria:

- Relevance to the scope of BNM
- Originality and novelty
- Appropriateness of choice, presentation and discussion of methods
- Presentation and discussion of results
- Relevance to the scientific and/or professional
- Legibility, style and structure of the text

In case of missing standards, lacks in scientific precision or other major deficiencies, the manuscript will be rejected.

If a manuscript is being considered for publication but in need of improvement, revision of the manuscript is being required. The authors have to follow the reviewer's comments and reply to them. Once all these requirements are being fulfilled, the Editor-in-Chief decides on the publication of the article.

Once all reviews have been received and considered by the Editors-in-Chief, an e-mail with the decision is sent to the corresponding author. The following decisions are possible:

- Accepted
- revise with minor changes
- revise with major changes
- Rejected

After the initial double blind peer-review, submissions accepted for publication, the complete reviewer reports, author response letter(s), and decision letter(s) will be published as supplementary material and as part of the article record. Permissions of the reviewers and authors are requested by submission.

5. Submission of Revised Manuscripts

Where revisions to a manuscript are requested, the corresponding author must resubmit the revised version within approx. 6 weeks (extension of deadline is possible on request). Prompt revision allows rapid publication, where the

paper is definitely accepted for publication. The final decision is being made by the Editors-in-Chief.

6. Proofreading

Prior to publication, the corresponding author will receive a pdf file with the edited version of the manuscript for final proofreading. This is the last opportunity to review and correct an article before its publication. No changes or modifications can be made once following publication. Authors are therefore advised to check and compare the edited version against their own manuscript carefully.

Where corrections are necessary, they should be prepared in a list in the form:

- Page/line: Is: Should be:

This requirement is necessary for the rapid processing of corrections by the production office. The corresponding author should return the list of corrections within 10 working days to the production office. At this stage of production changes to content are no longer permitted. Only minor linguistic and typing corrections are possible.

Authors are occasionally asked to provide additional comments and explanations on linguistic or technical aspects to the language or technical editors.

7. Publication

Manuscripts accepted for publication receive a DOI (Digital Object Identifier) and will be immediately published online. For final publication, the articles are summarized according to year of publication (volumes) and numbers (issues), including consecutive pagination for each volume.

8. Reprints

BNM is published as an online open access journal with no printed version. Therefore authors receive no reprints of their article, but they can access the PDF file of the published version.

9. Correction Notes and Errata

Errors detected in published articles should be reported to the Editors-in-Chief. The corresponding author should send the appropriate corrected material to the Editors-in-Chief. The corrections will, in accordance with the Editor's decision, be published as soon as possible.

10. Copyright

Copyright is regulated by the Creative Commons License. Upon acceptance for publication the submission will be published under the license: [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs \(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

11. Scientific misconduct and other fraud

Scientific misconduct is defined as the fabrication or falsification of research results, intellectual property theft (plagiarism), or other practices that deviate from commonly accepted standards within the academic community for scientific work on the proposal, conducting or reporting of research. In cases where there is a suspicion or allegation of scientific misconduct or fraudulent

research in submitted or published manuscripts, the BNM Editors reserve the right to impose sanctions on the authors. This may include the following measures:

- Immediate rejection of the manuscript.
- Exclusion of author(s) from submitting manuscripts to the journal for a certain period of time.
- Retraction of published manuscripts.
- Informing editors of other journals and publishers.
- Bringing the concerns to the authors' sponsoring or funding institution, or other appropriate authority for investigation.

BNM publishes only original manuscripts and not those previously published, nor under consideration for publication through any other medium. Multiple submission or publication of manuscripts, or redundant publications (repackaging of data by the same authors with different formulation) will be rejected. Where this is detected only after publication, the journal reserves the right to retract the article and to publish an appropriate Retraction Note.

12. Retraction Policy

Serious errors or violation of professional and ethical standards in a published manuscript will result in the retraction of the article. This will occur where the article:

- Is clearly defamatory, or infringes on others' legal rights.
- Is the subject of a court order, or there is good reason to believe that it will be.
- If acted upon, could pose a serious health risk.

In all of these cases, all co-authors will be informed about the retraction. A Retraction Note, detailing the reasons for retraction, will be linked to the original article.

13. Conflict of Interest

To encourage transparency without impeding publication, all authors, reviewers and editors must declare any association that poses a conflict of interest in connection with the manuscript. No contractual relations or proprietary considerations that would affect the content of the publication should exist.

A conflict of interest for a scientific journal is anything that interferes with, or could reasonably be perceived as interfering with, the full and objective presentation, review, or publication of research findings, or of articles that comment on or review research findings. Potential conflicts of interest exist when an author, editor or reviewer has financial, personal or professional interests in a publication that might influence their scientific judgment.

It is the responsibility of the author/s to disclose any funding sources for the project, or other relevant relationships, in the author statement section.

The editors must consider whether there are any conflicts of interest relevant to them. Where an Editor believes that the conflict will impair his judgment, he should decline to handle the manuscript.

Reviewers must disclose all conflict of interests or relationships to the author/s. If they feel that they are unable to review a paper objectively because of any competing interest, they should notify the Editors-in-Chief.