



*Society for Imaging Science & Technology*  
7003 Kilworth Lane ▲ Springfield, VA 22151

703/642-9090; 703/642-9094 fax  
info@imaging.org

## **SOCIETY FOR IMAGING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PUBLICATION GUIDELINES<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> The Society acknowledges permission granted by SPIE to adapt portions of the “SPIE PUBLICATION ETHICS GUIDELINES” in this document

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

According to the Mission Statement of the Society for Imaging Science and Technology (referred to herein as “Society” or “imaging.org”), a goal of the Society is to keep members aware of latest scientific and technological developments in the field of imaging through conferences, journals, and other publications. The purpose of this document is to advance this mission by presenting guidelines on responsibilities and recommended practices for authors, editors, reviewers, and others who submit to, publish in, or evaluate a Society publication. Unless specifically stated, guidelines in this document refer to both conference and journal publications, whether in printed or digital form.

This document must be read and understood in conjunction with the IS&T Publications Policy, which defines ethical standards for Society publications, as well as processes for discovering, investigating, and determining consequences for misconduct in the publication process.

## **2. AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITIES**

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the concept, design, execution, or interpretation of the research study. All those who have made significant contributions should be offered the opportunity to be listed as authors. Other individuals who have contributed to the study should be acknowledged, but not identified as authors. The sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. Proper acknowledgment of the work of others used in a research project must always be given.

All collaborators share some degree of responsibility for any paper they coauthor. Some coauthors have responsibility for the entire paper as an accurate, verifiable, report of the research. These include, for example, coauthors who are accountable for integrity of critical data reported in the paper, who carry out data analysis, who write the manuscript, who present major findings at conferences, and/or who provide scientific leadership for junior colleagues.

Coauthors who make specific, limited, contributions to a paper are responsible for them, but may have only limited responsibility for other results. As all coauthors may not be familiar with all aspects of the research presented in a paper, all collaborations should have in place an appropriate process for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy and validity of all reported results.

All coauthors should be aware of this process. Every coauthor should have the opportunity to review the manuscript before its submission. Any individual unwilling or unable to accept appropriate responsibility for a paper should not be a coauthor.

It is the obligation of each author to provide prompt retractions or corrections of errors in published works. Coauthors who disagree substantially with the scientific content of a paper

submitted in their name(s) may contact the editor of the publication and request to have their names(s) removed from it.

It should be recognized that honest error is an integral part of the scientific enterprise. It is not unethical to be wrong, provided that errors are promptly acknowledged and corrected when they are detected. All coauthors share in the obligation to provide prompt retraction to or correction of errors in published works.

Author collaborations are expected to follow a process to archive and verify the research record. This process should facilitate internal communication, allow all authors to be fully aware of the entire work and respond to questions concerning the joint work, and it should enable other responsible scientists to share the data. Research results should be recorded and maintained in a form that allows analysis and review. Research data should be immediately available to scientific collaborators. Following publication, the data should be retained for a reasonable period in order to be available promptly and completely for appropriate scientific review. Exceptions may be appropriate in certain circumstances to preserve privacy, to assure patent protection or for similar reasons.

Fabrication of data or selective reporting of data with the intent to mislead or deceive is an egregious departure from the expected norms of scientific conduct, as is the theft of data or research results from others, or the concealing of relevant data, results, or references.

### **3. EDITOR RESPONSIBILITIES<sup>2</sup>**

The term “editor” refers to any individual who makes final decisions on acceptance, rejection, or redirection of publications. It can include the editor, an associate editor, or the technical or publications chair(s) of a conference.

Editors should give unbiased consideration to all submissions, judging each on its own merits without regard to nationality, ethnic background, physical disability, religion, gender, sexual orientation, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s). All manuscripts submitted for publication should be considered within a timeframe that is deemed reasonable for the given publication. Editors should respect the intellectual independence of authors.

The responsibility for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript rests with the editor, but exercise of this duty normally requires that the editor seek advice from reviewers, chosen for their expertise and good judgment, as to the quality, relevance, and reliability of manuscripts submitted for publication. Submissions may be rejected without external review if considered by

---

<sup>2</sup> based in part on the corresponding policy of the American Chemical Society entitled “Ethical Guidelines to Publication of Chemical Research”.

the editors to be inappropriate for the conference or journal in terms of topic or depth of content. Authors are expected to submit manuscripts that are written in acceptable English; editors have the right to reject a manuscript that is of poor written quality and/or ask that an author address this issue and then resubmit the manuscript .

While an author may request that the editor use or not use certain reviewers in consideration of a manuscript, the selection of reviewers is ultimately at the discretion of the editor and/or members of the publication's Editorial Board. The editor must remain sensitive to the possibility of bias in reviews.

The editor and members of the editorial staff must treat manuscripts and details related to them as confidential documents. They may not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than those from whom professional advice is sought. After a decision has been made about a manuscript, the editor and members of the staff may disclose or publish titles and authorship of papers that have been accepted for publication.

Editorial responsibility and authority for any manuscript authored by an editor and submitted to the journal for which s/he has oversight or to a conference on which s/he serves on the committee should be delegated to an associate editor (in the case of a journal) or the conference general chair (in the case of a conference submission). Editorial consideration of the manuscript in any way or form by the author-editor constitutes a conflict of interest and is therefore improper. Likewise input of individual members of the Editorial Board should not be sought in respect to the acceptance decision for papers of which that member is an author, co-author, or where the member has been significantly involved the research program on which the article is based.

When a manuscript is so closely related to the current or past research of an editor as to create a potential conflict of interest, the editor should arrange for some other qualified person to take editorial responsibility for that manuscript. In some cases, it may be appropriate to tell an author about the editor's research and plans in that area.

If an editor is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance or conclusions of a published report are flawed or erroneous, the editor should facilitate publication of an appropriate letter 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. In the former case the original author should be notified of the editor's intent to publish the letter and be given an opportunity to respond.

#### **4. REVIEWER RESPONSIBILITIES<sup>3</sup>**

Peer review provides advice and feedback concerning the technical merit, novelty, accessibility, and appropriateness of scientific publications. Additionally it provides authors with a useful critique of their research methods and data analysis. It also can guide them to present their work with greater precision and clarity. It is an essential component of the scientific publication process. Although peer review can be difficult and time-consuming, scientists have an obligation to participate in the process.

Reviewer identity will be known only to the editor(s), and will not be revealed by the editorial board to the author(s). A reviewer should be fair and objective in evaluating the quality of a manuscript. S/he should not evaluate a manuscript authored or co-authored by a person with whom s/he has a personal and/or professional connection if the relationship could result in any bias in evaluation. A reviewer who feels inadequately qualified to perform a review should promptly return the manuscript to the editor.

Reviewers should support their evaluations with substantive explanations so that editors and authors may understand the basis of their evaluation and the direction in which authors might proceed to correct and/or improve presentation of the material. Unsupported assertions are of little value and should be avoided. In their evaluation, reviewers should note any failure of an author(s) to cite relevant work by others. Reviewers have an obligation to report any substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper or manuscript submitted concurrently to another conference or journal (see [imaging.org](http://imaging.org) Publications Policy).

A reviewer should act promptly, submitting an evaluation within the agreed-upon timeframe . Should a reviewer receive a manuscript at a time when circumstances preclude prompt attention to it, the un-reviewed manuscript should be returned immediately to the editor. Alternatively, the reviewer may notify the editor of probable delays and propose a revised review date.

A review of a submitted manuscript may include constructive criticism; however, in no case is personal criticism of the author considered to be appropriate.

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential by reviewers, and should not be used for competitive gain. In special cases, a reviewer may seek specific advice from other individuals; the identities of those consulted should be disclosed to the editor. If a reviewer feels that information to be gained from reading a manuscript may pose a potential conflict with his/her own work in terms of intellectual property, he/she should withdraw from reading and reviewing the manuscript. For details on handling conflict of interest, refer to the [imaging.org](http://imaging.org) Publications Policy.

---

<sup>3</sup> based in part on the corresponding policy of the American Chemical Society entitled "Ethical Guidelines to Publication of Chemical Research".