



LACCEI International Multi-conference Publication and Malpractice Statement

LACCEI International Multi-conference for Engineering, Education and Technology is aware of the importance of avoidance of any type of malpractice from the authors, technical committee and reviewers. These malpractices are unethical behaviors during the submission, review and publication processes. For that purpose LACCEI International Multi-conference for Engineering, rejects any type of unethical behavior such as: plagiarism in any form, republishing practices, originality of the work or unfair evaluation of the papers.

Also the technical committee requires the compliance of the IEEE Plagiarism Complaints that can be found on the following link:

http://www.ieee.org/publications_standards/publications/rights/plagiarism.html

Policies for authors, technical committee and reviewers:

Technical committee responsibilities:

1. **Authors Notification:** The technical committee members will give the authors the notification of acceptance or rejection of their paper based on the average of the scores given for the reviewers during the review process.
2. **Review of papers and fairness:** LACCEI technical committee do a double blind review process in which authors do not know the identity of the reviewers and reviewers do not have any information about the author. This process guaranties any kind of unfair evaluation or discrimination based on author's' gender, race, nationality, religion, university or political philosophy.
3. **Promptness:** Reviewers of LACCEI technical committee that can not complete the review process in the time given for that purpose, should inform the LACCEI technical committee chair, to assign the document to another reviewer.
4. **Confidentiality and Conflicts of Interest:** LACCEI technical committee ensures that information submitted by the authors is confidential and will not use these materials for different purposes.

Authors responsibilities:

1. **Originality:** Authors must ensure that their work is entirely original content. If the authors use information of another author, they must cite or quote that work. Also the result presented in their work must be clearly presented without falsification or manipulation.
2. **Multiple, Redundant, or Concurrent Publications:** Authors should not submit the same paper describing the same research, to more than one conference or journal regarding the period of time.
3. **Fundamental Errors in Published Works:** If at any point of time, the author(s) discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in submitted manuscript, then the error or inaccuracy must be reported to the editor.
4. **Sources:** All the sources of the external information presented in the author's work must be correctly cited and have permission of the source.
5. **Authorship:** Only those authors, who have made significant contributions, should be listed as co-authors. The corresponding author should ensure that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.
6. **Disclosure:** If the research work has any financial or other conflict of interest, this information must be disclosed in the manuscript.

Reviewers responsibilities:

1. **Promptness and competence:** If the reviewer is not able to perform the review must inform the situation to the technical committee and withdraw as soon as possible.
2. **Objectivity:** The reviewer must present their analysis clearly and with supporting arguments. The reviewer does not present personal criticism of the author.
3. **Confidentiality:** Reviewers should keep all information of the works as confidential and treat them as privileged information and
4. **Sources:** If the reviewer finds some unquoted information or even part of the manuscript very similar to another article already published should inform the situation to the technical committee.
5. **Disclosure:** The information of the unpublished manuscripts must not be used for personal advantage of the reviewer. Also the reviewer must reject the review of manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest due to competitive, collaborative, or other relationships with the authors or institutions related with the paper.