

# 出版道德声明

《雷达学报》遵循公认的出版道德规范。本刊坚决反对任何形式的抄袭。向本刊投稿的作者须确认稿件内容的原创性，此外，还应保证其文章既没有以任何语言完全或部分发表在其他地方，也没有为出版目的而在任何地方接受评审。

本刊编辑、作者和审稿人应履行下列职责，还应遵循《雷达学报》的其他相关规定和要求。

## 一、编辑的职责

- 1、根据审稿人的评审意见和编委会的评审报告，编辑可以接受、拒绝或要求修改文稿。
- 2、编辑不应与他们拒绝或接受的文章有利益冲突。
- 3、编辑必须确保每一篇文稿最初都通过原创性评估，利用合适的软件来进行。经过这种检测之后，文稿将转发给两位审稿人进行单盲同行评审，他们将就文稿的接受、拒绝或修改提出具体建议。

4、编辑必须确保本刊所接受的每一篇文稿均经过知识内容审查，而不考虑作者的性别、种族、宗教和国籍等。

## 二、作者的职责

- 1、作者应提供一个关于其原始研究的准确描述和其重要性的客观论述。文稿应符合本刊“投稿须知”中的相关要求。
- 2、作者不得同时将相同的文稿提交到一个以上期刊，也不应将描述相同研究的文稿发表于多个期刊。
- 3、作者应确认该研究中所用数据的所有来源，并引用在其研究工作中已产生过影响的出版物。
- 4、作者应限于那些对报道的研究的构思、设计、执行或解释做出过重大贡献者，有显著贡献者必须列为联合作者。

## 三、审稿人的职责

- 1、审稿人须保证作者已确认该研究中所用数据的所有来源，如发现有抄袭行为或一稿多投现象，应立即告知编辑。
- 2、审稿人对文稿的评审必须做到客观公正，应通过论据来表达自己的观点。
- 3、审稿人应与该研究、作者和/或该研究资助者没有利益冲突。
- 4、审稿人应指出尚未被引用的已发表的相关作品。
- 5、当审稿人觉得不可能在规定的时间内完成文稿的评审时，必须将该信息告知编辑，以便该文稿能发送给其他审稿人。

## 四、撤稿与更正

1、编辑在下列情况下应考虑撤稿：有明确的证据表明，因不当行为(如数据造假)或诚实的错误(例如误判或实验误差)导致研究结果不可靠；研究结果先前已发表在其他地方而没有适当的交叉引用、许可或理由(即重复发表)；构成剽窃；报道不道德的研究。

2、撤稿通告应尽可能链接到该撤稿(即所有电子版本)；清楚地标识该撤消文章(例如，在撤稿标题中包括标题与作者)；及时公布，以尽量减少误导性出版物的有害影响。

3、编辑在下列情况下应考虑发布更正：可靠的出版物中一小部分被证明是误导(尤其是因为诚实的错误)；作者/贡献者名单不正确(即称职的作者被省略或不符合著作权条件者被列入)。

# Publication Ethics Statement

“Journal of Radars” follows the recognized publication ethics. We firmly oppose plagiarism in any form. Authors submitting articles to the journal should affirm that manuscript contents are original. They should also warrant that their article has neither been published elsewhere in any language fully or partly, nor is it under review for publication anywhere.

The editors, authors and reviewers of “Journal of Radars” should perform the following duties, and adhere to the submission guidelines and other requirements of the journal.

## **Duties of Editor**

1. Based on the review report of the editorial board, the editor can accept, reject or request modifications to the manuscript.
2. Editors should have no conflict of interest with respect to articles they reject/accept.
3. Editor must ensure that each manuscript is initially evaluated by the editor for originality, making use of appropriate software to do so. After passing this test, the manuscript is forwarded to two reviewers for single-blind peer review, each of whom will make a recommendation to accept, reject, or modify the manuscript.
4. The editor must ensure that each manuscript received by “Journal of Radars” is reviewed for its intellectual content without regard to gender, race, religion, citizenship, etc. of the authors.

## **Duties of Authors**

1. Authors should present an accurate account of their original research as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Manuscripts will follow the submission guidelines of the journal.
2. Author should not submit the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently. The author should not publish redundant manuscripts or manuscripts describing same research in more than one journal.
3. Authors should acknowledge all sources of data used in the research and cite publications that have been influential in their research work.
4. Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to conception, design, execution or interpretation of the reported study. Others who have made significant contribution must be listed as co-authors.

## **Duties of Reviewers**

1. Manuscript reviewers must ensure that authors have acknowledged all sources of data used in the research. If the reviewers find plagiarism or a manuscript cast more phenomenon, they should immediately tell the editor.
2. Review of submitted manuscripts must be done objectively and the reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.
3. Reviewers should have no conflict of interest with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders.
4. Reviewers should point out relevant published work which is not yet cited.
5. When a reviewer feels it is not possible to complete review of manuscript within stipulated time then this information must be communicated to the editor, so that the manuscript could be sent to another reviewer.

## **Retractions and Corrections**

1. Editors should consider retracting a publication if they have clear evidence that the findings are unreliable, either as a result of misconduct (*e.g.* data fabrication) or honest error (*e.g.* miscalculation or experimental error); the findings have previously been published elsewhere without proper cross-referencing, permission or justification (*i.e.* cases of redundant publication); it constitutes plagiarism; it reports unethical research.
2. Notices of retraction should be linked to the retracted article wherever possible (*i.e.* in all electronic versions); clearly identify the retracted article (*e.g.* by including the title and authors in the retraction heading); be published promptly to minimize harmful effects from misleading publications.
3. Editors should consider issuing a correction if a small portion of an otherwise reliable publication proves to be misleading (especially because of honest error); the author / contributor list is incorrect (*i.e.* a deserving author has been omitted or somebody who does not meet authorship criteria has been included).