

## Statement on Publication Ethics and Misconduct

These guidelines are fully aligned with COPE's principles of transparency and best practice, as well as COPE's Code of Conduct. For more information, please visit: <https://publicationethics.org/>.

We promote the highest standards of publication ethics and take all possible measures to prevent publication misconduct. As a publisher, the Heinz Nixdorf Institut takes its supervisory responsibility for all phases of publication very seriously and is aware of its ethical and other responsibilities.

**Publisher:** Heinz Nixdorf Institute,  
Fürstenallee 11,  
33102 Paderborn,  
Germany

**Editor:** Prof. Dr.-Ing. Roman Dumitrescu (Heinz Nixdorf Institute)  
Prof. Dr. Katharina Hölzle (Fraunhofer Group for Innovation Research)

---

### DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EDITORS

In addition to many general duties, such as continuously improving the quality and integrity of the conference proceedings, striving to meet the needs of authors and readers, promoting academic debate, and others, the editors undertake to perform the following tasks to the best of their knowledge and belief:

#### Program Committee

The program committee is made up of recognized experts in the field. The editors provide the full names and affiliations of the members as well as current contact information for the editorial office on the symposium/conference proceedings website.

#### Publication decisions

The editors are responsible for deciding which of the submitted articles will be published. The validity of the work and its significance for researchers and readers guide this decision. The editors may base their decision on the recommendations of the reviewers and take into account legal requirements such as those relating to copyright.

#### Peer review process

All contributions to the conference proceedings are subject to a two-stage review process. The first stage begins with the submission of an abstract. The editors review the abstracts as part of an editorial screening process and may reject contributions if they are thematically unsuitable or do not meet basic quality requirements. If abstracts successfully pass this first phase, the authors are invited to submit a full paper. Full papers are then subjected to a double-blind peer review. The papers are forwarded anonymously to two independent reviewers. They evaluate the paper as 'ready for publication', 'ready for publication with minor revisions', 'requires major revision', or 'reject'. Their statements usually contain an explicit

recommendation. Based on the reviewers' assessments and the availability of program slots, the editors make the final decision on whether to accept or reject the paper. The decision is communicated to the authors.

The editors must justify any deviations from the described procedure. Revisions of previously made decisions are possible only in cases of serious issues.

With this document, the editors also provide guidelines for authors and reviewers. These guidelines will be updated as necessary.

### **Fair play**

The editors evaluate submissions solely on the basis of their intellectual content, without regard to the gender, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political views of the authors. The decision to publish is based on significance, originality, clarity, and relevance to the objectives of the conference proceedings.

### **Archiving**

All accepted and published contributions to the Symposium for Foresight and Technology Planning will be permanently archived digitally. The contributions are accessible via the conference proceedings on the official website of the symposium. The publisher also ensures that access to the content is maintained by the German National Library. Each published conference proceedings also receives a DOI number to ensure long-term citability and findability.

### **Confidentiality**

Editors and editorial staff may not disclose any information about submitted manuscripts—except to the corresponding authors, reviewers, potential reviewers, or the publisher. Manuscripts remain confidential during the review process.

### **Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted paper may not be used in the editors' own research without the express written consent of the author(s). Privileged information or ideas obtained through the peer review process must be kept confidential and may not be used for personal advantage. Editors will withdraw from reviewing submissions (i.e., assign them to a co-editor, associate editor, or other member of the editorial board instead) if they have one (or more) conflicts of interest arising from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections to an author, company, or (potential) institutions related to the submissions. Editors require all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and to publish corrections if competing interests are discovered after publication.

### **Procedures for dealing with unethical behavior**

Unethical behavior can be recognized at any time and by anyone and reported to the editor or publisher. Anyone who informs the editor or publisher of such behavior should provide sufficient information and evidence to enable an investigation. All allegations must be taken seriously and treated in the same manner until a well-founded decision or final conclusion has been reached. Every reported case of unethical publication behavior must be investigated, even if it only becomes known years after publication.

The editors, in cooperation with the publisher, should take appropriate action when ethical complaints are made about a submitted contribution or a work that has already been published. Such action usually includes contacting the author and carefully examining the complaint or allegation. Depending on the severity of the misconduct, this may also include notifying the relevant institutions or research organizations.

Minor misconduct may be dealt with without further consultation. In any case, the author should be given the opportunity to respond to the allegations.

The submission of identical or nearly identical articles to multiple publication media (“redundant publication”), the deliberate falsification of data (‘fabrication’) and its manipulation (“falsification”) constitute a serious violation of publication ethics. Such behavior will be thoroughly investigated and may result in rejection, retraction of already published articles, and further sanctions.

In cases of serious misconduct, one or more of the following measures may be necessary:

- Informing or educating the author or reviewer if there has been a misunderstanding or incorrect application of accepted standards
- Publishing a formal notice of the misconduct
- Sending a formal letter to the head of the author's or reviewer's department or funding institution
- Formal withdrawal or retraction of the publication in consultation with the head of the department concerned

Imposition of a formal embargo on submissions by a specific person for a defined period of time.

---

## DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF AUTHORS

### Fees

No separate publication fees are charged for submitting or publishing contributions. Only conference fees are charged for participation in the Symposium for Foresight and Technology Planning. There are currently four price categories: Research Track: €800 (plus VAT), Visitors: €500 (plus VAT), Industry Track: €400 (plus VAT), Members of the program committee.

All information on the currently applicable fees will be published transparently on the official symposium website before the submission of contributions. The fee structure is subject to change until the opening of the call for contributions.

### Reporting standards

Authors of articles should provide an accurate representation of the work performed and an objective discussion of its significance. The underlying data must be accurately reproduced in the article. An article should contain sufficient detail and references to enable others to reproduce the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

## Data access and retention

Authors may be asked to provide raw data and must be prepared to make it publicly available (in accordance with the ALPSP-STM Statement). The data must be stored for an appropriate period of time.

## References, originality, and plagiarism

Authors must ensure that their work is original and that all content used from others has been correctly cited and acknowledged. Any use of another person's materials, data, or ideas without proper attribution—whether through copying, paraphrasing, or adopting research results—is considered plagiarism. Plagiarism in any form is unethical and unacceptable.

Information obtained from confidential sources or in the course of confidential services—such as private conversations, the review of contributions, works, or funding applications by other persons or authors—may not be used or published without the express written permission of the persons concerned.

Authors are responsible for ensuring that their contributions are free of plagiarism and that the rights of others are appropriately respected.

## Use of AI

The use of AI is permitted exclusively as a supporting tool (e.g., for linguistic optimization, formatting, or graphic design). The scientific substance, including hypothesis formation, methodology, interpretation, and conclusions, must be developed independently by the author. The use of AI must be made transparent, specifying the tools used and their specific contributions. Automated generation of content without the author's own intellectual contribution is not permitted.

## Multiple or concurrent publications

An article should not be submitted to multiple publication media at the same time. Simultaneous submission of the same article to more than one publication medium constitutes unethical publication behavior. In general, an author should not submit a paper that has already been published for publication in another publication medium.

Copyright remains with the authors, allowing them to decide on any republication of their work. The primary reference must be cited in the secondary publication.

## Authorship

Only individuals who have contributed significantly to the conception, execution, or interpretation of the work are considered authors. All contributors must be listed as co-authors. The corresponding author must ensure that all co-authors approve the final version and support the submission. A declaration of consent from the authors must be submitted to the editorial office before the article is published.

## Conflicts of interest

All potential conflicts of interest (e.g. employment, consulting activities, share ownership, fees, paid expert statements, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other financing, etc.)

must be disclosed as early as possible, as must the role of funding institutions or financial backers (e.g., in study design, data collection, analysis, and publication decisions).

### **Fundamental errors in published works**

If an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, they are obliged to notify the editors of the conference proceedings or the publisher immediately and to cooperate with the editor to withdraw or correct the work. If the editor or publisher learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error, the author is obligated to immediately correct or withdraw the article or provide the editor with evidence of the accuracy of the original article.

---

## **DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE REVIEWERS**

### **Contribution to decision making**

Reviewers support editors in their decision-making and help authors improve their work.

### **Promptness**

Any selected reviewer who does not feel sufficiently qualified or who is unable to complete the review within the specified time frame is obliged to inform the publisher immediately and, if necessary, withdraw from the review process.

### **Confidentiality**

All manuscripts received for review must be treated confidentially. They may not be shown to others or discussed with them unless the editor has expressly approved this.

### **Objectivity**

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly and with sound arguments.

### **References**

Reviewers should identify relevant literature that has not been cited and point out any plagiarism or overlap in content with known publications.

### **Conflicts of interest**

Unpublished content may not be used without the authors' consent. Reviewers may not review submissions in which they have conflicts of interest due to competitive, cooperative, or other relationships or connections to any of the authors, companies, or institutions associated with the work.

Last updated: January 2026