

Journal policy

Concept, aim and objectives

The concept. To create an effective professionally-oriented information resource for integrating knowledge and experience of scientists and practitioners in the field of medicine. To make the expert opinion of specialists in demand when making decisions in medicine and the healthcare system.

Aim. To increase the medical, social and economic efficiency of the functioning of the healthcare system, as well as the quality of medical and preventive care provided to the population by using the journal's publications on optimal organizational and methodological forms and new medical technologies. To serve as a link between specialists in different fields, providing information that allows the doctor to stay abreast of the most important trends in related fields in medicine. To focus on research and approaches that are of the greatest practical importance for improving the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of diseases.

Tasks

1. Rapid and reliable dissemination of the results of theoretical and clinical original research among the medical community.
2. Assisting doctors of various specialties to keep abreast of the latest achievements not only in their specialty, but also in related disciplines.
3. Fostering scientific dialogue and discussions: publishing comments and letters to the editor, allowing to criticize, clarify and develop the ideas published in the journal.
4. Informing readers about non-clinical aspects of medicine, including relevant philosophical, ethical, sociological and economic issues.
5. Maintaining high ethical standards of medical journalism.
6. Striving for the Medical Journal to meet international requirements.

The editorial board:

- follows the principle of editorial freedom and consistently pursues an independent policy in selecting materials for publication based on relevance, originality and scientific validity, rather than the commercial success of the journal;
- constantly improves the editorial policy of the journal, aiming to better meet the needs of readers and authors;
- takes all available measures to ensure the high quality of the published material, working closely with authors and reviewers;

- guarantees the possibility of publishing materials reflecting different points of view, is ready to admit mistakes and, if necessary, publish corrections, clarifications, refutations and apologies.

Main journal sections

head editor's page

Review articles

Original scientific publications

To help a practicing doctor

To the young scientist

Public health and healthcare

A case from clinical practice

History of medicine

Frequency: quarterly (No. 1 – January, No. 2 – April, No. 3 – July, No. 4 – October)

Open Access Policy

The Medical Journal provides immediate open access to its content by supporting the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI). Free open access to the journal's resources on the Internet allows users to read, distribute, copy, print, referring to the full texts of documents. And also to use materials published in the journal for any other legitimate purpose without first obtaining permission from the publisher or the author, with mandatory preservation of references to the authors of the work and the original publication in this journal.

Archiving

The full texts of the Medical Journal can be found:

- on the journal's website in the Archive section;
- on the website of the Scientific Electronic Library eLibrary.RU – the largest Russian information and analytical portal in the field of science, technology, medicine and education;
- Cyberleninka– a scientific electronic library based on the paradigm of open science, whose main objectives are the popularization of science and scientific activity, public quality control of scientific publications, the development of interdisciplinary research, a modern institute of scientific review, increasing the citation of Russian science and building a knowledge infrastructure;
- in the unified industry database with open access "Russian Medicine. Magazines and articles" (RusMED);
- on the website of the National Library of Belarus, the main universal scientific library of the Republic of Belarus.

Reviewing

General provisions

The editorial board of the Medical Journal adheres to the recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) and the Council of Science Editors (CSE) when handling manuscripts, reviewers and the organizing of the review process.

The editorial board manages all the editorial content of the journal and the timing of its publication. The founders cannot interfere with the evaluation, selection, planning, or editing of individual articles either directly or by creating an environment that influences decision-making.

The editorial board bases its decisions based on the reliability of the published materials and their importance to readers, rather than on commercial or other interests, and has the right to express critical views on all aspects of medicine.

The head editor has the final say in making decisions about which sponsored content the journal will host, as well as in the use of the journal's brand and in relation to potential commercial use of the journal's content.

The review is performed free of charge

The decision on the choice of a reviewer is made by the scientific editor, coordinating with the head editor if necessary.

Type of review

The manuscripts submitted to the editorial office of the Medical Journal are subject to double-blind review. This means that the author and the reviewer do not know each other's names and places of work, and all correspondence is conducted through the editor of the Medical Journal. Letters and editorial articles are subject to unilateral peer review.

Review period

The review process takes from 1 to 3 months. This period includes time for initial review of the manuscript, selection of reviewers, time for review preparation, time for revision of the article by the author, re-review and involvement of additional experts.

Review progress

Each article is sent to at least two experts. If different opinions about the manuscript are received, a third expert may be involved. The presence of negative reviews is not a sufficient reason for refusing to publish the manuscript. In such case, the manuscript is submitted for consideration by the editorial board, taking into account the recommendations of the reviewers. The final decision

on the publication of the manuscript is made by the head editor. Based on the results of the review, the editor of the journal informs the author about one of the following decisions:

1. Accept the manuscript for publication. In this case, the manuscript will be scheduled in one of the issues of the journal and handed over to the editor for further work. The author will be notified of the publication date.

2. Accept for publication after correcting the shortcomings noted by the reviewer. In this case, the author will be asked to make the changes indicated by the reviewer to the manuscript within two weeks. In case of elimination of deficiencies or justified refusal to make changes, the manuscript is accepted for publication.

3. Accept for publication after correcting the shortcomings noted by the reviewer and re-reviewing. In this case, the author will be asked to make the changes indicated by the reviewer to the manuscript within two weeks. The manuscript will be sent for re-review. The author will receive the final decision on the manuscript within 30 days.

4. Reject. In this case, a reasoned refusal to publish the manuscript will be sent to the author. The rejection does not prohibit the authors from further submitting manuscripts to the Medical Journal, however, if publication is refused due to gross violations on the part of the author, the head editor may decide to blacklist the author. In this case, other articles by this author will not be considered.

The editorial board of the Medical Journal provides for three rounds of peer review. This means that after the first decision to finalize the article, the author has two attempts to make changes based on the reviewer's recommendation or a reasoned rejection of them. If, after the third round of review, the expert sends comments again, the editor of the journal will suggest to the author to consider the possibility of publishing this article in another journal or to submit the article again for review with the amendments after six months.

If the author does not plan to finalize the manuscript, he must notify the editorial board of the journal. Work on the manuscript will be terminated. If the authors do not return the revised version within one month from the date the review was sent, even if there is no information from the authors with a refusal to finalize the manuscript, the editorial board removes it from consideration due to the expiration of the deadline for revision. In such situations, the authors are notified accordingly by email.

If the author has a conflict of interest with an expert who could potentially be a reviewer of the manuscript, he must notify the editor of the journal. The editorial board of the journal will select another reviewer, if necessary. There may be a conflict between the author and the reviewer during

the review process. In this case, the editor of the journal has the right to appoint a new reviewer and involve the head editor to resolve the dispute.

The Medical Journal may publish articles by the head editor and members of the editorial board, but there should be no abuse of office. External experts are involved to resolve contradictions and conflict situations. The editorial board does not exempt any scientists from reviewing the manuscript, regardless of their status. Copies of the reviews are kept in the editorial office for at least 3 years.

The composition of the reviewers

The review of incoming manuscripts involves experts with experience in the relevant scientific field and publications on the subject of the reviewed manuscript over the past 3 years.

Principles of reviewer selection and editorial actions to ensure high quality expertise

The editorial board of the Medical Journal carries out regular work to attract recognized experts in the field of theoretical and practical medicine to work on the journal. Reviewers are invited to collaborate with the journal on the recommendation of the head editor and members of the editorial board.

New reviewers

The first reviews of new reviewers are evaluated as follows:

- Has the importance of the issue raised in the study been commented on?
- Is the originality of the study assessed?
- Have the strengths and weaknesses of the study (study design, data collection and analysis) been identified?
- Are there any useful comments regarding the language and structure of the article, tables and figures?
- Are the reviewer's comments constructive?
- Did the reviewer provide arguments to substantiate the comments?
- Has the interpretation of the research results been commented on?
- The quality of the review as a whole.

If the quality of the review does not satisfy the editorial board, cooperation with the reviewer is terminated.

Confidentiality

The editorial board of the Medical Journal does not share the personal data of reviewers and authors. Any manuscript is considered by the editorial board of the journal as a confidential document. The editorial board expects that reviewers will not share or discuss the texts of the

manuscripts with third parties without the editor's consent. Reviewers may involve third parties to work on the review with the editor's consent.

Responsibility of the reviewer

By agreeing to review manuscripts for the Medical Journal, the reviewer agrees to follow the journal's policy in evaluating the manuscript, preparing the review, and meeting ethical requirements. The reviewer, like the editor, should strive to ensure the high quality of the materials published in the journal and review the manuscript only if he has sufficient experience in the relevant field and time for a thorough and comprehensive evaluation of the manuscript. The reviewer is obliged to inform the editor about a conflict of interest (personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political, religious). If a conflict or doubts exist, the reviewer must discuss the situation with the editor. The reviewer has the right to refuse to review at any stage of the review process, in this case he is obliged to notify the editorial board.

The reviewer is obliged to refuse reviewing if:

- he is the supervisor or subordinate of the author of the manuscript, as well as the holder of joint grants;
- does not plan to prepare a review, but only wants to get acquainted with the text of the article;
- prepares his own article on a similar topic for publication.

The reviewer is obliged to inform the editor of his intention to review the article and complete the work within the specified period. If he is unable to conduct a review, it is advisable to recommend another expert to the editor. The reviewer cannot use his status for personal purposes and impose links to his works on the authors. All materials received from the editor of the journal are strictly confidential. The reviewer must not share materials to third parties or involve other specialists in reviewing the manuscript without the consent of the editor of the Medical Journal.

Recommendations to reviewers

For the reviewer's convenience, the editorial board of the Medical Journal offers a standard review form, which reflects the questions that the editor needs to know the answers to in order to make a decision on the manuscript. Reviews can be prepared in a free form.

Content and structure of the review

The editorial board of the Medical Journal identifies the following criteria when evaluating a manuscript:

- scientific or methodological novelty;
- originality;
- Ethical and methodical rigor;

- clarity, conciseness, logical and structured presentation;
- reliability of the results;
- relevance according to the objective and subject of the journal;
- reproducibility of results;
- Adequate literature coverage;
- Practical and theoretical significance

Comments for the editor. Conflict of interest describes a real or potential conflict of interest related to the content of the manuscript or with its authors which may lead to a biased conclusion. Confidential comments – This section is intended for comments that will not be shared with the authors. It includes the reviewer's final opinion on the fate of the manuscript, the reviewer's assumptions, the expression of doubts about a possible violation of ethics, as well as recommendations and accompanying comments (e.g., the reviewer may advise the editor to request additional information from the author). The intended decision is usually a brief conclusion on the fate of the manuscript (accept for publication, accept for publication after minor revision, accept for publication after significant revision, reject, reject and invite the author to submit the manuscript for review again).

Comments for the authors. Introductory part – this section describes the main conclusions and the value of the article for readers. The main comments in this section describe the relevance to the goals and objectives of the journal, the level of credibility and ethical conduct. Special comments – the reviewer evaluates sections of the article (abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion) or comments on specific pages, paragraphs, or lines. Recommendations to the author – the reviewer gives recommendations to the author to improve the quality of the manuscript and, possibly, future research. The final comment is a brief description of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript without any additional recommendations.

Criteria for evaluating the manuscript

Compliance with the subject area. You should not waste time reviewing an irrelevant manuscript, regardless of its quality. First of all, it is necessary to determine whether the manuscript corresponds to the subject area of the scientific journal and the interests of its audience.

Validity. Does the research design, scientific methods, structure and content, as well as the depth of analysis meet all the necessary requirements? Does it deviate from the principles of impartial scientific research, and are the research results reproducible? Is the sample under study properly compiled? Has it been analyzed in sufficient detail to summarize the results of the study?

The novelty. Has the conducted research brought something new to the relevant subject area?

Ethics. Does the research meet the requirements of originality? Is there no data manipulation or falsification of results? Has it been approved by the ethics committee (if applicable)? Is it impartial in terms of conflicts of interest? Regardless of the perceived significance of a manuscript is, it cannot be allowed to be published in case of plagiarism or violation of the ethical principles of scientific research, including the concepts of legality, benefit and respect for people.

Evaluation of the manuscript elements. The editorial board of the Medical Journal suggests using the following questions to expedite the process of preparing an expert opinion and provide the most complete information about the article to the editor and the author.

Title. Does the title exactly reflect the content of the manuscript? Will the title attract the readers' attention?

Resume. Is the content of the manuscript presented properly in the summary (structured, with a description of goals, methods, results, and significance)? Are there discrepancies between the resume and the sections of the manuscript? Is it possible to understand a resume without reading the manuscript?

Introduction. Is the introduction concise? Is the purpose of the study and the tasks set clearly defined? Does the author substantiate the relevance and significance of the research based on the literature review? Are the definitions of the terms found in the manuscript given? If the manuscript belongs to the "Original scientific publications" section, is there a clearly formulated hypothesis?

Literature review. How comprehensive and complete is the literature review? Is the search strategy specified (databases used, keywords in Russian and English, as well as time coverage)?

Methods. Are the research methods clearly described? Could another researcher be able to reproduce the obtained results using the proposed methods? Is the choice of research methods (visualization, analytical tools, statistical methods) justified? If the authors make a hypothesis, have methods been developed to reasonably test this hypothesis? How is the study design presented? How does data analysis help achieve this goal?

Results. Are the results of the work clearly explained? Does the order of presentation of results correspond to the order of description of methods? Are the results justified and expected or unexpected? Are there any results that are not preceded by a corresponding description in the Methods section? How accurate and objective is the presentation of the results?

Discussion. Is the discussion informative and concise enough? If a hypothesis has been stated, do the authors report whether it has been confirmed or refuted? If the hypothesis has not

been confirmed, do the authors report whether the question posed in the study has been answered? Are the conclusions of the authors consistent with the results obtained during the study? If unexpected results are obtained, do the authors analyze them appropriately? What is the potential contribution of research to the field of science? Have the results been compared and discussed with similar studies? Do the authors note the limitations of the study? Are there any additional restrictions that should be noted? What is the opinion of the authors about these limitations? The authors' opinion on the direction of future research?

Conclusions. Are the main points of the article presented? Are all the conclusions justified, and are there any conclusions missing from the Discussion section? Are the extrapolations justified, and recommendations are given on the possible use of the proposed research design?

References. Does the list of references correspond to the format of the journal? Are there any bibliographic errors in the list of references? Are the citations to publications from the list of references in the text of the article correct? Are there any important works that are not mentioned, but that should be noted? Are there more links in the article than necessary? Are the cited references relevant and scientific?

Tables. If there are tables in the article, do they correctly reflect the results? Should tables be added to the article (especially in reviews, whose purpose is classification, analysis and synthesis of data)? Are the data presented in the tables processed accordingly and facilitate the perception of information or complicate it?

Figures. Are figures an appropriate choice for the task? Could the results be illustrated in another way? Do the figures and graphs accurately reflect the obtained results? Are the figure and graph captions presented in text format (not as a bitmap image) and do they allow to understand the information without referring back to the manuscript? Are the axes indicated in the graphs and are the units of measurement indicated, and in the case of statistics is the P-value shown?

Disclosure of a conflict of interest (reviewed by the editor, not the reviewers). Is the information about funding and conflicts of interest clearly stated?

Editing reviews

The editorial board of the Medical Journal expects that the reviews will be written in a respectful tone following the rules of the Russian (Belarusian, English) language. It is forbidden to become personal, insult the author, and pointlessly criticize any aspect of the research, language, and style of the manuscript. The editorial board strives to transmit the reviews to the authors in their original form. However, in some cases it may be necessary to edit the text of the review without

losing its meaning (e.g., when combining comments from several experts on the same issue or if there are confidential comments in the review section that are not intended for the author).

The editorial board has the right to send a review for revision to an expert in case of a large number of errors or an unacceptable tone of the review.

Ethics of scientific publications

Editorial ethics is a set of principles and rules that guide the participants in the process of publishing scientific publications (authors, reviewers, editors, publishers, readers) in their interactions.

The editorial office and editorial board are guided in their work by the legal requirements of the legislation of the Republic of Belarus regarding copyright, plagiarism and ethical principles supported by the community of leading publishers of scientific periodicals. They are responsible for the publication of copyrighted works, as well as follow the recommendations of the International Committee for Publication Ethics (COPE).

Head Editor

The most important condition for the normal operation of a scientific medical journal is editorial freedom. The head editor is free to determine the journal's policy, scientific level and quality standards of articles. Founders and publishers make important business decisions, including appointing and dismissing the head editor, but they must not interfere with the content of the journal. Editorial freedom implies that the head editor has a certain position, which is reflected in the form of the concept, main goals and objectives of the editorial office. The head editor puts the interests of readers above all else.

Ethical principles on which the activities of the head editor and the editorial Board are based

The most common ethical issues faced by the head editor of the journal and the editorial board:

- plagiarism and submission of an article to several journals simultaneously;
- authorship issues;
- conflict of interests between the author and the reviewer.

The head editor and the editorial board are responsible for publishing the author's manuscripts, which implies that their activities comply with the following principles:

- When making a decision on publication, they are guided by the reliability of the data presentation and the scientific significance of the work under consideration;

- they must evaluate the intellectual content of the manuscripts regardless of race, gender, religious beliefs, origin, citizenship, social status of the authors;
- unpublished data presented in the manuscript must not be used for personal purposes or shared with third parties without the written consent of the author.;
- information or ideas obtained during editing related to possible benefits must be kept confidential and not used for personal gain.;
- information is not allowed to be published if there is reason to believe that it is plagiarism.;
- together with the publisher, they are obliged not to leave unanswered claims regarding the reviewed manuscripts or published materials, and, if conflict situations are identified, take the necessary measures to restore violated rights.

Conflict of interest

A conflict of interest arises when reviewing a manuscript in cases where its author, reviewer, or editor have their own interests that may influence their judgments. The most important source of conflict of interest is financial relationships with pharmaceutical or medical companies. There may be other reasons, such as personal relationships, academic rivalry, etc.

When submitting an article to the journal, the authors must indicate in their cover letter the existing financial relationships that could lead to a conflict of interest in relation to the work under consideration. The source of research funding must be indicated.

Editors should avoid making decisions in cases where the work under consideration is a source of conflict of interest for them.

The presence of authors, reviewers, and editors' own interests is not an obstacle to the publication of scientific work, however, all parties involved in the process of reviewing and publishing articles must disclose the existence of conflicting interests.

Ethical principles for reviewers

Reviewers conducting scientific examination of copyrighted materials should be guided by the following principles:

- A manuscript received for review is considered as a confidential document that must not be disclosed for review to third parties who do not have the appropriate editorial authority.;
- the reviewer is obliged to give an objective and reasoned assessment of the presented research results.;
- unpublished data obtained from submitted manuscripts must not be used for personal purposes;

- a reviewer who, in his opinion, does not have sufficient qualifications to evaluate the manuscript, or is unable to be objective, must inform the editor with a request to exclude him from the review process of this manuscript.

Reviewers should:

- conduct the review objectively;
- avoid personal criticism of the author, express their views clearly with justifications and references, and declare conflicts of interest as necessary;
- decline to review manuscripts where they have a conflict of interest due to competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with the authors, companies, or institutions;
- maintain the confidentiality of materials submitted for review, and must not discuss unpublished manuscripts with colleagues or use information about them in their work. If the reviewer wishes to delegate the manuscript to a colleague for review, the editor's permission must be obtained.

Ethical principles in the author's work

The author (or the team of authors) is aware of the responsibility for the novelty and reliability of the results of scientific research, which implies adherence to the following principles:

- provide accurate research results, knowingly erroneous or falsified statements are unacceptable;
- ensure that the research results presented in the manuscript are original;
- borrowed fragments or statements in the text of the manuscript should be accompanied by an indication of their author and original source.;
- the contribution of all persons, who influenced the course of the research, must be acknowledged, in particular, the manuscript should contain references to works that were significant during the research.;
- It is unacceptable to send articles submitted to another journal, accepted for review, or published in other publications;
- All individuals who have made a significant contribution to the research (development of the design concept, research format, collection, processing of material, statistical processing, analysis, interpretation of the data obtained), writing and editing of the article must be indicated as co-authors. Individuals who did not participate in the research must not be listed;
- All authors are responsible for the development, writing and editing of the manuscript, for checking the article before submitting it to the editorial board and during editorial and publishing preparation. If the authors discovers significant errors or inaccuracies in the article at the stage of its

review or after publication, it is necessary to notify the editorial board of the journal as soon as possible;

- all co-authors must be familiar with the final version of the text, approve its version before printing the final layout and give permission for printing.;
- if it turns out that the article contains false information and errors, the article was written using plagiarism/fraud, all co-authors share responsibility.

Anti-plagiarism Policy

In order to ensure the high quality of published materials and copyright compliance, articles submitted to the editorial office are checked for plagiarism (the presence of borrowings) through the Anti-Plagiarism system.

Plagiarism is considered to be:

- the use (verbatim quoting) of any materials in any amount without indicating the source;
- the use of images, drawings, photographs, tables, graphs, diagrams and other forms of graphical presentation of information without specifying the source;
- the use of images, drawings, photographs, tables, graphs, diagrams and other forms of graphic presentation of information published in scientific publications without the consent of the copyright holder;
- the use of materials without written permission, the authors or copyright holders of which prohibit their use without special consent.

Articles containing less than 70% of the original author's text are not published in the journal. The editors do not welcome an excessive number of citations, even if they are properly worded. Reviews and other articles that require more citations for objective reasons are reviewed individually.

Article Retraction policy

The editorial board uses the retraction of an article in order to warn readers about duplicate publications, plagiarism, concealment conflicts of interest, and provision of inaccurate data that could affect the interpretation of the data or recommendations for its use.

Grounds for retraction:

- detection of plagiarism in a publication;
- duplication of articles in various journals;
- detection of serious errors in the article (incorrect interpretation of the results, etc.), which casts doubt on its scientific value;
- detection of falsifications or fabrications in the text of the article;

- incorrect composition of the authors (inclusion of persons who do not meet the criteria of authorship);

- Conflicts of interest and other violations of publication ethics;
- re-publication of the article, carried out without the author's consent.

Retraction of an article can be initiated by:

- the author of the article;
- the editorial board of the another journal;
- persons involved in a conflict of interest in the presence of evidence of violations of scientific ethics by the author of the article;
- the editorial board of the journal upon discovery of violations of scientific ethics by the author of the article.

The retraction of articles is as follows:

1. After a request from the author or another person who provided facts of violations of scientific ethics in an article, the editorial board of the journal appoints a commission to conduct an investigation based on the available facts and verifies the ethics of the publication.

2. Having decided to retract the article, the editorial board indicates the reason for the retraction (in case of plagiarism, indicating the sources of borrowing) and the date of the retraction in the meeting minutes.

3. In order to add information to the database of retracted articles, the Council on Ethics of Scientific Publications is provided with a protocol indicating the date of the meeting, the result of the examination, an informed decision and a completed form:

- Full name of the author and the title of the article;
- the publication from which the text is being retracted;
- initiator of the retraction;
- grounds for the retraction of the article and the date of the decision;
- link to the page on the publication's website that contains information about retraction;
- output data of the DOI article (if available);
- Subject area (medical sciences, biological sciences, etc.).

4. Information about the retracted texts is transmitted to the scientific information databases.

Upon receiving a retraction request, information about the article and the full text remain on elibrary.ru and in CyberLeninka, but are supplemented with retraction information. The retracted articles and links from them are excluded from the RSCI and are not included in the calculation of indicators.

5. In case of serious moral damage to the parties to the conflict of interests, information about the fact of violation of scientific ethics may be transmitted at the author's place of work.

6. The editorial board reserves the right to decide on further cooperation with the authors of the retracted articles (complete refusal to cooperate for a certain period of time, additional examination of articles if cooperation is resumed).

Informed consent. Human and animal rights

In its work, the scientific and practical journal Medical Journal is based on the provisions of the Helsinki Declaration of the World Medical Association (WMA Declaration of Helsinki "Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects") and strives to ensure compliance with ethical standards and rules for data collection for research conducted with human participants.

Medical research involving humans must conform to generally accepted scientific principles and be based on a thorough knowledge of scientific literature, other relevant sources of information, on the results of appropriately conducted laboratory tests, as well as, where applicable, animal studies. It is also necessary to show humanity towards the animals used in the research.

Before starting the research, the scientist should familiarize himself with the provisions on informed consent of the Helsinki Declaration and conduct the research in strict accordance with the principles set out below (provisions of the Helsinki Declaration, paragraphs 25-32):

25. The participation of individuals capable of giving informed consent as subjects of the study should be voluntary. Although it may be appropriate consultation to consult family members or community, no individual capable giving informed consent may be enrolled in a research unless they have given their own voluntary consent.

26. In a medical research involving individuals capable of giving informed consent as research subjects, each potential subject must receive sufficient information about the goals, methods, sources of funding, any possible conflicts of interest, affiliation to any organizations, expected benefits and potential risks, and inconveniences that may arise as a result of participating in the study, the conditions in force after the end of the study, as well as any other significant aspects of the study. A potential research subject should be informed of their right to refuse to participate in the study or to withdraw their consent to participate at any time without any adverse consequences for themselves.

27. When obtaining informed consent to participate in a research study, a doctor must be particularly cautious if the potential subject is in a dependent position with the doctor or may consent under pressure. In such cases, informed consent must be obtained by a person who has the appropriate qualifications and is completely independent of such a relationship.

28. If a potential research subject is a person who is unable to give informed consent, the doctor must obtain the informed consent of his legal representative. Such individuals must not be included in a research that are not likely to benefit them, except in cases where such research is conducted in order to improve the provision of medical care to a group of people of which the potential subject is a representative, cannot be replaced by research on individuals, and is associated only with minimal risks and inconveniences.

29. If a potential subject who is deemed unable to give informed consent is nevertheless able to express his own attitude towards participating in the research, the doctor must request his opinion in addition to the consent of his legal representative. The potential subject's disagreement should be taken into account.

30. Research involving subjects who are physically or mentally incapable of giving consent, for example, unconscious patients, may be conducted only if the physical or mental condition that prevents giving informed consent is a necessary characteristic of the research group. In such circumstances, the doctor must seek informed consent from the legally authorized representative. If no such representative is available and if the research cannot be delayed, the study may proceed without informed consent provided that the specific reasons for involving subjects with a condition that renders them unable to give informed consent are stated in the research protocol and the study has been approved by a research ethics committee. Consent to remain in the research must be obtained as soon as possible from the subject or a legally authorized representative.

31. The doctor must provide the patient with complete information about which aspects of the treatment relate to the ongoing study. The patient's refusal to participate in the research or the decision to withdraw from the study must not affect his relationship with the doctor.

32. For medical research using identifiable human material or data, such as research on material or data contained in biobanks or similar repositories, physicians must seek informed consent for its collection, storage, and/or reuse. There may be exceptional situations where consent would be impossible or impractical to obtain for such research. In such situations, the research may be done only after consideration and approval of a research ethics committee.

When presenting the results of experimental studies on humans, the authors must indicate whether the procedures performed complied with the ethical standards prescribed in the Helsinki Declaration. If the research was conducted without taking into account the principles of the Declaration, the authors must justify the chosen approach to conducting the research and ensure that the ethics committee of the organization in which the research was conducted approved the chosen approach.

Ethical aspects of the use of animals in medical research

When describing animal experiments, the authors are required to include information in the article on the compliance of the maintenance and use of laboratory animals during research with international, national and ethical animal treatment regulations of the institution in which the work was performed.

About using artificial intelligence-based services

Due to the increasing use of the programs based on artificial intelligence (AI), including in the preparation, writing and reviewing of scientific articles, the editorial board of the journal "Medical Journal" considers it necessary to focus the attention of authors and reviewers on the following points:

1. Responsibility and authorship

The responsibility for the content of the manuscript, including the accuracy of the data, the correctness of citations and compliance with ethical standards, lies entirely with the authors, regardless of the use of generative AI tools (capable of creating new content). The authors guarantee that the final text of the manuscript is original and reflects the result of the research conducted by the authors.

AI-chatbots such as ChatGPT and similar tools cannot be listed as authors of the article or contributors to the preparation of the manuscript. AI-based programs do not meet the criteria of authorship, as they cannot take responsibility for the content of the work, cannot declare a conflict of interest or manage copyrights.

2. Personal control and reliability

When using AI tools as auxiliary tools for text editing, literature search, data analysis and visualization, or idea generation, users must provide personal control at all stages of manuscript preparation, carefully verifying all AI-generated outputs, including facts, citations, and analytical conclusions for compliance with the relevance of the data and accepted scientific standards. AI can be used to generate images (diagrams) illustrating processes, concepts, and mechanisms of action. It is forbidden to use AI to generate actual research results or modify images obtained during the study.

3. Transparency and disclosure of information

Authors must indicate the use of generative AI tools when submitting a manuscript, including the title, program version, and purpose of use (text editing, data analysis, and summary of the manuscript). This information can be omitted if non-generative AI was used, or there was no significant modification to the content of the manuscript when using generative AI, for example:

- Basic grammar checking tools were used;
- only a few words that did not change the general meaning were replaced in the text of the manuscript.;
- the literature was searched using AI without its interpretation and data synthesis;
- the order and format of literature sources were adjusted;
- general image editing was performed without modification (cropping, contrast enhancement, etc.).

The editorial board may request additional information on the use of AI to comply with ethical standards.

4. rights Protection and confidentiality

Authors and reviewers must ensure that the AI tools used are:

- comply with the personal data protection and confidentiality requirements;
- do not violate the rights of third parties, including intellectual property and data confidentiality;
- they do not assign rights to the content created by the authors and do not use it to train AI models without the user's consent.

By submitting material created using AI, the authors guarantee that they have the right to use generative content under the terms of AI licenses.

5. Technical control by the editorial staff

The editorial board uses specialized tools such as the Anti-Plagiarism system module to identify AI-generated texts. Manuscripts containing improper use of AI may be rejected or sent back for revision.

6. Compliance with international standards and best practices

The editorial board of the Medical Journal supports the position of the international publishing community and the best practices presented in the following documents:

- GOST 71657-2024 "On the use of artificial intelligence technologies in the creation of scientific publications."
- World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) "Chatbots, Generative AI, and Scholarly Manuscripts".
- International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) "Recommendations, Part II, paragraph A4".
- The editorial policy of Wiley and Springer Nature publishers regarding the principles of using AI in scientific publications.

Publication fee

The journal does not charge publication fees.