



Supplementary Clause on Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement for *Robot*

Duties of Authors

1. An author should present an accurate and complete account of the research performed, absolutely avoid deception, including the data collected or used, data fabrication and selective report.
2. An author should submit an original work, which is either previously unpublished or currently under no consideration to any other publications. Plagiarism in any form is unacceptable and is considered as a serious breach of professional conduct. Using of someone else's prior ideas, methods, or results should be indicated and cited clearly.
3. The co-authors and their affiliations of a paper should be all those who have made significant scientific contributions to the work reported and who share responsibility and accountability for the results. The authors' arrangement should be based on their contributions to the work. The inclusion of inappropriate co-authors and affiliations is absolutely unacceptable. Other contributions should be indicated in a footnote or an "Acknowledgment" section.
4. The funding source except for secret projects should be indicated very clearly and accurately in the paper. Any indication of irrelevant funding source is unacceptable.
5. Simultaneous submission to different journals is unacceptable. This applies to the entire period in which a manuscript is under *Robot* review. The submission to any other journals before receiving rejection from *Robot* is unacceptable.
6. All manuscripts must be peer-reviewed. Author is obligated to provide any kinds of data and materials required.

Duties of Reviewers

1. A reviewer should treat a manuscript sent for review as a confidential document. It should neither be shown to nor discussed with others except, in special cases, to persons from whom

specific advice may be sought; in that case, the identities of those consulted should be disclosed to the editor.

2. A reviewer of a manuscript should judge objectively the quality of the complete manuscript and the supporting information with due regard to the maintenance of high scientific and literary standards. A reviewer should respect the intellectual independence of the authors.

3. A reviewer should be sensitive to the appearance of a conflict of interest when the manuscript under review is closely related to the reviewer's work in progress or published. If in doubt, the reviewer should return the manuscript promptly without review, advising the editor the conflict of interest or bias.

4. A reviewer should be alert to failure of authors to cite relevant work by other scientist, bearing in mind the complaints that the reviewer's own research was insufficiently cited may seem self-serving.

Duties of Editors

1. Editors have the sole responsibility for acceptance and rejection of a manuscript. A manuscript may be rejected without external review if considered by the editors to be inappropriate for the journal. Such rejections may be based on the failure of the manuscript to fit the scope of the journal, to be of current or sufficiently broad interest, to be written in acceptable Chinese etc.

2. An editor should give unbiased consideration to all manuscripts offered for publication, judging each on its merits without regard to sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the authors.

3. Editorial responsibility and authority for any manuscript authored by an editor and submitted to the editor's journal should be delegated to some other qualified editor. Editorial consideration of the manuscript in any way or form by the author-editor would constitute a conflict of interest, and is therefore improper.

4. All manuscripts should be double-blind peer reviewed. Reviewers are unaware of the identity of the authors, and authors are also unaware of the identity of reviewers. There are at least two or more reviewers for each manuscript.