



ADVANCING STANDARDS
TRANSFORMING MARKETS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS (COP) PROCEDURE AND POLICIES Updated April 2025

CONTENTS

1. PROCEDURES

1.1 Procedures for Journals

1.2 Procedures for Books (Manuals, Monographs, Data Series, and other non-STP or compilation books)

1.3 Procedures for STPs (Selected Technical Papers)

1.4 Technical Reports (TRs)

2. POLICIES

2.1 Previously Published Material

2.2 Policy on Plagiarism

2.3 Review Policies

2.4 STPs (Selected Technical Papers)

2.5 Journals

2.5.7 Special Issue Policies

2.6 Author Name Change Policy

2.7 Publication Ethics Policy

2.8 Correction and Retraction Policies

2.9 Authorship Policy

2.10 Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

2.11 Conflicts of Interest

2.12 Data Availability Statement

3. AWARDS

3.1 Award for Excellence in (Symposium Planning and) Publication Management

3.2 Outstanding Article in the *Journal of Testing and Evaluation*

3.3 Outstanding Practice Article in the *Geotechnical Testing Journal*

3.4 Charles B. Dudley Award

3.5 Outstanding Article in *Advances in Civil Engineering Materials*

3.6 Award for Outstanding Editorial Board Member for *Advances in Civil Engineering Materials*

4. CONTACTS

1. PROCEDURES

1.1 Procedures for Journals

1.1.1 Review Process:

1.1.1.1 A minimum of two peer reviewers will be identified for each paper by the designated Editorial Board Member (EBM), Editor, or Guest Editor. The journal Editor shall not be one of the two reviewers.

1.1.1.2 To safeguard against potential bias, the EBM should attempt to locate reviewers who do not share the same affiliation as the authors.

1.1.1.3 During the submission process, authors may choose to note recommended reviewers or opposed reviewers. These recommended or opposed reviewers should be entered with institutional email addresses wherever possible. Authors should be prepared to provide details as to why these reviewers are recommended or opposed.

1.1.1.4 Editorial Board Members may invite one author-recommended reviewer if they have first researched the individual and concluded that they are an appropriate reviewer for the paper. No more than one of the two required reviews can come from an author-recommended reviewer.

1.1.1.5 A single-blind review process is used. Once all of the reviewers' comments are received, they are sent to the designated Editor who is given 10 days to make a recommendation.

NOTE: The designated EBM or Editor may also request additional reviews as warranted.

1.1.1.6 After 10 days, the reviewers' comments and any additional comments provided by the designated Editor are sent to the author requesting revision of the paper accordingly.

NOTE: If the designated Editor does not respond within 10 days, the reviewers' comments are forwarded to the author for revision in accordance with their recommendations.

1.1.1.7 When a reviewer recommends material be "Rejected", the designated Editor considers all of the reviewers' comments and makes a recommendation based on those reviews.

Reviews are not required for revised papers; however, if a reviewer's overall recommendation for a paper is Reject or Mandatory Revisions, they will be invited to review the revised paper.

NOTE: ASTM journal Editors have the right to reject papers without input from a Committee on Publications (COP) representative as long as no conflict of interest exists.

1.1.1.8 An author of a paper that has been rejected for publication may submit a written appeal to the Chair of COP. The appeal must provide clearly a basis for reconsideration of the rejected paper.

1.1.1.9 The Chair of COP is responsible for assuring that all appeals are handled professionally, fairly and in accordance with the policies of COP and ASTM.

NOTE: In cases where the Chair of COP is also the designated Editor, Guest Editor, author, or reviewer, the Vice Chair of COP will be responsible for the appeal.

1.1.1.10 The ASTM staff will provide copies of the appeal to the designated Editor and Guest Editor (if any) that handled the rejected paper, for their review and comment.

1.1.1.11 COP cannot adjudicate issues of a technical nature. In cases where the appeal is based on technical issues, the judgment of the designated Editor and Guest Editor should be given preference. It may be advisable to seek advice from the appropriate ASTM technical committee(s) in special cases.

1.1.1.12 In cases where the judgment of reviewers is questioned, it may be appropriate to use additional reviewers to settle the issue. In general, the original reviewers should not be contacted or involved with the appeal.

1.1.1.13 The following actions on appeal are possible:

(1) Rejection Confirmed. The basis of the appeal is not convincing and the decision to reject the paper is upheld.

(2) Rejection Overturned. The basis of the appeal is convincing, and the paper is found to be acceptable. Revision of the paper may also be recommended before it is acceptable.

1.1.1.14 The Chair of COP shall communicate the decision to the author(s).

1.1.1.15 The appeal procedure shall not delay publication significantly of a group of papers as in the case of Special Issues.

NOTE: A Special Issue is a collection of journal papers on a topic. These may have been solicited by an EBM or journal Editor.

1.1.2 Previously Published Material—If an exception is made to COP policy regarding previously published material, all necessary waivers of copyright must be obtained by the author and submitted in writing to ASTM and cited in the publication with the copyright holder's permission.

1.2 Procedures for Books (Manuals, Monographs, Data Series and other non STP or compilation books)

1.2.1 Proposal Review:

1.2.1.1 Proposals are routinely submitted for consideration for publication by ASTM. Some are unsolicited, and many are initiated by the staff based on market considerations. A representative from COP will be assigned to each book proposal that is submitted to ASTM for consideration. The procedure for determining the acceptability of a publication or other product is as follows:

1.2.1.2 ASTM staff reviews each proposal for completeness and conducts a feasibility analysis.

1.2.1.3 The proposal may be sent to reviewers if input is needed to complete the feasibility analysis.

1.2.1.4 The proposal will be sent to a representative from COP for the following considerations:

(1) Will the proposed book or product be an asset to ASTM?

(2) Are there any areas of concern regarding COP policies regarding commercialism or apparent liability?

(3) Is there a balance of coverage for the proposed topic?

(4) Does the proposed plan for peer review seem adequate for the topic?

1.2.1.5 The proposal will be sent to an appropriate technical committee for sponsorship (see Committee Sponsorship for a Proposal, Item 1.2.2).

1.2.1.6 If all phases listed above are positive, the ASTM staff will prepare an agreement for the author/editor/product developer.

1.2.1.7 A schedule is determined, and development begins.

1.2.1.8 The original submission is checked by the staff to determine if the product delivered is what was proposed.

1.2.1.9 The peer review is conducted.

1.2.1.10 If any reviewer recommends rejection, the representative from COP will be asked to consider the comments. He or she may be asked to confer with the reviewers and/or the Chair of the sponsoring technical committee to make a final recommendation regarding the acceptability of the material. Procedures 1.1.1.5 through 1.1.1.12 apply.

1.2.1.11 The revised document, when satisfactory, is edited in ASTM style.

1.2.2 Committee Sponsorship of a Proposal:

1.2.2.1 Book proposals are routinely submitted for consideration for publication by ASTM. It is the policy of ASTM to review proposals prior to receipt of the manuscript by:

- (1) Conducting a feasibility analysis to ensure that such products are not a drain on the Society,
- (2) Obtaining support from a representative from COP to ensure no policies of COP are compromised, and
- (3) Obtaining "sponsorship" from an appropriate technical committee.

1.2.2.2 Committee sponsorship includes, but is not limited to:

- (1) Reviewing the proposal to determine that the nature and scope of the proposal is consistent with the goals of the committee.
- (2) Suggesting additions to or deletions from the proposal based on technical grounds, as necessary.
- (3) Reviewing the plan for peer review (at least 2 peer reviewers) and adding committee members to the review panel, if desired.

1.2.2.3 If, based on the proposal, the committee agrees to sponsor the project; the ASTM staff will enter into an agreement with the author with appropriate milestones, for example:

- (1) The first draft must be suitable for peer review (consistent with the proposal and written within ASTM's standards for professional, technical writing), and
- (2) The peer review process must be satisfied (all mandatory and/or rejection comments thoroughly resolved via peer reviewers and/or a COP arbitrator).
- (3) If these milestones are not to the satisfaction of ASTM, the agreement with the author will be terminated.
- (4) If the committee should object to sponsoring the project, sound technical reasons must be provided.

1.2.2.4 If the committee does not want to commit time to the project but agrees the proposal is technically sound, COP may sponsor the project.

1.2.2.5 The ASTM staff will communicate the decision to the author.

1.2.3 Review Process:

1.2.3.1 A single-blind review process is used. A minimum of two peer reviewers will be identified for each chapter.

1.2.3.2 Once all of the reviewers' comments are received, they are sent to the book Editor who is given 10 days to make a recommendation.

NOTE: The Editor may also request additional reviews as warranted.

1.2.3.3 After 10 days, the reviewers' comments and any additional comments provided by the Editor are sent to the author requesting revision of the paper accordingly.

NOTE: If the Editor does not respond within 10 days, the reviewers' comments are forwarded to the author for revision in accordance with their recommendations.

1.2.3.4 When a reviewer recommends material be rejected, the Editor and representative from COP together consider all of the reviewers' comments and make a joint recommendation based on those reviews.

1.2.3.5 An author of a book or chapter that has been rejected for publication may submit a written appeal to the Chair of COP. The appeal must clearly provide a basis for reconsideration of the rejected material.

1.2.3.6 The Chair of COP is responsible for ensuring that all appeals are handled fairly and according to the policies of COP and ASTM.

NOTE: In cases where the Chair of COP is also the Book Editor or Author, chapter author, or reviewer, the Vice Chair of COP will be responsible for the appeal.

1.2.3.7 The ASTM staff will provide copies of the appeal to the Book Editor or Author that handled the rejected material, for their review and comment.

1.2.3.8 COP cannot adjudicate issues of a technical nature. In cases where the appeal is based on technical issues, the judgment of the Book Editor or Author should be given preference. It may be advisable to seek advice from the appropriate ASTM technical committee(s) in special cases.

1.2.3.9 In cases where the judgment of reviewers is questioned it may be appropriate to use additional reviewers to settle the issue. In general, the original reviewers should not be contacted or involved with appeal.

1.2.3.10 The following actions on appeal are possible:

(1) Rejection Confirmed. The basis of the appeal is not convincing and the decision to reject the book or chapter is upheld.

(2) Rejection Overturned. The basis of the appeal is convincing, and the book or chapter is found to be acceptable. Revision of the book or chapter may also be recommended before it is acceptable.

1.2.3.11 The Chair of COP shall communicate the decision to the author(s).

1.2.3.12 The appeal procedure shall not significantly delay publication of a book as in the case of multi-authored books.

1.2.4 Previously Published Material:

If an exception is made to COP policy regarding previously published material, all necessary waivers of copyright must be obtained by the author and submitted in writing to ASTM and cited in the publication with the copyright holder's permission.

1.3 Procedures for STPs (Selected Technical Papers)

1.3.1 COP Review of Calls for Papers and Abstracts:

1.3.1.1 Under the current procedures, COP representatives are involved in the peer review process if papers are rejected by a reviewer. They are also required to approve publication of any STP when there are less than the minimum of ten papers required for publication.

1.3.1.2 The Symposia Manager will send the Call for Papers draft to the Publishing Manager, who will forward it to the COP rep for review. The COP rep will return comments to the Publishing Manager within 5–7 days. The Publishing Manager will share the comments with Symposia Manager and the STP Chairs.

1.3.1.3 The Symposia Manager will also send the Symposium Chair's selected abstracts to the Publishing Manager, who will then send them to the COP rep. The COP rep will review the abstracts and send feedback to the Publishing Manager within 5–7 days. The Publishing Manager will notify the Symposia Manager which abstracts were approved by COP and note any comments of concern. The Symposia Manager can then send the acceptance letters to authors.

1.3.2 Review Process:

1.3.2.1 A minimum of two peer reviewers will be identified for each paper by the designated STP Editor. The designated Editor shall not be one of the two reviewers.

1.3.2.2 Once all of the reviewers' comments are received, they are sent to the designated Editor who is given 10 days to make a recommendation.

NOTE: The designated STP Editor may also request additional reviews as warranted.

1.3.2.3 After 10 days, the reviewers' comments and any additional comments provided by the designated Editor are sent to the author requesting revision of the paper accordingly.

NOTE: If the designated Editor does not respond within 10 days, the reviewers' comments are forwarded to the author for revision in accordance with their recommendations.

1.3.2.4 When a reviewer recommends material should be rejected, the designated Editor and the representative from COP consider all of the reviewers' comments and make a joint recommendation based on those reviews.

1.3.2.5 An author of a paper that has been rejected for publication may submit a written appeal to the Chair of COP. The appeal must clearly provide a basis for reconsideration of the rejected material.

1.3.2.6 The Chair of COP is responsible for assuring that all appeals are handled fairly and according to the policies of COP and ASTM.

NOTE: In cases where the Chair of COP is also the Book Editor, chapter author, or reviewer, the Vice Chair of COP will be responsible for the appeal.

1.3.2.7 The ASTM staff will provide copies of the appeal to the Book Editor that handled the rejected material, for their review and comment.

1.3.2.8 COP cannot adjudicate issues of a technical nature. In cases where the appeal is based on technical issues, the judgment of the Book Editor should be given preference. It may be advisable to seek advice from the appropriate ASTM technical committee(s) in special cases.

1.3.2.9 In cases where the judgment of reviewers is questioned it may be appropriate to use additional reviewers to settle the issue. In general, the original reviewers should not be contacted or involved with appeal.

1.3.2.10 The following actions on appeal are possible:

- (1) Rejection Confirmed. The basis of the appeal is not convincing and the decision to reject the paper is upheld.
- (2) Rejection Overturned. The basis of the appeal is convincing, and the paper is found to be acceptable. Revision of the paper may also be recommended before it is acceptable.

1.3.2.11 The Chair of COP shall communicate the decision to the author(s).

1.3.2.12 The appeal procedure shall not significantly delay publication of a book as in the case of multi-authored books.

1.3.3 Previously Published Material:

If an exception is made to COP policy regarding previously published material, all necessary waivers of copyright shall be obtained by the author and submitted in writing to ASTM and cited in the publication with the copyright holder's permission.

1.4 Technical Reports (TRs)

When a technical committee has a publication need that is not conducive to an ASTM Standard, an Adjunct, a Journal article, Book, etc., the technical committee may prepare a Technical Report (TR). A TR provides guidance and will help committees determine fundamental principles as they work towards the development of standards. TRs are not consensus documents, not balloted, but peer reviewed prior to publication.

A TR is a document that describes the current state, challenges, processes, progress, or research in a specific technical area related to the work of one or more technical committees. It might also include data, recommendations, and conclusions.

ASTM/ISO Technical Reports, per the Additive Manufacturing Partnering Standards Developing Organization (AMPSDO), follow the guidance provided by ISO that relies on TRs as guidance documents.

1.4.1 Procedures for Technical Reports:

Initial contact should be made with a technical committee's Staff Manager or staff representative of a collaborative ASTM related group*, to provide the contact information to the publications team who will provide Author Instructions.

*Example: SMAC (<https://www.astm.org/smartmanufacturing>) or BEAC (<https://sn.astm.org/?q=features/astm-and-beac-jf14.html>) to the ANSI/America Makes AMSC (<https://www.ansi.org/portal/amsc/america-makes-and-ansi-amsc-overview>)

Committee Sponsorship: Each TR will be submitted to the appropriate ASTM Technical Committee, as well as to the COP in all cases of a collaborative ASTM-related group, for sponsorship. If the TR content relates to other ASTM Technical Committees, each of those Technical Committees shall have the opportunity to act as reviewers and oversee the approval of reviews and revised manuscripts in the earliest stages of the TR, e.g., the initial stages and all subsequent stages. If a TR submitted from a collaborative ASTM-related group not involved with an ASTM Committee, the COP shall provide sponsorship.

Committee sponsorship includes, but is not limited to:

- (1) Reviewing the TR to determine that the nature and scope of the TR is consistent with the goals of the ASTM Committee and contacting committees that have an overlap with the TR scope to inquire if they want to serve as a reviewer
- (2) Reviewing the plan for peer review (at least two peer reviewers) and selecting reviewers. [NOTE: This is not required if the publication is balloted by ASTM.] If more than one ASTM Committee has interest, the reviewers of other ASTM Committees must provide their review while the TR is being balloted.
- (3) Overseeing the approval of reviewers' comments and the revised manuscript. [NOTE: This is not required if the publication is balloted by ASTM.]
- (4) If the committee should object to sponsoring the project, the TR will not move forward to publication.

1.4.2 Proposal Review:

1.4.2.1.A representative from COP will be assigned to each TR proposal that is submitted to ASTM for consideration. The procedure for determining the acceptability of a publication or other product is as follows:

1.4.2.2 The proposal will be sent to a representative from COP for the following considerations:

- (1) Are there any areas of concern regarding COP policies regarding commercialism or apparent liability?
- (2) Does the proposed plan for peer review seem adequate for the topic? [NOTE: This is not required if the publication is balloted by ASTM.]

1.4.3 TR Peer Review Process: [NOTE: This is not required if the publication is balloted by ASTM.]

- (1) A single-blind review process is used. A minimum of two peer reviewers will be identified for the TR by the Chair/Designee.
- (2) Once all the reviewers' comments are received, they are sent to the Chair/Designee of the sponsoring committee who is given 10 days to make a recommendation.

NOTE: The Chair/Designee may also request additional reviews as warranted.

- (3) After 10 days, the reviewers' comments and any additional comments provided by the Chair/Designee are sent to the author requesting revision of the paper accordingly.

1.4.3.1 Appeals Process:

- (1) When a reviewer recommends material be rejected, the Chair/Designee and a representative from COP will consider all the reviewers' comments and make a joint recommendation based on those reviews.
- (2) An author of a TR that has been rejected for publication may submit a written appeal to the Chair of COP. The appeal must clearly provide a basis for reconsideration of the rejected material.
- (3) The Chair of COP is responsible for ensuring that all appeals are handled fairly and according to the policies of COP and ASTM.

NOTE: In cases where the Chair of COP is also the author or reviewer, the Vice Chair of COP will be responsible for the appeal.

1.4.3.2 COP cannot adjudicate issues of a technical nature. In cases where the appeal is based on technical issues, the judgment of the Chair/Designee should be given preference. It may be advisable to seek advice from the appropriate ASTM technical committee(s) in special cases.

In cases where the judgment of reviewers is questioned, it may be appropriate to use additional reviewers to settle the issue. In general, the original reviewers should not be contacted or involved with the appeal.

1.4.3.3 The following actions on appeal are possible:

(1) Rejection Confirmed. The basis of the appeal is not convincing and the decision to reject the TR is upheld.

(2) Rejection Overturned. The basis of the appeal is convincing, and the TR is found to be acceptable. Revision of the TR may also be recommended before it is acceptable.

1.4.3.4 The Chair of COP shall communicate the decision to the author(s).

1.4.4 Previously Published Material—If an exception is made to COP policy regarding previously published material all necessary waivers of copyright must be obtained by the author and submitted in writing to ASTM and cited in the publication with the copyright holder's permission.

2. POLICIES

2.1 Previously Published Material

2.1.1 In order to maintain the integrity of the publication process, the policy of ASTM and COP forbids the publication of previously published material. For the purpose of this policy, "previously published" means published in a peer reviewed, archival document or electronic format such that the material can be easily referenced and obtained. With limited exceptions, this definition would encompass any material that is currently subject to copyright protection. Informally published proceedings of workshops or seminars would not normally fall under the scope of this definition.

2.1.2 In order to be subject to this policy, the material in question need not be identical to the previous publication, only substantially the same. The Editor of the publication and the assigned representative from COP are responsible for determining whether the material is "substantially the same" in each case.

2.1.3 Exception to this policy can be granted with the approval of the Editor of a journal or book and the representative from COP. Examples for exceptions may include the completeness or technical accuracy of a manual that might be compromised without the material contained in the previously published Work. Similarly, a journal Editor may feel that the readers would benefit from the information so much that they agree to sacrifice journal pages to accommodate the previously published article with all permissions necessary prior to peer review.

2.1.4 Authors may submit for publication a paper that has been posted online as a preprint. A preprint is considered a non-peer reviewed draft document that is shared publicly on preprint servers. Preprints may be given a digital object identifier (DOI) by the preprint servers. The cover letter must clearly state that the paper was posted as a preprint and provide the DOI or URL for the posted preprint. Versions of a manuscript that have been altered as a result of the ASTM peer review process may not be posted as preprints. Once the peer-reviewed paper is published by ASTM, the paper must be cited using the full citation to the published book or journal with the ASTM-assigned DOI, and the author is responsible for updating the preprint with a DOI and link to the ASTM-published version of the article.

2.2 Policy on Plagiarism

2.2.1 What is Plagiarism?

2.2.1.1 In the context of research proposals, the U. S. National Science Foundation defines plagiarism broadly as “the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit” [[Code of Federal Regulations, 45, 689.1](#)]. Plagiarism can also violate federal copyright law that is punishable by statute.

2.2.1.2 The U. S. Copyright – Fair Use ([Sections 107 through 118](#) of the Copyright Law title 17, U.S. Code) doctrine allows use in appropriate context of material published earlier when the source of the material is clearly identified.

2.2.1.3 **Plagiarism can be full, partial, or self-plagiarism.** An example of the first case is when an author republishes an entire chapter or article of another author without disclosing this fact or the source. In a partial plagiarism, only portions of another person’s earlier published work or direct statement is copied with little or no changes and, again, without proper attribution. Self-plagiarism is publishing one’s earlier peer-reviewed work again, in the same or a different publication, without disclosing this fact or the source. This also applies to material that is in the public domain or easily accessible on the Web such as Wikipedia <http://www.wikipedia.org/>.

2.2.1.4 **Images.** Authors are expected to properly reference image(s) from other sources and obtain written permission for the use of the image(s) from the copyright holder(s).

2.2.2 COP Policy on Plagiarism

ASTM COP does not tolerate plagiarism or violation of any federal copyright laws in any form in its publications. Plagiarism is an unethical behavior and is never acceptable. Work by others that are cited in articles or books whether quoted directly or paraphrased, must be properly acknowledged either by references or as footnotes.

2.2.3 Authors’ Responsibilities

All authors are equally accountable regarding the submitted work. To avoid the charge or claim of plagiarism, an author must provide clear indication of the original source of material by giving reference to previous work or source of a quote.

2.2.3.1 Authors are expected to be responsible for the contents of the text submitted to ASTM for publication. Hence, it is the responsibility of the author(s) to adhere to the highest ethical and professional standards with respect to plagiarism.

2.2.3.2 Authors who are unclear about what does and does not constitute plagiarism should research the definition to ensure that, in their collective conscience they are not in violation of plagiarism prior to submitting their work to ASTM.

2.2.3.3 **Images.** Authors are expected to properly reference image(s) from other sources and obtain written permission for the use of the image(s) from the copyright holder(s).

2.2.3.4 If COP brings a charge of plagiarism to the author(s), a response is required within three months. If there is no response, ASTM will contact the authors’ institution. If there is no response from the authors or the institution, ASTM will no longer accept any submissions from the authors or from their institution.

2.2.4 Reviewers' Responsibilities

If reviewers or other readers detect or suspect a case of plagiarism in an ASTM published work or material in the review stage, it is their ethical and professional responsibility to contact the ASTM Director, Books and Journals, who will follow up on the individual case.

2.2.5 Procedures for Investigating Plagiarism

All journal submissions will be checked for potential plagiarism using iThenticate/Turnitin™ software. iThenticate/Turnitin™ detects similarities to papers published in the existing literature. Based on the results of the check, the journal Editor will determine if the submission is acceptable for consideration for peer review. If a submission is rejected due to a substantial degree of similarities with published work, the author and co-authors of that submission will be advised that their submission has been rejected due to apparent plagiarism and their funding institution and/or employer will be informed.

The Director, Books and Journals will form an ad hoc committee consisting of 3 to 5 individuals that may include the journal or book editors, authors, reviewers, counsel, Vice President, Technical Committee Operations, and representatives from COP, to investigate the alleged violation and make a recommendation to COP for a vote regarding the allegation.

2.2.5.1 ASTM COP will follow the procedures on self-plagiarism (redundancy) and plagiarism as outlined in the flowcharts published by the separate and independent organization, Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Go to www.publicationethics.org for full details and flowcharts.

2.2.5.2 This process includes comparing the documents in question, notifying all authors if possible, obtaining an explanation from the authors, determining the next course of action, e.g., revision to remove or reference material from other works, rejection, notification of the funding institution, publishing a retraction, or whatever is necessary to resolve the issue dependent on the publication stage of the material in question.

2.2.6 Notifying ASTM of Plagiarism

To inform ASTM of suspected plagiarism submit your allegation in writing to the Director, Books and Journals. Include your name, email address, phone number, and indicate exactly what parts of the work published or under review by ASTM International are duplicated and the citation of the original work. Include any documents or details that will assist in the investigation and discovery of the original sources.

2.2.7 Confidentiality

The investigation will be held in reasonable confidence during the investigation of plagiarism but will require full disclosure to anyone assisting the Director, Books and Journals in the deliberations.

2.2.8 Penalties

In the case of a positive finding of plagiarism by ASTM's investigation, ASTM will notify in writing the author(s), as well as the authors' funding institution and/or employer, of the allegations and subsequent positive findings. If the paper is still under review, it will be rejected. If the paper or book chapter has already been published by ASTM, it will be retracted with a retraction statement to explain why it was retracted. Additionally, ASTM will forward the submission to Retraction Watch (<http://retractionwatch.com>).

2.2.8.1 The author(s) of the plagiarized work will be requested to write a registered letter to the author(s) of the original work, apologizing for the violation. If there is a refusal to do so, ASTM will exercise their right to refuse all future submissions from the offending author(s) as well as the authors' institution/employer.

2.2.8.2 The author(s) of the original source material will also be notified by ASTM of the use of their material in the plagiarized work.

2.2.8.3 ASTM reserves the right to deny future submissions from any author or institution who violates this policy.

2.2.9 Sources used in creating this document:

2.2.9.1 Plagiarism policies:

[American Chemical Society](#)

[American Mathematical Society](#)

[American Physical Society](#)

[Association for Computing Machinery](#)

[Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#)

[Computer Science Journals](#)

[Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers](#)

2.2.9.2 Articles on plagiarism:

[Imperial College](#)

[Royal Society of Chemistry](#)

2.3 Review Policies

2.3.1 ASTM has a long-standing policy of maintaining the anonymity of the peer reviewers.

2.3.2 Technical papers, chapters, and books may be rejected on recommendations of reviewers and confirmed by journal Editors or COP. An author may appeal a rejection to the Chair of COP. A purpose of the appeal process is to assure that the policies of COP and of the Society are carried out faithfully. Appeals must be submitted and resolved in a timely manner so as not to delay the publication in question.

2.3.3 The review process for an STP must be completed within 6 months after the symposium date or the symposium Chair must appeal to COP for an extension. COP may grant an extension or may indicate other steps that must be followed to resolve the situation.

2.4 STPs (Selected Technical Papers)

2.4.1 **Parameters**—STPs are compiled from the symposium papers presented at a symposium provided there are at least 10 papers accepted for publication. Papers not submitted to the STP by the date of the symposium will not be included in the STP.

2.4.2 **Co-sponsorship**—Technical committees could agree to co-sponsor a symposium, suggest appropriate reviewers for papers related to their respective scopes, and agree to any arrangement that ensures that all interests are treated fairly, and papers appropriately reviewed.

2.4.3 **Size (June 1989)**—No STP shall exceed forty (40) papers.

2.4.3.1 Exceptions to this rule may be granted by the representative from COP only in exceptional circumstances where the Editor can demonstrate that a well-planned and diligent effort had been made to adhere to this limit. This waiver must be supported by a vote of the sponsoring executive subcommittee.

2.4.4 Deadlines (June 1985)—Papers that are not submitted to ASTM by the date of the symposium will not be accepted for publication in the resulting STP. Such papers, however, may be submitted for publication in an appropriate ASTM journal.

2.4.4.1 Exceptions to this rule may be granted by the representative from COP only in exceptional circumstances where the Editor can demonstrate that a diligent effort had been made to adhere to this date.

2.4.5 Balanced Coverage (June 1996)—It has long been recognized that the collection of papers selected for publication in an STP should represent a “balanced coverage” of the topic as described in the “Call for Papers.” Balance should be considered by the symposium Chair when making the selection from the abstracts submitted. It is realized that this is difficult considering the short synopses submitted for consideration.

2.4.5.1 Purpose

The purpose of “balanced coverage” is to allow all contrasting, opposing, and interacting interests an opportunity to participate.

2.4.5.2 Responsibilities

If the Committee on Publications’ representative for a given book has any questions regarding “Balanced coverage” he or she should contact the symposium Chair or Chair of the sponsoring committee for more information.

2.4.5.3 Procedure

It is suggested that the following questions be considered when determining whether “balanced coverage” exists, as the topic warrants:

2.4.5.3.1 Could the topic of the symposium and resulting publication adversely impact various interests thereby demonstrating the need that all sides be represented? (Interests may be financial, political, or intellectual.) **If not, balanced coverage is not an issue.**

2.4.5.3.2 Is adequate time given to the vital parties and have all parties been given an opportunity to contribute, i.e., has a Call for Papers been distributed? If a Call for Papers was not distributed, do the invited authors represent all sides of the issue?

2.4.5.3.3 Are the authors and speakers from a variety of organizations and do they represent industry, government, and academia, as appropriate?

2.4.5.3.4 If a significant number of papers (30-50 percent) were to be withdrawn, dropped, or rejected from the resulting publication would “balanced coverage” need to be reevaluated?

2.4.6 Scope of Symposia Related to Review:

2.4.6.1 When a topic covered at a symposium is outside the scope of the sponsoring committee, it is the responsibility of the symposium Chair to contact the Chair of any committee who oversees those topics.

2.4.6.2 The technical committees could agree to co-sponsor the symposium, suggest appropriate reviewers for papers related to their scopes, or any arrangement that ensures that all interests are treated fairly, and papers appropriately reviewed.

2.4.6.3 If there is any uncertainty regarding overlap, the Staff Manager of the committee initiating the symposium will investigate.

2.5 Journals

2.5.1 Responsible Parties

2.5.1.1 A successful journal publication is dependent upon clear understanding and communications among all persons with responsibility for some part of the total publication effort. It is essential that members of these groups understand what their individual responsibilities are, and how they need to interact to contribute to the overall success of the publication. For an ASTM journal the following individuals and groups of persons are involved:

2.5.1.2 Editor, Editor-in-Chief, or Co-Editor depending on the specific arrangements,

2.5.1.3 Editorial board members (EBMs),

2.5.1.4 Reviewers,

2.5.1.5 Committee on Publications, and

2.5.1.6 ASTM staff.

2.5.2 Editor, Editor-in-Chief, or Co-Editors—The Editor of an ASTM journal shall be an individual(s) who is a well-recognized authority in the subject that is the major thrust of the journal. Editors shall be nominated by the sponsoring technical committee(s) of the journal and are subject to approval by COP. Editors shall serve a three-year term after which time they may stand for reappointment. Responsibilities of the Editor of the journal include the following:

- (1) Maintain the technical and professional quality consistent with the originally intended purposes of the journal,
- (2) Maintain and continually develop an international Editorial Board that enhances the reputation of the journal, attracts authors, and expedites publication,
- (3) Ensure that each EBM understands and fulfills their responsibilities,
- (4) Replace nonperforming EBMs,
- (5) Utilize EBMs to suggest policies and procedures for managing the publication of the journal,
- (6) Seek COP approval on all journal policy matters,
- (7) Solicit manuscripts,
- (8) Ensure that all manuscripts are reviewed by the proper experts in accordance with the peer review process,
- (9) Review alerts in the submission site and address them or raise them to ASTM staff,
- (10) Resolve conflicts on the technical quality of manuscripts after careful consideration of the reviewers' comments. If a conflict of interest exists between the Editor, reviewers and/or the authors, the Editor is urged to seek assistance from the appropriate representative from COP during deliberations,
- (11) Support the mission of the Society, and
- (12) Ensure that their editorial services will not compromise the impartiality of ASTM.

2.5.3 Editorial Board Members—EBMs are selected by the Editor. They serve a three-year term with consecutive reappointments possible as requested by the Editor. EBMs are expected to be recognized experts in some aspect of the major thrust of the journal. Responsibilities of the EBMs include the following items:

- (1) Maintain the desired standards of quality and credibility in the journal by means of the peer review process,
- (2) Recommend policy and procedures to the Editor,
- (3) Solicit manuscripts,
- (4) Promptly review manuscripts as requested or recommend appropriate reviewers, not more than 1 of which can be recommended by the authors,
- (5) Review alerts in the submission site and address them or raise them to the journal Editor or ASTM staff,
- (6) Support the mission of the Society, and
- (7) Ensure that their editorial services will not compromise the impartiality of ASTM.

2.5.4 Reviewers—Reviewers are invited by the Editorial Board Members. They are expected to have expertise in the topical area of the paper. Responsibilities of the reviewers include the following items:

- (1) Maintain the desired standards of quality and credibility in the journal by means of the peer review process,
- (2) Promptly review manuscripts as requested or recommend appropriate alternate reviewers,
- (3) Abide by all ASTM policies, and
- (4) Ensure that their editorial services will not compromise the impartiality of ASTM.

2.5.5 Role of COP—COP has the responsibility to ensure timely, relevant, high-quality publications. In publishing a journal, COP has the following responsibilities:

- (1) Ensure that each journal is fulfilling a need in a manner consistent with the goals of ASTM,
- (2) Review the viability of existing journals in terms of the market being served, size of the journal issues, issues per year, and need for changes in publication operations,
- (3) Recommend the establishment of new journals to the ASTM Board of Directors,
- (4) Establish performance criteria for new journals,
- (5) Monitor the progress of the journals in relation to the agreed upon performance standards,
- (6) Recommend to ASTM the termination of a journal when it no longer fills a need, or does not meet the established performance standards,
- (7) Utilize executive committees of sponsoring technical committees as a source of nominees for Editors,
- (8) Approve Editors, and
- (9) Terminate Editors who are not fulfilling their established obligations.

2.5.6 Role of ASTM Staff—It is the responsibility of the ASTM staff to support a journal by:

- (1) Managing the peer review process,
- (2) Managing final editorial review and production,
- (3) Expediting publication, and
- (4) Effectively marketing the journals.

2.5.6 Selection of New EBMs:

2.5.6.1 Editors select new members to their Editorial Boards by considering the following items as required:

- (1) The nominees' present affiliation, complete with title,
- (2) A list of degrees they hold,
- (3) The parameters of their area(s) of expertise,
- (4) Their association memberships, including any offices they have held, or currently hold,
- (5) A list or summation of published work, including any membership on other Editorial Boards,
- (6) Their contribution to the international reputation of the journal.

2.5.6.2 This information will allow the Journal Editors to give each nominee their full consideration and support.

2.5.7 Special Issue Policies

If guest editors who propose a special issue do not have an established credibility with ASTM—such as a peer reviewer, Editorial Board Member (EBM), author, or ASTM member—they will be asked to join the peer reviewer pool of the journal before they may submit a proposal for a special issue. The amount of time they serve as a peer reviewer will be at the discretion of the journal Editor(s).

2.5.7.1 The Special Issue

A special issue is a collection of papers focusing on a specific area of research that has a broad interest and is within the scope of the chosen journal. It could analyze and review a particular topic; address gaps, issues, or challenges in the body of knowledge; or enable and encourage dialogue and create new ideas.

2.5.7.2 The Guest Editor(s)

The responsibilities of guest editors include:

- Writing the call for abstracts and soliciting content for the special issue
- Reviewing submitted abstracts to determine their suitability for the special issue
- Promptly reviewing manuscripts as requested, inviting appropriate reviewers (not more than 1 of which can be recommended by the authors), and recommending action (accept, revise, reject) to the journal Editor
- Maintaining the desired standards of quality and credibility in the journal by means of the peer review process
- Adhering to all ASTM policies
- Ensuring that their editorial services will not compromise the impartiality of ASTM

It can be helpful for special issues to have more than one guest editor. This reduces potential bias and encourages balanced coverage. Guest editors should be able to demonstrate experience in editing or reviewing technical content. A team of guest editors may include a junior scholar who is building recognition in their field, if the other guest editors are accomplished and recognized scholars in the topic area. If none of the proposed guest editors are EBMs, the special issue will be overseen by the journal Editor or an EBM.

Guest editors may submit papers to the special issue. Their papers will undergo ASTM's standard peer review process along with all other papers. At the journal Editor's discretion, the peer review process for guest editors' submissions will be handled by either the journal Editor or an EBM of the journal Editor's choosing. To avoid competing interests, papers authored by the guest editors or their close colleagues (with close professional or personal relationships) should be a limited portion of the special issue content.

While soliciting content for the special issue, guest editors may send personal invitations to request contributions to the issue. Guest editors shall not guarantee publication for any author, and guest editors shall not accept payment (monetary, in-kind, or through professional arrangements) in exchange for publication.

2.5.7.3 The Journals

Special issues may be published in any of ASTM's active journals:

- *Advances in Civil Engineering Materials* (ACEM), <https://go.astm.org/ACEM>
- *Geotechnical Testing Journal* (GTJ), <https://go.astm.org/GTJ>
- *Journal of Testing and Evaluation* (JTE), <https://go.astm.org/JTE>

- *Materials Performance and Characterization* (MPC), <https://go.astm.org/MPC>
- *Smart and Sustainable Manufacturing Systems* (SSMS), <https://go.astm.org/SSMS>

2.5.7.4 The Proposal

All proposals should be submitted by email to the Publishing Manager, Alyssa Conaway, at aconaway@astm.org.

2.5.7.5 The Call for Abstracts

If you are using an open call for papers, ASTM staff will work with you in conjunction with the journal Editor to finalize the call for abstracts.

Upon approval from the journal Editor, ASTM's marketing team will format the call for abstracts into an ASTM-branded email for distribution. ASTM staff will share this email with you so that you can use it in your solicitations. Special issues are often most successful when the guest editor is active and engaged in soliciting content.

Abstracts will be submitted to ASTM for tracking purposes; if authors send you abstracts directly, please forward them to ASTM staff. When the abstract deadline closes, you will receive an email package with all submitted abstracts and a tracking sheet with abstract information. You will be asked to indicate in this tracking sheet which abstracts are approved. The authors of those approved abstracts will be invited to submit full papers for the special issue.

2.5.7.6 The Authors

Authors may be asked to submit a copy of their most recent CV/resume along with their abstract. Authors should be able to demonstrate experience in the topic of the special issue. Authors whose expertise is not within the scope of the journal or special issue will not be invited to submit full papers.

2.5.7.7 The Reviewers

Papers submitted to special issues undergo the same peer review process as regular submissions. All papers must receive at least 2 reviews from independent reviewers. As a guest editor, you may not also be a reviewer.

Peer reviewers may be EBMs or ASTM members, but this is not required. The guest editor should have previously vetted the peer reviewers and confirm that they are qualified to review on the issue topic. A single peer reviewer should not be assigned to more than 10% of total papers or more than 5 papers, whichever is less. Peer reviewers who do not use institutional email addresses may be asked to provide their institutional webpages or CVs/resumes to verify their credentials.

2.5.7.8 The Peer Review Process

The peer review team will check-in all submissions and ensure they are ready for peer review; i.e., all files are present and correctly formatted, all entries in the peer review site are complete, etc.

ASTM uses single-blind peer review, where the authors do not know the identity of the reviewers, but the reviewers know the identity of the authors. If the reviewers have any potential conflict of interest with the authors or the authors' affiliated organizations, they should decline to review.

The peer review process is as follows:

1. The peer review team will assign one guest editor as the handling EBM for each paper.
2. When you first receive a submission, you have the option to reject without review. This may be appropriate if the paper has a high iThenticate score for plagiarism, if the paper is poorly written, or if the paper is outside the scope of the issue or journal. If you recommend rejection without review,

the paper is sent to the journal Editor for a final decision.

3. Most papers proceed to peer review. Please assign at least 2 independent reviewers for each paper. We recommend inputting 3 or 4 reviewers for each paper and inviting the first 2. If a reviewer declines, the peer review staff can invite your alternate reviewers.
4. Once 2 reviews are submitted, you will be asked to make a recommendation (Revise, Accept, Reject). If the reviews greatly conflict, you may seek a third review. If you feel you have a situation that requires more than 3 reviewers, please contact ASTM staff (aconaway@astm.org).
5. To make a recommendation, please read the paper and the reviewer comments, synthesize the reviewer comments, and add feedback for the authors.
6. The paper, along with feedback from you and the reviewers, is then sent to the journal Editor for a decision.
7. If the paper is accepted or rejected, a final decision letter is sent to the authors. The decision letter includes the feedback from the reviewers, guest editor, and journal Editor.
8. If revisions are requested, a decision letter is sent to the authors with a revision deadline as well as the feedback from the reviewers, guest editor, and journal Editor.
9. When the revised paper is submitted, you will be notified to make a recommendation (Revise, Accept, Reject). You may send the revision back to 1 or more of the original reviewers. Please do not add new reviewers for revised papers.
10. The journal Editor makes the decision for all papers. When all papers in the issue have a final decision (Accept or Reject), peer review closes for the issue.

2.5.7.9 The Publication Process

Papers move through production (copyediting, typesetting, author proofing) individually after they complete peer review. Papers that finish peer review and production before the scheduled special issue publication date may publish online on the journal's First Look website. The First Look paper is assigned a DOI and is considered a published paper.

After the last paper completes peer review, you will be asked to provide an Editorial for the issue. The Editorial will serve as an introduction to the special issue, and it will be available for free download online so that interested readers can learn more about the special issue topic.

All authors will receive a link to download their paper and the full ebook of the special issue.

If staff or Editors identify irregularities during peer review, production, or post-publication, or if suspicions of ethical violations are raised by authors, reviewers, Editors, or third parties, ASTM will suspend the peer review and publication process of all content in the issue to investigate the concern. Such concerns may include but are not limited to peer review manipulation, trading of citations, or identity concerns of authors, editors, or reviewers involved in the special issue.

2.5.7.10 ASTM's Publication Decisions

All decisions of ASTM regarding the publication of articles or this issue are final, and ASTM is not obligated to publish any article or issue that does not meet its standards for quality or ethical conduct.

2.6 Author Name Change Policy

2.6.1 Background

Instituting policies such as the one proposed herein would ensure that ASTM meets its commitment to diversity and social justice. The need to change a name on a previous publication is an issue for many because of a divorce, a marriage, religious conversion, gender identity change, and other personal reasons. Specifically, this has become an issue of concern among the LGBTQIA+ research community as many people come out as transgender or non-binary later in life. Being able to change their name is an important part of the transition process.

2.6.2 Policy

This policy applies to ASTM's Journals, Selected Technical Papers (STPs), Manuals, Monographs, Data Series, and Technical Reports. Implementation of this policy is overseen by the ASTM Committee on Publications (COP).

The name change request must be submitted by the author; we will not entertain requests by non-authors. To ensure the identification of the person making the request is the author, ASTM requests one of the following forms of identification:

- ORCID
- Email used for the publication of the original publication
- Acceptance letter or email for the original publication
- Government ID or birth certificate in the author name on the original publication
- Or you may contact ASTM with an alternate means of identification

Please contact the ASTM Director of Books and Journals, Todd Reitzel, at treitzel@astm.org:

- To submit a request under this policy
- For appeals of decisions made under this policy
 - The appellant must submit a written explanation to the Director of Books and Journals
 - The Chair of COP will adjudicate the appeal
- For questions about the interpretation of this policy or suggested changes

2.6.3 How Updates Will be Made

ASTM will update the name in the author's prior ASTM publications. Such updates will be in the form of replacing the original online version of record with an updated PDF and metadata, and updating the product page on ASTM.org, the Table of Contents, promotional materials, and the ASTM Author Database.

The updated metadata will be distributed to the indexes and databases where the journal or book is included for them to update according to their timelines and procedures.

We will not include a notification of update on the paper or notify the coauthors. It is suggested that the author requesting the change notify the coauthors of the change so that they cite the paper with the updated name.

The originally published version of record will be made available only upon request for good cause (e.g., subpoena) after approval of ASTM's counsel.

2.7 Publication Ethics Policy

Authors, editorial board members, editors, and reviewers are expected to be aware of and abide by best practices in publication ethics (<https://publicationethics.org/>). For authors, that includes but is not limited to: policies on authorship, dual submission, plagiarism, use of AI, and conflicts of interests. For reviewers, editorial board members, and editors, that includes but is not limited to our policies on the use of AI and conflicts of interest.

Authors, reviewers, editorial board members, and editors will use ethical and legal practices to obtain and store their data. They will not disclose confidential information about a business, employer, client, or public body in which they currently or have previously served.

2.7.1 Peer Review Manipulation. Peer review manipulation is where an individual or group of people use dishonest or fraudulent practices with goals such as publishing fabricated or plagiarized research, or preventing or inappropriately influencing the evaluation of a submission by an independent peer.

Peer review manipulation often attempts to influence the publication record or achieve financial gain. It can involve a single paper, multiple submissions in one journal, or submissions across multiple journals.

Peer review manipulation includes, but is not limited to, the following actions:

- Authors recommending falsified reviewers
- Authors or reviewers falsifying their affiliations and/or professional credentials
- Engagement of a third party to act as falsified reviewers
- Authorship for sale
- Substitution of a manuscript after acceptance
- Data or figure manipulation
- Excessive self-citation
- Authors or reviewers asking another to cite their own works, without justification or explanation of how it relates to the paper in review

Any suspected peer review manipulation will result in the paper(s) in question being placed on hold while the publisher investigates, following the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). If after an investigation there are valid concerns, the authors and/or reviewers will be contacted using their supplied email addresses and given an opportunity to address the issue. Failure to respond may result in their institutions also being contacted.

Decisions to reject or retract papers with ethical violations will be final, subject to the adjudication through the COP appeal process. ASTM reserves the right to deny future submissions from any author or institution who has violated this policy.

2.7.2 Procedures for Investigating Peer Review Manipulation

All journal submissions will undergo a research integrity check before a decision letter is sent to the authors. During this check, the authors, reviewers, editorial board members, and/or journal Editor may be contacted to provide additional information. Based on the results of this check and the comments from peer reviewers (if applicable), the journal editor will determine if the submission is able to proceed in the peer review process. If a submission is rejected as a result of the research integrity check, the author and coauthors of that submission will be advised that their submission has been rejected due to violation of the publication ethics policy, and ASTM will attempt to contact their funding institution and/or employer.

2.7.2.1 ASTM will follow the procedures on peer review manipulation as outlined in the flowcharts published by the separate and independent organization, Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Go to www.publicationethics.org for full details and flowcharts.

2.7.2.2 This process includes investigating the paper, authors, reviewers, and editors involved in its peer review; notifying all authors, if possible; obtaining an explanation from the authors or reviewers; contacting the affiliated institutions of the authors or reviewers; and determining the next course of action, e.g., revision, additional peer review, rejection, notification of the funding institution, publishing a corrigendum or retraction, or other actions that ASTM deems necessary to resolve the issue dependent on the publication stage of the material in question.

2.7.2.3 Allegations received for papers that have been published and are no longer in the peer review process will undergo the same process for research integrity checks as outlined above.

2.7.3 Reporting

To report an allegation under this policy, please contact the Publishing Manager, Alyssa Conaway, aconaway@astm.org, and include your name, email address, phone number, and indicate exactly what parts of the work published or under review by ASTM may have violated this policy. Include any documents or details that will assist in the investigation.

2.7.4 Confidentiality

The investigation will be held in reasonable confidence but will require full disclosure to anyone assisting the Director, Books and Journals, and Publishing Manager in the deliberations.

2.7.5 Penalties

If a paper is found to be in violation of the publication ethics policy, ASTM will notify in writing the author(s) of the allegations and subsequent findings and will attempt to notify the authors' funding institution and/or employer. If the paper is still under review, it will be rejected. If the paper is already published, the acceptance may be rescinded and the paper may be returned to peer review; republished with a corrigendum; or retracted with a retraction statement to explain why it was retracted.

ASTM reserves the right to deny future submissions from any author or institution who violates this policy.

2.8 Correction and Retraction Policies

ASTM provides authors with the opportunity to review proofs before an article posts online. Authors should make every attempt to make all necessary corrections at this proofing stage. However, in some cases corrections may be required post-publication. Correction notices will be issued as either Corrigenda (author error) or Errata (publisher error).

ASTM may issue post-publication corrections (Corrigenda or Errata) to address any changes to the version of record that include:

- Errors or omissions that impact readability, indexing, or compliance to ASTM policies
- Errors or omissions related to the validity of an article

Multiple errors or omissions in the article that impact the validity of the article may require investigation by ASTM, following the guidelines of the Committee on Publications Ethics (COPE), and may result in retraction.

Please see our Author Name Change Policy for information regarding post-publication author name changes.

ASTM will consider retracting a publication if:

- There is evidence that the findings are unreliable, either because of major error (such as miscalculation or experimental error) or as a result of fabrication or falsification
- There is evidence that the paper was plagiarized or that the findings have been previously published elsewhere without attribution or permission (redundant publication)
- Copyright infringement, reporting of unethical research, or other legal concerns made in conjunction with ASTM legal counsel
- The work has been published solely on the basis of a manipulated peer review process
- The authors failed to disclose a major conflict of interest that would have affected recommendations by the peer reviewers and editors

Retractions are generally not appropriate if:

- There is no reason to doubt the validity of the findings
- The main findings of the work are still reliable, and correction could sufficiently address errors or concerns
- An editor has inconclusive evidence to support retraction, or is awaiting additional information
- Author conflicts of interest have been reported to the journal after publication, but in the editor's view these are not likely to have influenced recommendation for publication.

2.8.1 Reporting

Requests should be submitted to the Publishing Manager, Alyssa Conaway, aconaway@astm.org, with the correction and an explanation of the request. With the approval of all authors, these may be made at the discretion of ASTM.

2.9 Authorship Policy

Being listed as a coauthor means that you have made a significant contribution to the work; you have reviewed and agreed to the final version of the article before submission; and you agree to be accountable for the work. You also agree that the corresponding author will act on your behalf in all communication through submission, peer review, production, and publication. In line with standard publishing ethics, if the work is found to be in error, or in breach of the copyright agreement, that responsibility is shared by all named coauthors. If coauthors have any concerns about these authorship policies, please contact the ASTM office directly at aconaway@astm.org.

When you upload your paper, you will be asked to select the contribution(s) for each author. This is a mandatory field in the submission site. The contributor roles are intended to be high-level and cover the work that allows scholarly publications to be produced. Possible contributor roles include:

- Conceptualization
- Data curation
- Formal Analysis
- Funding acquisition
- Investigation
- Methodology
- Project administration
- Resources
- Software
- Supervision
- Validation
- Visualization
- Writing – original draft
- Writing – review & editing

Any deletion, addition, or rearrangement of author names after initial submission will require the approval of all authors and a detailed explanation of the reasoning for the requested change. If all authors do not approve or if the explanation is unsatisfactory, the authors' institution(s) may be contacted to assist in resolving the paper's authorship. During any such investigation, the paper will remain on hold and will not receive a final decision or proceed to publication. Failure to resolve the authorship may result in the paper being rejected.

2.10 Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Authors may not use AI to generate any part of their manuscript, and so AI may not be included or acknowledged as an author or any other type of contributor.

Authors may use AI to identify improvements to their manuscript, including graphics, but must review, evaluate, and take responsibility for those improvements and must be transparent in their methods section and their cover letter about how they have used AI.

Reviewers may not submit any ASTM manuscript submission to any LLM or use AI in any way on a review of an ASTM manuscript submission.

2.11 Conflicts of Interest

Conflicts of interest are situations that may influence people's judgements or be seen as having the potential to influence people's judgements. Conflicts of interest may include but are not limited to:

- Sharing affiliations, either current or within the past 3 years, between any of the following: authors, reviewers, editorial board members, editors
- Accepting financial or other benefits from authors, reviewers, editorial board members, editors, either directly or indirectly
- Ownership of stocks or shares
- Patent applications (pending or actual), including both individual applications and those belonging to the institution where the author(s) are affiliated
- Research, travel, and other funding grants
- Acting as an expert witness
- Membership in a government or organizational advisory board, or lobbying or advocacy organization
- Personal relationships (such as friend, family member, current or previous mentor, adversary) with individuals involved in the submission or evaluation of a paper
- Personal convictions (political, religious, ideological, or other) related to a paper's topic that might interfere with an unbiased publication process (at the stage of authorship, peer review, editorial decision-making, or publication)

Authors are responsible for recognizing and disclosing in their cover letters any conflict of interest that could be perceived to bias their work, and they should acknowledge all financial support and any other personal connections with any of the Editors.

Editorial board members should attempt to invite reviewers who do not have obvious conflicts of interest with the authors; e.g., who do not share an affiliated institution and who have not recently published or worked together (within about the last 3 years).

Reviewers should consider when they receive an invitation to review if they have conflicts of interest with the authors, their institutions, their funding agencies, or the content of the paper; if they do, they should decline the invitation to review.

2.11.1 Reporting Conflicts of Interests

To report conflicts of interest during or after the publication process, please contact the Publishing Manager, Alyssa Conaway, aconaway@astm.org. Please include your name, email address, phone number, and indicate exactly what parts of the work published or under review by ASTM may have violated this policy. Include any documents or details that will assist in the investigation.

2.11.2 Confidentiality

The investigation will be held in reasonable confidence but will require full disclosure to anyone assisting the Publishing Manager in the deliberations.

2.11.3 Penalties

If a paper is found to be in violation of the conflicts of interest policy, ASTM will notify in writing the affected individuals; e.g., the author(s), reviewer(s), editor(s), funding institution, and/or employer(s), of the allegations and subsequent findings. If the paper is still under review, revisions may be required or it may be rejected. If the paper is already published, the acceptance may be rescinded and the paper may be returned to peer review to ascertain whether it received an unbiased review; republished with a corrigendum; or retracted with a retraction statement to explain why it was retracted.

ASTM reserves the right to deny future submissions from any author or institution who violates this policy.

2.12 Data Availability Statement

To foster transparency, authors will be asked to choose one of the following, and that choice will constitute a section in the published article called Data Availability Statement:

1. The data, models, and/or code used for this study are included in this article.
2. The data, models, and/or code used for this study are available at [insert DOI]. (Examples of repositories are Dryad, figshare, Mendeley Dataset, and NIST Science Data Portal; ASTM authors may use these or others.) In this case, a reference should also be included in the reference list.
3. The data, models, and/or code used for this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.
4. Some or all data, models, and/or code used for the study are available, as indicated in Acknowledgements, from a third party upon request.
5. No data, models, or code were generated or used for this study.

Authors may update or change their statement if information changes during peer review, but it may not be changed after acceptance of the submission.

3. AWARDS

3.1 Award for Excellence in (Symposium Planning and) Publication Management (depending on whether an event was held prior to publication)

3.1.1 Objective—The purpose of the award is to recognize excellence and to reward those Symposium Chair or journal Guest Editors who have demonstrated outstanding proficiency in producing and conducting a successful symposium or non-event Call for Papers resulting in a valuable STP (Selected Technical Papers) or Special Issue of a journal.

3.1.2 Criteria—The symposium Chair/journal Guest Editor(s) planned and conducted the symposium in a well thought out, responsible fashion or solicited papers via an independent Call for Papers.

3.1.2.1 By the established deadlines the symposium Chair/journal Guest Editor(s) satisfied the needs of the schedule.

3.1.2.2 The symposium Chair/Guest Editor(s) fulfilled all duties and responsibilities and ensured that the other symposium/publication team members also fulfilled their duties and responsibilities.

3.1.2.3 The symposium Chair/journal Guest Editor(s) selected a cooperative, responsive team of reviewers who reviewed all papers and resolved all controversies in a timely fashion.

3.1.2.4 The symposium Chair/journal Guest Editor(s) recognized their responsibilities to the contributing authors, handling their needs and papers with respect for their efforts.

3.1.2.5 The symposium Chair/journal Guest Editor(s) was a leader. He or she motivated the authors and reviewers, took initiative when necessary, reacted to special situations as they arose, and served as a team player as well as the team leader.

3.1.2.6 The symposium Chair/journal Guest Editor(s) supported the objectives and policies of COP.

3.1.3 Nomination and Selection Process:

3.1.3.1 The nominating committee consists of the Director, Books and Journals, the Technical Papers Coordinator, the Symposium Manager, and a representative from COP. The nominating committee recommends candidates to COP for final approval.

3.1.3.2 The symposium Chair/STP Editor or Journal Guest Editor(s) shall be chosen from a given year's STPs or special journal issue. The year includes all books or Special Issues published within a given calendar year; the decision shall be made no later than February of the following year and presented for approval at the annual COP meeting.

3.1.4 Sponsorship—The award shall be sponsored by COP and presented by a member of COP or ASTM staff.

3.1.5 Frequency—No more than two awards shall be presented within a given year. No award shall be presented if no symposium Chair/guest editor(s) within the given year meets the criteria of the award.

3.1.6 Presentation of Award—Each award shall be presented at the next committee meeting of the recipient's committee, as soon after selection as possible.

3.1.7 Style—The award shall be matted and framed for presentation.

3.1.8 Wording:

ASTM COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS
(YEAR) AWARD
FOR EXCELLENCE
IN
SYMPOSIUM PLANNING AND PUBLICATION MANAGEMENT
to

(name)

For (his/her) outstanding efforts leading to
STP #_____, "Book Title" (or special journal issue)

_____ date

Chair,
Committee on Publications

Vice President,
Technical Committee Operations

3.2 Outstanding Article in the *Journal of Testing and Evaluation*

3.2.1 Objective—The Award for the Outstanding Article in the *Journal of Testing and Evaluation* (JOTE) is presented not more frequently than once a year to the author(s) of an outstanding, full-length

manuscript (research, application, review, interlaboratory report, test procedure, or case study) published in *JOTE* during the previous calendar year. Each author is recognized by COP for making a significant contribution toward a particular field of interest to ASTM. Established in 1988, the Award is intended to stimulate interest in the Journal's objectives, enhance the overall quality of the manuscripts submitted to the Journal, and recognize exceptional contributions.

3.2.2. Criteria—The criteria for judgment are that the manuscript be outstanding in style, clarity, and significance of content, with promise of high influence in an area of ASTM International's interest.

3.2.3 Eligibility—Members of the Editorial Board of *JOTE* and members of the professional staff of ASTM International are not eligible for the award. All authors of articles in *JOTE*, whether they be members of ASTM International or not, are eligible to be nominated for the award.

3.2.4 Administration:

3.2.4.1 Nominations—Nominations for the Award will be evaluated by the Editor-in-Chief of *JOTE* through its Award Task Group, which will consist of the Editor-in-Chief and three members of the Editorial Board appointed by the Editor-in-Chief of *JOTE*. Nominations will be selected from the manuscripts published in the preceding calendar year. If, in the opinion of the Award Task Group, no manuscript(s) meets the criteria for the award, then no award will be presented that year.

3.2.4.2 Manuscript Rating—Each manuscript shall be evaluated and rated according to a 5-point scoring system described by an increasing scale of 1 = Average, 2 = Good, 3 = Very Good, 4 = Excellent, 5 = Outstanding for each of the four criteria: (a) Clarity (b) Style (c) Significance to Field and (d) Influence to ASTM International's interests.

3.2.4.3 Manuscript Ranking—To determine the best manuscript, two scoring methodologies can be employed: the first method adds scores in each of the four criteria from all the evaluators for each nominated manuscript and the manuscript with the highest numerical score is ranked as one and is identified as the best manuscript. In the second method, all the nominated manuscripts are ranked first according to the scores provided by each evaluator. The manuscript receiving the highest score by an evaluator is awarded a rank of 1. If there is a tie based on the scores for two (or more) nominated manuscripts, then (all) those manuscripts are awarded the same rank. For example, if two manuscripts are tied for a second place, then both manuscripts are awarded the rank of 2 and the manuscript with the next lower score is awarded a rank of 4. After completing this process for each evaluator, the ranks from all the evaluators are added to provide a sum of ranks for each nominated manuscript. The nominated manuscripts are then ranked again based on the sum of ranks from all the evaluators. In the second phase, the manuscript with the lowest sum of ranks from all the evaluators is awarded a rank of 1 and is identified as the best manuscript.

3.2.4.4 COP Approval—The recommendation of the Award Task Group will be submitted in writing by the Editor-in-Chief of *JOTE* for consideration by the members of the Committee on Publications who must approve with at least two thirds affirmative.

3.2.4.5 Notification and Award Presentation—The recipient(s) of the award will be notified of selection in writing by the Editor-in-Chief of *JOTE* within one month following the approval by the COP and announced in *Standardization News* and on social media. The award will be presented to the recipient(s) by the Editor-in-Chief of *JOTE* or designee at an ASTM meeting of the recipient's choosing.

3.2.5 Award—The award will consist of an engraved plaque bearing the ASTM logo and suitably inscribed as follows:

Committee on Publications
(Year) Award
for the
Outstanding Article
in the
Journal of Testing and Evaluation
(Name of author)
(Title of the outstanding article)

(signed)
Chair
Committee on Publications

(signed)
Editor

(signed)
Vice President,
Technical Committee Operations

3.2.6 Financing the Award—Funds are established in COP’s award budget to purchase the engraved plaque(s) each year.

3.3 Outstanding Practice Article in the *Geotechnical Testing Journal*

3.3.1 Objective—The Award for the Outstanding Practice Article in the *Geotechnical Testing Journal* is presented not more frequently than once a year to the author(s) of an outstanding full-length paper (application, review, interlaboratory report, test procedure, or case study) published in *GTJ* during the previous calendar year. Each author is recognized by the Society’s COP for making a significant contribution toward a particular field of interest to ASTM. Established in 1996, the award is intended to stimulate interest in the Journal’s objectives, enhance the overall quality of the contributions.

3.3.2 Criteria—The criteria for judgment are that the paper is outstanding in style, clarity, and significance of content, with promise of high influence in an area of practical interest to ASTM Committee D18 on Soil and Rock i.e. related to improvements in the performance of lab and field testing or the quality of results.

3.3.3 Administration:

3.3.3.1 Nominations for the award will be evaluated by the Editorial Board of *GTJ* through its award task group, that will consist of three members and one alternate of the editorial board appointed by the Editor(s) of *GTJ*. Nominations will be invited from reviewers and editorial board members. Nominations must be received by the Editor(s) of *GTJ* by April 1 of the year following publication. Nominations shall contain:

- (1) The full title of the paper and date of publication,
- (2) The name(s) of the author(s),
- (3) The name and address of the nominator, and
- (4) A statement of not more than 300 words that attests to the meeting of the criteria.

3.3.3.2 Members of the Editorial Board of *GTJ* and members of the professional staff of ASTM are not eligible for the award. All authors of articles in *GTJ*, whether they be members of ASTM or not, are eligible to be nominated for the award. The recommendation of the award task group will be submitted in writing to the Editors of *GTJ* prior to the annual COP meeting, where the Editors of *GTJ* will make a motion to the COP that the award be approved. If, in the opinion of the Editorial Board of *GTJ*, no paper meets the criteria for the award, then no award will be given that year. The recipient(s) of the award will be notified of selection in writing by the Editor(s) of *GTJ* within one month following the January meeting

of the Editorial Board of *GTJ*. The award will be presented at an ASTM committee meeting of the choice of the recipient(s) and will be announced in *Standardization News* and on social media.

3.3.4 Award—The award will consist of a plaque bearing the ASTM logo and suitably inscribed as follows:

Committee on Publications
(Year) Award
for the
Outstanding Article in the Practice of
Geotechnical Testing
(Name of Author(s))
(Title of the Article)

(signed)
Chair
Committee on Publications

(signed)
Editor(s)

(signed)
Vice President,
Technical Committee Operations

3.3.5 Financing of the Award—Funds are established in COP's award budget to purchase the plaques each year.

3.4 Charles B. Dudley Award

3.4.1 Objective:

3.4.1.1 The Charles B. Dudley Award is presented not more frequently than once a year to an author(s) or editor(s) of a book or paper, or a series of books or papers, published by ASTM International, that has made a widely recognized impact on its field or industry.

3.4.1.2 The award, established in 1925, is in honor of the first President (now termed Chair of the Board) of ASTM, whose inspiring leadership had a profound influence on the organization's development. The award is intended to stimulate research leading to standardization, extend the knowledge of the properties of engineering materials, and recognize meritorious contributions to the publications of ASTM International.

3.4.2 Administration:

3.4.2.1 The award shall be administered by COP through its Dudley Award Task Group, that consists of three members of ASTM appointed for three-year staggered terms. Members will be appointed by the Chair of COP from the members of COP.

3.4.2.2 Nominations will be solicited from ASTM Committees through a notice to be placed by staff in an issue of *Standardization News* and through appropriate announcements as needed.

3.4.2.3 Not more than one nomination from a Committee shall be submitted per year to COP for consideration by the award task group.

3.4.2.4 Members of COP are not eligible for the award. Nominations must be submitted by the date announced in *Standardization News* to COP, c/o the ASTM Director of Books and Journals, by means of a letter containing supporting documentation for the nomination. A letter acknowledging receipt of a nomination will be sent to the submitter by the Director.

3.4.2.5 Nominations must contain:

- (1) The name of the publication(s),
- (2) Name of the author(s), editor(s), or contributors of the publication(s) being nominated,
- (3) Name of ASTM Committee submitting the nomination and the name and address of the individual submitting the nomination on behalf of the Committee, and
- (4) Statement of 300 to 500 words indicating why the Committee is nominating the publication illustrating how it meets the criteria, **primarily focusing on the demonstration of how this publication has impacted its industry or field; any examples of such impact should be stated in the nomination.**

3.4.2.6 A minimum of 3 years must have elapsed between the date of publication of a nominee and the nomination deadline.

3.4.2.7 The same scope cannot win the award twice within ten years. This includes multiple editions of the same Work.

3.4.2.8 Nominations not selected during a calendar year may be retained and reconsidered the following year with approval of the sponsoring technical committee on a one-time basis only.

3.4.2.9 The Dudley Award Task Group shall submit its recommendations to the Chair of COP for consideration at the meeting of that committee following the deadline referenced in *Standardization News*. The recommendation shall require approval of at least two-thirds of the members present.

3.4.2.10 If, in the opinion of COP, no publication meets the criteria for the award, none shall be given for that year.

3.4.2.11 This is a Society award and as such must be approved by the Board of Directors. The Vice President, Technical Committee Operations, shall present the recommendation from COP to the Board of Directors for their approval.

3.4.2.12 The Membership Promotion and Awards Department shall be notified by the Director, Books and Journals, no later than one month after the ASTM Board meeting at which the Board of Directors reached a decision regarding the award.

3.4.2.13 The recipient of the Charles B. Dudley Award will be notified of selection by the ASTM Chair of the Board within one month after the meeting of the Board of Directors at which the Committee reached a decision regarding the award.

3.4.2.14 The Awards Department will work with the vendor to prepare the recipient(s) plaque. The Awards Department will then work with the recipient(s) and Corporate Communications to prepare appropriate publicity announcements.

3.4.2.15 The award shall be presented by the Chair of the Board of ASTM or designee at an ASTM meeting of the recipient's choosing.

3.4.3 Criteria—The award is made for an outstanding contribution that has widely recognized impact on the particular field of ASTM interest and has been documented in the ASTM literature. Among the eligible publications are:

- (1) An individual or group of papers,
- (2) An STP (Selected Technical Papers), and
- (3) A new publication series (manual, data series, or monograph).

(4) A Technical Report

NOTE: ASTM standards are not publications eligible for consideration under this award.

3.4.3.1 The nominated publication must meet the requirements of the journal, manual, monograph, data series, STP, Technical Report, or group of technical papers.

3.4.4 The Award:

3.4.4.1. The Charles B. Dudley Award shall consist of a walnut plaque with royal port velvet background containing:

- (1) One bronze base relief medallion of Charles B. Dudley,
- (2) One bronze ASTM International logo disc, and
- (3) One bronze plate suitable for engraving.

3.4.4.2 Wording on the plate will include:

Charles B. Dudley Award

Established in 1925 by ASTM in commemoration of the Society's first President, Charles B. Dudley, in order to stimulate research leading to standardization, extend knowledge of the specific interests of the Society, and recognize meritorious contributions to the publications of the Society.

is conferred on
(Name)
(Citation)

(Signature)
President

Year

(Signature)
Chair of the Board

3.4.5 Honorarium—In addition to the award, recipients shall receive an honorarium, whose amount shall be \$2,500.00 for a single author or \$5,000.00 for two or more authors, divided equally among the authors.

3.4.6 Committee Recipient—Should a Committee be named the recipient of the Charles B. Dudley Award; the Committee Chair shall receive the plaque on behalf of the Committee, and the honorarium shall be placed in the Committee's account.

3.4.7 Financing—The Charles B. Dudley Award was originally established through contributions made by the ASTM membership. All charges for the award shall be covered by the Society under the Honors and Awards Department.

3.5 Outstanding Article in *Advances in Civil Engineering Materials*

3.5.1 Objective—The Award for the Outstanding Article in *Advances in Civil Engineering Materials (ACEM)* is presented not more frequently than once a year to the author(s) of an outstanding full-length paper (research, application, review, interlaboratory report, test procedure, or case study) published in ACEM during the previous calendar year. Each author is recognized by the Society's COP for making a significant contribution toward a particular field of interest to ASTM. Established in 2016, the award is intended to stimulate interest in the Journal's objectives, enhance the overall quality of the papers submitted to the Journal, and recognize exceptional contributions.

3.5.2. Criteria—The criteria for judgment are that the paper be outstanding in style, clarity, and significance of content, with promise of high influence in an area of ASTM interest. Judging is based on quality, original, subject matter, and timeliness.

3.5.3 Administration:

3.5.3.1 Nominations will be invited by reviewers and editorial board members. The *ACEM* Editor(s) will evaluate the nominations prior to the annual COP meeting, where the Editor(s) of *ACEM* will make a motion to the COP that the award be approved. Nominations must be received by the Editor(s) of *ACEM* by April 1 of the year following publication. Nominations shall contain:

- (1) The full title of the paper and date of publication,
- (2) The name(s) of the author(s),
- (3) The name and address of the nominator, and
- (4) A statement of not more than 300 words that attests to the meeting of the above criteria.

3.5.3.2 Editorial board members of *ACEM* and members of the professional staff of ASTM are not eligible for the award. All authors of articles in *ACEM*, whether they be members of ASTM or not, are eligible to be nominated for the award. If in the opinion of the Editor(s) of *ACEM*, no paper meets the criteria for the award, then no award will be given that year. The recipient(s) of the award will be notified of selection in writing by the Editor(s) of *ACEM* within one month following a spring meeting (possibly virtually or by phone) of the editorial board of *ACEM*. The award will be presented at an ASTM committee meeting of the choice of the recipient(s) and announced in *Standardization News* and on social media.

3.5.4 Award—The award will consist of an engraved plaque bearing the ASTM logo and suitably inscribed as follows:

Committee on Publications
(Year) Award
for the
Outstanding Article
in the
Advances in Civil Engineering Materials
(Name of author)
(Title of the outstanding article)

(signed)
Chair
Committee on Publications

(signed)
Editor(s)

(signed)
Vice President,
Technical Committee Operations

3.5.5 Financing the Award—Funds are established in COP’s award budget to purchase the engraved plaque(s) each year.

3.6 Award for Outstanding Editorial Board Member for *Advances in Civil Engineering Materials*

3.6.1 Objective—The purpose of the award is to recognize excellence and to reward Editorial Board Members who have demonstrated outstanding proficiency in handling the review process, reviewing articles, leading a Special Issue of the journal as a guest editor or co-editor, and publishing in *ACEM* as corresponding or coauthor within the award year and prior year.

3.6.2 Criteria—The Editorial Board Member has consistently shown dedication to the review process through responsible, efficient handling of manuscripts as part of one or more of the following: 1) regular manuscript handling; 2) solicited papers via an independent Call for Papers; 3) been a guest editor or co-editor of a special issue, and 4) published in ACEM as corresponding or co-author within the award year and prior year.

3.6.2.1 By the established deadlines the Editorial Board Member satisfied the needs of the schedule of a Special Issue.

3.6.2.2 The Editorial Board Member fulfilled all duties and responsibilities and ensured that the other publication team members also fulfilled their duties and responsibilities.

3.6.2.3 The Editorial Board Member selected a cooperative, technically appropriate, responsive team of reviewers who reviewed all papers and resolved all controversies in a timely fashion.

3.6.2.4 The Editorial Board Member recognized their responsibilities to the contributing authors, handling their needs and papers with respect for their efforts.

3.6.2.5 The Editorial Board Member was a leader. They motivated the authors and reviewers, took initiative when necessary, reacted to special situations as they arose, and served as a team player as well as the team leader.

3.6.2.6 The Editorial Board Member supported the objectives and policies of COP.

3.6.3 Nomination and Selection Process:

3.6.3.6 The nominating committee consists of the Editor(s)-in-Chief, a member of the Editorial Board, and a representative from COP. The nominating committee recommends candidates to COP for final approval.

3.6.3.2 The nominee must be a standing member of ACEM's Editorial Board for at least the year under which the award is given. The decision shall be made no later than February of the following year and presented for approval at the annual COP meeting.

3.6.4 Sponsorship—The award shall be sponsored by COP and presented by a member of COP or ASTM staff.

3.6.5 Frequency—No more than two awards shall be presented within a given year. No award shall be presented if no Editorial Board Member within the given year meets the criteria of the award.

3.6.6 Presentation of Award—Each award shall be presented at the next committee meeting of the recipient's committee, as soon after selection as possible.

3.6.7 Style—The award shall be a certificate created by ASTM's graphics department.

3.6.8 Wording:

ASTM COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS
(YEAR) AWARD
FOR ACEM OUTSTANDING EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBER
to

(name)

For (their) outstanding efforts leading to
Successful review and publication in “Advances in Civil Engineering Materials”

_____date

Chair,
Committee on Publications

Vice President,
Technical Committee Operations

Co-Editor,
Advances in Civil Engineering Materials

Co-Editor,
Advances in Civil Engineering Materials

4. CONTACTS

For assistance with a specific policy, please contact the staff person listed in that policy. For questions or concerns that are not previously addressed in this document, please contact a member of the Books and Journals staff:

Todd Reitzel, Director, Books and Journals
treitzel@astm.org

Alyssa Conaway, Publishing Manager
aconaway@astm.org
610-832-9620