

# CODE OF PUBLISHING ETHICS

## INFORMATION ON DUPLICATE PUBLICATION IN A SUBMITTED OR PUBLISHED ARTICLE

### Editor's activities:

1. S/he collects complete documentation with evidence.
2. **In the case of a significant repetition range:**
  - a) S/he informs the author about reported suspicions , attaching to the correspondence a statement signed by the author, stating that the submitted work was not published anywhere.
  - b) If the author's explanation is not sufficient or he pleads guilty, s/he informs him in writing about the rejection of the publication and possible consequences.
  - c) If the publication has already been published, s/he informs the author in writing about the possibility of publishing a statement about the repetition of the publication or its withdrawal. In addition, s/ he informs about the repetitions the editor of the other magazine.
  - d) If the author's explanation is sufficient, s/he informs the author in writing about the standpoint of the journal and indicates the best follow-up action.
  - e) If the author does not respond to allegations, s/he contacts other authors. If this is not possible or the publication has no co-authors, the matter is formally referred to the author's supervisor. If this also proves unsuccessful, s/he will try to contact him again every 3-6 months.
3. **In the case of a small range of repetitions,** s/he contacts the author and explains the standpoint of the magazine, indicating that secondary works must refer to the original, which the author is also obliged to do.
4. **In the absence of a significant repetition range,** s/he informs reviewers of the decision taken and continues the review process.
5. S/he informs the persons who revealed the repetitions on an ongoing basis about the actions taken and their results.

## Information on suspected plagiarism

### Editor's activities:

1. S/he collects complete documentation with evidence.
2. In the event that large fragments of a text and / or data are used without attribution:
  - a) S/he informs the author in writing about the suspicion, attaching to the correspondence evidence of plagiarism and a statement signed by the author, stating that the submitted work is original and is his property.
  - b) In the absence of sufficient explanation or the author's pleading guilty, s/he informs the author in writing of the rejection of the publication, explains the standpoint of the journal and informs about the actions taken and their results of his superiors.
  - c) If there are sufficient explanations, s/he informs the author in writing about the rejection of the publication or the required revision, and presents the standpoint of the journal, indicating at the same time follow-up action.
  - d) If the author does not respond to the allegations, s/he contacts the co-authors. If this is not possible or the publication has no co-authors, the matter is formally referred to the author's supervisor.
3. In the case of a small copy (short phrases) without incorrect attribution:
  - a) S/he contacts the author and explains the standpoint of the magazine, indicating that it is necessary to reformulate the copied phrases or enclose them in quotation marks with links.
  - b) After completing these steps, the review process resumes.
4. S/he informs victims and persons who revealed irregularities on an ongoing basis about actions taken and their results.

## Information about suspected fabricated data in the article

### Editor's activities:

1. S/he collects complete documentation with evidence.
2. S/he is obliged to make sure that the suspicion is justified by asking another reviewer for an opinion.
3. S/he contacts the author to clarify the matter.
4. In the absence of sufficient explanation of the author or his pleading guilty, s/he informs all authors in writing about this fact and transfers the case to the institution supervising the work of the author and asks for investigation.
5. If the circumstances of the case are clarified in favor of the Author, He shall be cleared of all charges and apologized. Then s/he informs the reviewer / reader and continues the review process.
6. If the author does not respond to the allegations, s/he contacts the co-authors. If this is not possible or the publication has no co-authors, s/he informs the author's institution and asks for a formal referral of the matter to the supervisor of the author's institution or the institution supervising the author's work. If this is also ineffective, s/he directly contacts the supervising institution and asks for an investigation. Depending on the findings of the supervising institution, s/he proceeds according to the provisions of items 6 or 7.
7. If proven guilty, s/he rejects the article, and in the event that the publication has been published, s/he publishes a note of its withdrawal.

## **Information on adding/removing author before or after publication of the article**

### **Editor's activities:**

1. S/he explains the reason for the change of authorship, and then verifies that all authors agree to add / remove the author.
2. If all authors agree to add a new author before publication - he or she shall complete the declaration of authorship. If this applies to the situation after publication, and the removed author also agrees - the editor publishes the correction.
3. If the authors suspect dishonest actions – see: provisions regarding suspicion of plagiarism or fabrication of data.
4. S/he informs the suspected author of dishonest acts that it is possible to respond to them in the form of a letter and address the allegations of other authors. The letter will be referred to them by the editor. The interested parties may respond to it. If this helps to clarify the matter, the editor can publish the letters with the consent of the authors.
5. If the authors do not agree to add or remove the author, until all authors have resolved the authorship, they stop reviewing / publishing the text, and in the case of an already published publication - suspend publishing corrections.
6. Both in the case of adding and removing the author, s/he makes appropriate entries in the publication's documentation, showing the changed current state.
7. If the author objects to a decision regarding his exclusion, s/he informs him of the right to ask the co-authors or their institutions to clarify the matter.

## **Information about suspicion for ghost, guest or courtesy writing**

**Ghost author** - a person who has been omitted from the list of authors, despite being eligible for authorship, e.g. statistics.

**Guest or courtesy author** - the person mentioned as the author, despite the fact that he does not meet the criteria for authorship, i.e. adding people for publication in exchange for being added to their publication.

### **Editor's activities:**

1. S/he asks the correspondent author for a statement that all authors meet the criteria for authorship and none have been omitted, and for information on the participation and roles of individual persons.
2. If it is determined that a specific person is missing from the list of authors, even though qualified for authorship, s/he asks for written permission from all authors for changes in the authorship. In addition, s/he reminds the magazine's authorship policy.
3. If it is revealed that a given author does not meet the criteria for authorship, s/he removes such a person from the list and asks for written permission from all authors for changes in the authorship. In addition, s/he reminds the magazine's authorship policy.
4. In the event of renewed suspicion of the same authors, s/he informs the persons responsible for the supervision of the research and / or the authors.

## **Information on suspected conflict of interests in submitted or published article**

### **Editor's activities:**

1. S/he asks the authors to provide relevant documentation, e.g. copies of informed consent documents.
2. If the authors deny it, s/he explains the conflict of interest, presents the policy of the publishing house / magazine and receives from the authors statements of all conflicts of interest, if they have not been obtained previously.
3. In the event that the suspicion concerns a submitted article, s/he shall suspend the review process until the matter is resolved, of which s/he shall inform the author.
4. Then s/he refers the matter to the author's institution or the person responsible for supervising research in that institution.
5. Should s/he not receive explanations within 6 months , s/he shall report the matter to the appropriate ethics committee.
6. S/he informs the reviewer / reader about the transfer of the case to the above-mentioned authorities and about their decisions.

## **Information on suspicion of misappropriation of an idea or author data by a reviewer**

### **Editor's activities:**

1. S/he collects evidence from the author and other sources.
2. If s/he considers the allegations to be justified, s/he informs the reviewer in writing and asks for clarification.
3. If the explanation is not satisfactory or the reviewer does not respond to the allegations, s/he informs the reviewer's institution about the case and asks for clarification of the case.
4. Should the reviewer be found guilty, s/he shall remove the reviewer from the reviewer's database.
5. S/he keeps the author informed about the actions taken.

## **Reservations for the published article addressed directly at the publisher or editor**

### **Editor's activities:**

1. S/he provides information about any publisher's allegations.
2. If the allegations are specific, s/he shall inform the authors by e-mail about the reservations and ask for clarification.
3. If the explanation is not satisfactory, s/he takes appropriate action depending on the type of objections raised.
4. If the allegations were made via social media, s/he responds through the same website, but gives an email to the editor for further contact.
5. S/he informs people who have raised objections about the activities and results of actions, via the same messengers that the reporting persons used.

**SUBMISSION AND REVIEW PROCEDURE**  
of the articles to the journal „*The study of Security*”

