

Ethical principles in the "Copernican Journal of Law"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Rules for members of the Editorial Board.....	2
Author Policy.....	8
Reviewer Policy	14
Rules for members of the Scientific Council	17
Reader Policy	18

Introduction

The principles of publication ethics in force in the journal are in accordance with the guidelines of the Board on Publication Ethics (COPE), the *Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors* [1] and the *Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing* [2].

In cases not covered by this Publication Ethics Policy, the Editorial Board shall apply appropriate procedures prepared by the Publication Ethics Committee (COPE) [3].

The standards presented below concern the ethical principles applicable to Authors, Editors, Reviewers and the Scientific Council at each stage of publication of texts in the journal.

All articles submitted for publication in the journal are checked for compliance with the principles of ethics, reliability, transparency, value and scientific usefulness.

Sources:

[1] COPE Council, *Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors*, https://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf, Access: 12.12.2024.

[2] The Committee on Publication Ethics, DOAJ, the Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association, the World Association of Medical Editors, *Principles of transparency and best practice in scholarly publishing*, <https://doaj.org/apply/transparency/>, Access: 12.12.2024.

[3] COPE Council, *Polish: all flowcharts*, <https://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts/polish-all-flowcharts>, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.36>, Access: 12.12.2024.

Rules for members of the Editorial Board

The members of the Editorial Board constantly take care of the good condition, consistency, regularity, availability and quality of the journal. They are guided by scientific reliability and impartiality. The Editorial Board strives to raise scientific, editorial and ethical standards.

I. Monitoring of ethical standards

The Editorial Board constantly monitors compliance with standards and ethical principles related to the publication of scientific texts and counteracts practices that are not in accordance with the accepted standards.

II. Principle of fair play

Texts submitted for publication are evaluated by the Editorial Board primarily in terms of content, form and technology. The Board's decisions must be based on scientific values, and issues such as race, gender, religion, ethnicity, citizenship, disability or political beliefs of the Authors must in no way affect the evaluation of articles [2].

III. Publication decisions

The Editorial Board decides which materials will be published and which will not be published. The following criteria are key in making a decision: scientific significance of the paper, originality of the approach to the problem, transparency and compliance with the thematic scope of the journal, compliance with the principles of ethics, compliance with the substantive and formal requirements described in *the Editorial Guidelines* and indications formulated by the Reviewer during the scientific review process.

The Editorial Board is obliged to inform the Author(s) about the result of the editorial evaluation of the submitted text.

IV. Confidentiality

Members of the Editorial Board adhere to the principle of confidentiality, so they do not disclose any information about the papers submitted for publication to unauthorized persons. Only the Authors, selected Reviewers, authorized Editors and members of the Editorial Board and the Scientific Council remain authorized to possess this information.

V. Prevention of conflicts of interest

Unpublished articles may not be used by members of the Editorial Board or by any other persons participating in the publishing procedures without the written consent of the Authors.

The Editorial Board, when appointing a Reviewer, must take into account the principle of counteracting conflicts of interest.

A conflict of interest in the case of a Reviewer may arise when circumstances arise that may raise doubts as to his/her impartiality or affect his/her actions during the review procedure, e.g. professional, financial, legal connections, opinions of the Reviewer, scientific rivalry, family relationships.

In the event that a member of the Editorial Board or the Scientific Council submits a text to the journal, the Editorial Board makes every effort to maintain impartiality in the editing and review processes. These processes are supervised by another Editor of the journal, and the person submitting the text is excluded from them [4].

The Editorial Board provides the reader with information on the sources of funding for publications and institutional support or financial disclosure from organizations and other persons or entities (*financial disclosure*) in published research.

VI. Complaints, complaints, appeals

In the event of complaints, grievances or appeals, the Editorial Board of the journal is obliged to record and archive them. The Board asks for a detailed description of the case in the report and an indication of what content or actions it concerns. The Board is obliged to maintain the anonymity of the data of the person sending it, unless the person himself expresses a desire to disclose his data. The only persons authorized to possess this information are: the submitter, authorized Editors and the Publisher. The Editorial Board is obliged to respond in writing to complaints, complaints and appeals submitted to the Editorial Board within 30 days from the date of receipt of such a document. The Board's response must include at least an assessment of the case and a description of the actions taken or planned by the Editorial Board in connection with the case.

VII. Principle of scientific integrity

Members of the Editorial Board are obliged to make every effort to maintain the integrity of the scientific integrity of the published papers. To this end, they may make appropriate corrections and, in the event of suspicion of unfair practices (plagiarism, falsification of research results, etc.) or unethical activities, decide to withdraw the text from publication.

All manifestations of *scientific misconduct*, in particular: *ghostwriting*; *guest authorship*; plagiarism; fabrication or falsification of data; data manipulation; the Matilda phenomenon; the St. Matthew effect [5]; erroneous and unconscientious conduct of research proceedings and violation of the principles of ethics in science are inadmissible and must be immediately analysed and considered by the Editor-in-Chief and the Scientific Council.

The Editorial Board of the journal is obliged to record and archive such cases.

The Editorial Board asks for information if such practices are detected. It is suggested that the report should include a detailed description of the case and an indication of what content it concerns.

Upon receipt of the application, the Board contacts the Author(s), asks for clarification, collects and familiarizes itself with the collected and provided evidence of scientific malpractice, and then formulates a decision on retraction, correction/correction, and informing the relevant authorities and/or institutions.

VIII. Firewall of ghostwriting and guest authorship

The Editorial Board, in the interest of scientific reliability of the published texts, selects the submitted articles in accordance with the principles of the ghostwriting and guest authorship firewall. The phenomenon of ghostwriting occurs when someone has made a significant contribution to the creation of a publication, but their participation as one of the authors has not been disclosed or their role in the acknowledgements included in the publication has not been indicated. Guest authorship (honorary authorship) is a case where someone who had a negligible or no part in the creation of a publication was nevertheless designated as the Author/Co-Author of the publication.

To counteract cases of ghostwriting and guest authorship, the Editorial Board introduces appropriate procedures.

The Board requires Authors and Co-Authors to submit declarations [6], in particular declarations of the type and scope of contribution (percentage) of individual Authors and Co-Authors to the creation of the work, along with data (name, surname, affiliation, ORCID identifier).

Ghostwriting and guest authorship are manifestations of scientific dishonesty, and any detected cases will be exposed, including the notification of relevant entities (institutions employing authors, scientific societies, associations of scientific editors, etc.).

The Board requires information on the sources of funding for publications and the institutional support of published research by organizations and other entities (*financial disclosure*).

IX. Proofreading of texts

The Editorial Board, Author(s) and Reviewers may correct texts through discussion at the stage of the editorial process (before the publication of the text).

The author may require the Editorial Board to make any corrections to the text submitted by him/her.

The Board also reserves the right to correct texts after their publication, without informing the Readers and Authors. This applies only to the so-called minor changes. Minor changes include, for example, fixing formatting and spelling. These are not significant adjustments that affect the reception or scope of the content presented.

Significant changes, such as retraction of the article due to error, addition or removal of the Author, improvement of data affecting the interpretation of research results after publication, may be implemented in accordance with the procedures indicated by COPE [3].

The Editorial Board invites all interested parties to engage in debates and discussions on the published content. The Board may publish the content of the debate on the journal, on the journal's website or on an external website.

X. Withdrawal of the text

The Drafting Board may consider withdrawing a text if:

- there is clear evidence of a lack of reliability of the test results, fabrication of data, as well as unintentional errors (e.g. errors in calculations, methodological errors);
- the results of the research have been previously published elsewhere without proper reference to previous sources or disclosure of such information to the Editorial Board, without consent for republication or without justification (cases of redundant publication);
- it contains materials or data without appropriate consents to their use (e.g. the right to use illustrations, the right to dispose of the image, other licenses or sublicenses – also the wrong scope of fields of exploitation or the time range of such consents/licenses);
- it infringes a copyright or derivative right;

- ethics procedures or international, national and institutional regulations were not followed during the research;
- the principle of no conflict of interest of the Authors, Reviewers or the Editorial Board has been violated, which affects the interpretation of the texts;
- the work bears the hallmarks of plagiarism, self-plagiarism or violates other ethical principles.

A notice of retraction of a text should be treated as equivalent to a retraction of an article. This notice should contain information about the person (the heading should include at least the title(s) and the name(s) of the Author(s) of the paper) and the reasons (in order to distinguish between unintentional errors and intentional misuse) determining the retraction. Withdrawn texts are not removed from the published version of the journal, but the fact and reason for their withdrawal will be clearly indicated. This does not apply to situations in which the legitimate legal interest of the Author, the Editorial Board, the Publisher or third parties is violated – in which case the text may be withdrawn and the Board is obliged to publish an explanatory notice. The author has the right to appeal against the decision of the Editorial Board.

In other cases, the Editorial Board follows the recommendations indicated in *the COPE Retraction Guidelines* [7] and *COPE Flowcharts* [3].

XI. Corrections, clarifications, additions to texts, errata

The Editorial Board, if necessary, is always ready to publish appropriate corrections, clarifications or apologies. They will be published on the journal's website and/or in the published version of the journal.

If, in accordance with this Code of Publication Ethics and the recommendations of COPE, a text does not qualify for retraction or correction of minor changes, the Editorial Board shall allow the publication of errata, additions and/or corrections. Any amendment concerning significant changes (affecting the reception or scope of the content presented and the determination of authorship) should be supplemented with a correction by the Board indicating the scope of the supplement and the reason for introducing this addition.

The Editorial Board undertakes to analyse and document all manifestations of scientific dishonesty.

Any detected and confirmed cases of scientific dishonesty will be exposed, including the notification of relevant entities (institutions employing the Authors, scientific societies, associations of scientific editors, etc.).

XII. Principle of openness and constant access

The Editorial Board supports the open access policy. The journal is published in open access, which means that all content is available free of charge to users and institutions.

All texts are published in electronic version. The editors strive to archive texts in various databases.

XIII. Data sharing and data reproducibility policy

The Editorial Board encourages the Authors to archive research data in open research data repositories. The Editorial Board does not require the Authors to submit research data. In

selected cases, however, the Board may ask the Author to provide research data (e.g. problems with the integrity of the presented data reported to the Board or duplicate data).

XIV. Advertisements

The Editorial Board does not accept any advertisements for publication in the journal.

XV. Fees for Authors and Reviewers

The Editorial Board informs that it does not charge article processing charges (APC) for submission fee, publication fee, review fee, processing fee and does not transfer royalties.

Contact with the Editorial Board of the journal:

Doubts regarding scientific reliability should be addressed: cjl@sgmk.edu.pl

Discussions and comments should be directed to: cjl@sgmk.edu.pl

Ethics of scientific research – questions and applications should be addressed:
cjl@sgmk.edu.pl

In cases not described in this Publication Ethics Policy, the Editorial Board follows the recommendations set out in the COPE Retraction Guidelines [7] and the COPE Flowcharts [3].

Sources:

[1] COPE Council, *Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors*, https://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf, Access: 12.12.2024.

[2] The Committee on Publication Ethics, DOAJ, the Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association, the World Association of Medical Editors, *Principles of transparency and best practice in scholarly publishing*, <https://doaj.org/apply/transparency/>, Access: 12.12.2024.

[3] COPE Council, *Polish: all flowcharts*, <https://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts/polish-all-flowcharts>, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.36>, Access: 12.12.2025.

[4] COPE Council, *Editor as author in own journal*, <https://publicationethics.org/case/editor-author-own-journal>, Access: 12.12.2024.

[5] Examples of scientific dishonesty:

- *Plagiarism* – consists in "appropriating or misleading as to the authorship of all or part of someone else's work or artistic performance" in accordance with the Act of 20 July 2018. Law on Higher Education and Science, Journal of Laws 2018, item 1668, Art. 287 point 1.1.
- *Self-plagiarism* – giving a false impression as to the originality of one's own work in relation to one's previous, but in fact copied, works" (J. M. Doliński, *Self-plagiarism*,

"Edukacja Prawnicza", 2012, no. 3 (132),
<https://www.edukacjaprawnicza.pl/autoplgiat/>, Access: 12.12.2024).

- *The Matilda Phenomenon* – the phenomenon of discrimination against women in science (more: A. Derra, *Silenced and Forgotten. On the Matilda Phenomenon, or the Systemic Diminishing of the Role of Women in Science*, "Ethos. Quarterly of the John Paul II Institute of the Catholic University of Lublin", 2016, Vol. 29, No. 1 (113), pp. 203–220, <https://czasopisma.kul.pl/ethos/article/view/5314>, Access: 12.12.2024).
- *The St. Matthew effect* – occurs when "certain psychosocial processes affect the allocation of rewards to scientists for their contributions – an allocation that in turn affects the flow of ideas and discoveries in the communication networks of science" (R.K. Merton, *The Matthew effect in science: The reward and communication systems of science are considered*, "Science", 1968, 159 (3810), p. 56, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1723414.pdf>, Access: 12.12.2024).

[6] The list of necessary documents is presented in the section Rules for Authors. Basic formal requirements for publication.

[7] COPE Council, *COPE Guidelines: Retraction Guidelines*,
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.4>, Access: 14.12.2024.

Author Policy

I. Rules regarding the authorship of the work

Authorship can refer to individuals or groups who create an idea or develop a publication that disseminates intellectual or creative work [2].

All persons listed as Authors in the submitted work must have actually had a significant share in the creation of the text (design, idea, planning, execution, interpretation of results). In addition, all people who had an impact on the final shape of the work should be listed as Co-authors. The obligation to make sure that the persons contributing to the creation of the article accept its final form lies with the Author submitting the text for publication.

Other people who do not meet the above condition of authorship and their contribution to the creation of the text was insignificant (e.g. general mentoring, coordinating research, data collection) may give their consent to be included in the Acknowledgments section.

The order of the Authors must be determined and accepted by all the Authors of the text. A change in authorship or order in unpublished texts requires the consent of the Authors of the text and the Editor-in-Chief, as well as an explanation of the reason for such changes. After the publication of the text, changes to the information about the Authors can be implemented in accordance with the procedures indicated by COPE [1].

The Editorial Board recommends the use of the CRediT taxonomy (*Contributor Roles Taxonomy*) [3] in determining the contribution of the Authors.

The Board requires the Authors to submit a statement of originality of the work [4], in particular a declaration of the type and scope of the contribution of individual Authors to the creation of the work, along with data (name, surname, affiliation, ORCID identifier).

Before publishing the text, the author(s) sign a license agreement with the Publisher (including the GDPR clause) and submit to the Editorial Board a Statement of Originality of the work, confirming the fulfilment of the authorship criteria set out in this *Publication Ethics*. The contribution of individual Authors to the creation of the publication is presented; a certificate of non-omission of any other persons deserving of authorship and of responsibility for the completeness and correctness of the submitted statements.

By submitting a text for publication, the author undertakes to make editorial corrections, respond to reviews within the deadline set by the Board and declares that he/she will fulfil the obligation to respond to the discussion or polemic at the Board's request.

The author may require the Board to make any amendments to the text submitted by him.

Only a human being can be the author of scientific texts. AI tools cannot be considered an author or co-author.

II. Principle of fair play

Texts submitted for publication are evaluated by the Editorial Board primarily in terms of content, form and technology. The Board's decisions must be based on scientific values, and issues such as race, gender, religion, ethnicity, citizenship, disability or political beliefs of the Author(s) must not in any way affect the evaluation of articles [2]. In the event that the Author(s) suspect that the principle of fair play has not been observed, they may (may) lodge a complaint or complaint with the Editor-in-Chief of the journal. More on this topic in the section: Rules for

members of the Editorial Board: Decisions regarding publication and Complaints, complaints, appeals).

III. Principle of scientific integrity

Authors of texts submitted for publication are obliged to provide a reliable description of the research work performed and an objective interpretation of the results. The work should contain sufficient information to identify the sources of data as well as to replicate the research. Unreliable or unethical presentation and interpretation of data and research results is unacceptable and may result in the retraction of the text.

All manifestations of scientific misconduct, in particular: ghostwriting; guest authorship; plagiarism; fabrication or falsification of data; data manipulation; the Matilda phenomenon; the St. Matthew effect [6]; erroneous and unconscientious conduct of research proceedings and violation of the principles of ethics in science are inadmissible and must be immediately analysed and considered by the Editor-in-Chief and the Scientific Council. The Editorial Board of the journal is obliged to record and archive such cases.

Texts that do not meet the principles of scientific reliability will not be admitted to publication. In the event that the unreliability has been reported/noticed after the publication of the text, the Editorial Board – after receiving such a report – contacts the Author, asks for an explanation, collects and familiarizes itself with the collected and provided evidence of scientific unreliability, and then formulates a decision on withdrawal, correction/correction, and on informing the relevant authorities and/or institutions. The author has the right to appeal against the decision of the Editorial Board to the Editor-in-Chief of the journal.

IV. Principle of reliability of sources

Authors of submitted papers are always obliged to indicate publications and other sources that were used by them in the creation of the article.

V. Principle of originality of the work

Authors may submit only their own original texts for publication. These texts cannot be submitted in parallel with another journal/publication or be part of an already published journal/publication.

Only in special and justified cases is it permissible for the Editor-in-Chief to consent to the republication of a previously published text. The text must contain a bibliographic reference to the originally published text.

Authors, using research or referring to the data or words of others, should use appropriate markings indicating citation. Plagiarism or fabrication of data are unacceptable.

VI. The principle of counteracting conflicts of interest of the Authors

Unpublished articles may not be used by members of the Editorial Board or any other persons participating in the publishing procedures without the written consent of the Authors.

By submitting a text, the authors provide information about the sources of funding for the publication and the support of published research by institutions, organizations or other persons and entities (*financial disclosure*).

In addition, they submit a declaration of no conflict of interest [4, 5].

Authors may be asked by the Editorial Board to submit the submitted text in an anonymized version in order to maintain the confidentiality of the data in the review process.

VII. Principle of data sharing

Author(s) may be asked to provide raw research results, so they should be prepared to provide access to this data. It is not required to attach research data to articles. You can archive these data in open repositories of research data [7], and then introduce their correct citation in your publications, in particular by providing a DOI number or other identifier.

VIII. Rules on errors in published papers

If the Author discovers significant errors or inaccuracies in his text, he is obliged to immediately notify the Editorial Board of the journal in order to withdraw the text, prepare an errata or correct the errors.

The author, by declaring his willingness to publish the article, at the same time declares that he will fulfil the obligation to respond to the Board's call for explanations regarding possible complaints, grievances, allegations of scientific unreliability regarding the published text.

IX. Proofreading of texts, additions

The author, the Editorial Board and the Reviewers may correct the texts at the stage of the editorial process (before the publication of the text), through discussion. By submitting a text for publication, the author undertakes to actively participate in discussions with the Editorial Board of the journal.

The Board reserves the right to correct texts after publication of the text without informing the Authors. This applies only to the so-called minor changes. Minor changes include, for example, corrections to formatting and spelling. These are not significant adjustments that affect the reception or scope of the content presented.

Significant changes, such as retraction of the article due to an error, addition or removal of the Author, improvement of data affecting the interpretation of research results after publication, may be implemented in accordance with the procedures indicated by COPE [1].

Authors are required to promptly report and correct any errors, inaccuracies, or misleading statements they discover.

X. Discussions

In accordance with these Rules of Publication Ethics, the Editorial Board invites all interested parties to discuss the published content. The Board may publish the content of the debate on the pages of the journal, on the journal's website or on an external website.

The author, when declaring his willingness to publish the article, at the same time declares that he will fulfil the obligation to respond to the discussion at the request of the Editorial Board.

XI. Withdrawal of the text by the Author

The author has the right to withdraw the text submitted to the Editorial Board in the event of gross negligence of the Board during the editorial work. In the event of significant delays in editorial work, the Authors should be informed of the reason for the delay. The Board should provide the Author with information about the assumed maximum time for the procedure of the

article. Complaints and grievances about the Board's negligence and requests for retraction of the article should be addressed directly to the Editor-in-Chief.

XII. Principle of compliance with ethical oversight

If the text describes a study conducted on humans, animals, embryos, dual-use products, and if it contains confidential data or describes issues that may have a harmful impact on the environment and living organisms, the Author is obliged to provide the Editorial Board with a declaration and certificates that all international, national and institutional procedures and regulations (e.g. CDBI – the Committee Steering Supervisor for Bioethics).

XIII. Personal data protection rules

In the case of processing of in-text personal data for scientific purposes, it is necessary to ensure that the rights of the data subject are safeguarded or appropriate consents to the processing of such data should be obtained, in particular, taking into account international and national law, taking into account Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation). If necessary, the Author should provide the Editorial Board with a personal data entrustment agreement or appropriate authorizations.

XIV. Principle of respect for intellectual property rights

The Author submitting the text for publication must declare that the article is original, does not infringe the rights or personal rights of third parties and that he has obtained consent from persons whose images or statements, artistic or photographic works have been recorded/used in the work, to use them in the text and make them available on the Internet and in print.

XV. Basic formal requirements for publication

The Author, when submitting a text for publication, undertakes, in particular, to provide the documents and statements required by the Editorial Board and/or the Publisher. Authors before publication of the text:

- sign an agreement with the Publisher (the obligation applies to all Authors of the article);
- provide the Editorial Board with a statement of originality of the work, which indicates:
 - the contribution of individual Authors to the creation of the publication;
 - meeting the authorship criteria set forth in this Publication Ethics Policy;
 - not omitting any other persons deserving authorship;
 - responsibility for the integrity and completeness of the information contained in the statement;
- provide a declaration of no conflict of interest (the obligation applies to all Authors of the article);
- provide a statement of originality of the work;

- provide information on sources of funding for publications and institutional support for published research by organizations and other individuals and entities (financial disclosure);
- provide appropriate declarations, licenses, sublicenses, consents or agreements required by law (e.g. consent to use the illustrations, statement of the right to dispose of the image);
- provide other required declarations and certifications, including that any ethical procedures have been taken into account in the study.

All required printouts in the downloadable version can be found on the journal's website in the Documents for Authors section.

In cases not described in this Ethics Policy, the Editorial Board follows the recommendations indicated in *the COPE Retraction Guidelines* [8] and *COPE Flowcharts* [1].

Sources:

[1] COPE Council, *Polish: all flowcharts*,

<https://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts/polish-all-flowcharts>,

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.36>, access: 14.12.2024.

[2] COPE, *Authorship*, <https://publicationethics.org/resources/discussion-documents/what-constitutes-authorship-english-june-2014>, Access: 14.12.2024.

[3] Contributor Role Taxonomy (CRediT), <https://credit.niso.org/>, Access: 14.12.2024.

[4] A template of the statement is available on the Publisher's website in the *Documents for Authors section*.

[5] "A conflict of interest in the Author occurs when the Author has specific financial interests or connections, direct or indirect, or there are other situations that may raise doubts as to his impartiality or affect his actions, e.g. when the validity of research depends on the Author's personal relationships, his private opinions, scientific rivalry, etc." Quote. from: Oxford Academic, *Conflicts of interest*, https://academic.oup.com/pages/authoring/journals/preparing_your_manuscript/conflicts_of_interest, Access 14.12.2024.

[6] Examples of scientific dishonesty:

- *Plagiarism* – consists in "appropriating or misleading as to the authorship of all or part of someone else's work or artistic performance" in accordance with the Act of 20 July 2018. Law on Higher Education and Science, Journal of Laws, 2018, item 1668, Art. 287 point 1.1.
- *Self-plagiarism* – giving a false impression as to the originality of one's own work in relation to one's previous, but in fact copied, works" (J. M. Doliński, *Self-plagiarism*, "Edukacja Prawnicza", 2012, no. 3 (132), <https://www.edukacjaprawnicza.pl/autoplgiat/>, Access: 12.12.2024).

- *The Matilda Phenomenon* – the phenomenon of discrimination against women in science (more: A. Derra, *Silenced and Forgotten. On the Matilda Phenomenon, or the Systemic Diminishing of the Role of Women in Science*, "Ethos. Quarterly of the John Paul II Institute of the Catholic University of Lublin", 2016, Vol. 29, No. 1 (113), pp. 203–220, <https://czasopisma.kul.pl/ethos/article/view/5314>, Access: 12.12.2024).
- *The St. Matthew effect* – occurs when "certain psychosocial processes affect the allocation of rewards to scientists for their contributions – an allocation that in turn affects the flow of ideas and discoveries in the communication networks of science" (R.K. Merton, *The Matthew effect in science: The reward and communication systems of science are considered*, "Science", 1968, 159 (3810), p. 56, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1723414.pdf>, Access: 12.12.2024).

[7] We encourage Authors to archive research data in open research data repositories, e.g.:

- Research Data Catalogue: <https://mostwiedzy.pl/pl/open-research-data/catalog>.
- RepOD Open Research Data Repository: <https://repod.icm.edu.pl/info/>.
- Zenodo: <https://zenodo.org/>.
- Figshare: <https://figshare.com/>.
- Mendeley Data: <https://data.mendeley.com/>.

[8] COPE Council, *COPE Guidelines: Retraction Guidelines*, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.4>, Access: 12.12.2024.

Reviewer Policy

I. Review process

Reviewers participate in the work of the Editorial Board and have an impact on the decisions made by the Board. They may also, in consultation with the Authors, influence the final shape and improvement of the published works.

The review is conducted in double blind mode, which means that the Authors and Reviewers do not know each other's identities.

The identity of the Authors is unknown to the Reviewer, but known to the Editorial Board.

The names of the reviewers of individual issues are disclosed in a given issue of the journal.

All scientific texts are subject to review (this rule does not apply to: scientific reviews, reports, communications, popular science articles, editorials).

The review takes place before the publication of the text, after the Author submits the text for evaluation by the Editorial Board.

The Board appoints at least two independent Reviewers from outside the scientific unit affiliated by the Author of the publication to evaluate each publication (external reviews).

The Editorial Board is responsible for the selection of the Reviewers, guided in particular by the research interests, scientific achievements and competences of the Reviewer in the field of science to which the text in question belongs.

The reviewer may refuse to perform a review for formal reasons (e.g. conflict of interest, inability to meet the deadlines for review) or non-formal reasons (research interests do not coincide with the subject matter addressed in the text). In such a case, the Reviewer is obliged to notify the Editorial Board without delay.

It is inadmissible to appoint a member of the Editorial Board or the Scientific Council as a Reviewer.

The Editorial Board does not use reviews from other journals, from commercial review platforms, online forums, etc.

If the Author of the text is a member of the Editorial Board or the Scientific Council, the selection of the Reviewer rests with another member of the Editorial Board, who is not the Author. Such a person is subject to the Author's rules and obligations, but is not subject to the privileges of a member of the Editorial Board or the Scientific Council related to participation in editorial work, in the review process and in making decisions related to this text.

The review must be in writing. The reviewer should provide a review form provided by the SGMK Publishing. The review must contain an unambiguous assessment of whether the article is accepted for publication or rejected with justification.

Only texts that are subject to the review process and have received two positive reviews may be admitted for publication by the Editorial Board.

Texts that have received one negative review, in relation to which the reviewer indicates the possibility of admitting the text for publication after correcting it, may be sent back to the Author with recommendations. The author makes appropriate corrections, then the text is sent for re-

review (second round of review). Texts that have received one negative review may be rejected by the Editorial Board without conducting a second round of review.

The evaluation criteria taken into account during the review process are indicated in the review form.

The Editorial Board provides the Reviewer with a review form, which is the basic document for expressing the Reviewer's conclusions. The reviewer may additionally provide other materials (e.g. written comments, content of the text with comments) along with the review form.

The content of the review is not disclosed to the public. Review reports are made available to the Editorial Board and may be made available to Authors (after anonymization).

No direct interaction between the Authors and the Reviewers is allowed. The contact is anonymized. Conclusions, reports from reviews and responses of the Authors are submitted through the Editorial Board or with the use of an appropriate system ensuring data anonymization in the double blind review mode.

II. Confidentiality

All peer-reviewed papers are confidential, which means that disclosure to third parties is not acceptable (except for authorized persons).

III. Principle of maintaining the standards of objectivity

Reviews should be objective. Personal criticism of the authors of the works is considered inappropriate. All the Reviewer's observations should be properly substantiated.

IV. Principle of scientific integrity

Reviewers are obliged to make every effort to comply with the standards and ethical principles related to the publication of scientific texts and to counteract practices inconsistent with the accepted standards. To this end, they may make appropriate corrections, and in the event of suspicion of unfair practices (plagiarism, falsification of research results, etc.) or unethical activities, they may decide not to allow the text to be published.

V. Principle of reliability of sources

Reviewers, if necessary, should indicate relevant works not cited by the Author. Any significant similarities to other works should also be indicated and reported to the Editorial Board.

VI. Principle of fair play

Issues such as: race, gender, religion, origin, citizenship, disability or political beliefs of the Authors cannot affect the result of the review in any way. Texts submitted for publication are evaluated primarily in terms of content, form and technology. The Reviewers' decisions must be based on scientific values [1].

V. Principle of counteracting conflicts of interest in the Reviewers

Reviewers may not use the peer-reviewed papers for their personal needs and benefits. They are also not allowed to evaluate texts in which there may be a conflict of interest with the Author(s).

A conflict of interest on the part of a Reviewer may arise where circumstances exist that could call into question the Reviewer's impartiality or affect the Reviewer's conduct during the review

procedure, including, but not limited to, professional, financial, or legal relationships, personal views, scientific rivalry, or family relationships.

VI. Principle of timeliness

Reviewers are obliged to provide reviews within the set deadline. If for some reason (substantive reasons, lack of time) they are unable to meet the deadline or undertake the review, they should immediately inform the Editorial Board.

In cases not described in this Publication Ethics Policy, the Editorial Board follows the recommendations indicated in the COPE Retraction Guidelines [2] and COPE Flowcharts [3].

Sources:

[1] COPE Council, *Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors*, https://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf, Access: 14.12.2024.

[2] COPE Council, *COPE Guidelines: Retraction Guidelines*, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.4>, Access: 12.12.2024

[3] COPE Council, *Polish: all flowcharts*, <https://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts/polish-all-flowcharts>, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.36>, Access: 12.12.2024.

Rules for members of the Scientific Council

Members of the Scientific Council should be recognized experts in the field consistent with the thematic scope of the journal.

The names and affiliations of the members of the Scientific Council are published on the journal's website. The Editorial Board undertakes to immediately update the information on the composition of the Scientific Council.

I. Duties of the members of the Scientific Council

The duties of the members of the Scientific Council include:

- Ensuring compliance with the standards and ethical principles applicable to the Authors, the Editorial Board, and the Reviewers at every stage of publication of texts in the journal, with an emphasis on scientific reliability, transparency of procedures, striving to present valuable and useful scientific texts.
- Setting and updating the goals and missions of the journal, controlling the implementation of the journal's mission.
- Striving to implement best practices, aligning with recommendations and requirements in the field of editorial work and scientific information.
- Identification and selection of members of the Editorial Board and verification of its activities.
- Defining the recipient group of the journal.
- Promotion of the journal.
- Periodic verification of solutions and practices used by the journal.
- Encouraging Authors and Reviewers to cooperate with the journal.
- Cooperation with other members of the Scientific Council.
- Mentoring, determining the journal's development policy.
- Cooperation with the Editorial Board of the journal and the Publisher.
- Resolving disputes and misunderstandings, contacting external authorities (e.g. COPE).
- Supporting its activities at the request of the Editorial Board, in particular in the event of any violations.

Reader Policy

I. Open access

All texts from the journal are published in electronic version under the Attribution – No Derivative Works 4.0 International (CC BY-ND 4.0) license, which means that the works can be copied and distributed in any medium and format with the appropriate attribution, a link to the license and an indication if changes have been made to them. In addition, you may not distribute modified content when remixing, processing, or creating from a work. Before using the licensed work, please read the license terms and conditions contained in the <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/deed.pl> license carefully (Access: 12.12.2024).

II. Discussions

The Editorial Board invites all interested parties to discuss the published content. The Board may publish the content of the debate on the pages of the journal, on the journal's website or on an external website.

III. Detection of manifestations of scientific dishonesty

The Editorial Board asks you to inform us if any manifestations of scientific misconduct are detected, in particular: ghostwriting; guest authorship, plagiarism, fabrication or falsification of data, manipulation of data, the Matilda phenomenon, the St. Matthew effect [1], erroneous and unconscientious conduct of research proceedings and violation of the principles of ethics in science. The Editorial Board of the journal is obliged to record and archive such cases. It is suggested that the report should include a detailed description of the case and an indication of what content it concerns.

Such applications must be immediately analysed and considered by the Editor-in-Chief and the Scientific Council.

Upon receipt of the application, the Editorial Board contacts the Author, asks for clarification, familiarizes itself with the collected and provided evidence of scientific unreliability, and then formulates a decision on withdrawal, correction/correction, and on informing the relevant authorities and/or institutions. The Editor-in-Chief (or Vice Editor-in-Chief) contacts the person reporting the infringement and/or makes the decision publicly available.

Contact with the Editorial Board of the journal:

Doubts regarding scientific reliability, as well as discussions and comments should be directed to: cjl@sgmk.edu.pl

Sources:

[1] Examples of scientific dishonesty:

1. *Plagiarism* – consists in "appropriating or misleading as to the authorship of all or part of someone else's work or artistic performance" in accordance with the Act of 20 July 2018. Law on Higher Education and Science, Journal of Laws, 2018, item 1668, Art. 287 point 1.1.

1. *Self-plagiarism* – giving a false impression as to the originality of one's own work in relation to one's previous, but in fact copied, works" (J. M. Doliński, *Self-plagiarism*, "Edukacja Prawnicza", 2012, no. 3 (132), <https://www.edukacjaprawnicza.pl/autoplgiat/>, Access: 12.12.2024).
1. *The Matilda Phenomenon* – the phenomenon of discrimination against women in science (more: A. Derra, *Silenced and Forgotten. On the Matilda Phenomenon, or the Systemic Diminishing of the Role of Women in Science*, "Ethos. Quarterly of the John Paul II Institute of the Catholic University of Lublin", 2016, Vol. 29, No. 1 (113), pp. 203–220, <https://czasopisma.kul.pl/ethos/article/view/5314>, Access: 12.12.2024).
1. *The St. Matthew effect* – occurs when "certain psychosocial processes affect the allocation of rewards to scientists for their contributions – an allocation that in turn affects the flow of ideas and discoveries in the communication networks of science" (R.K. Merton, *The Matthew effect in science: The reward and communication systems of science are considered*, "Science", 1968, 159 (3810), p. 56, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1723414.pdf>, Access: 12.12.2024).