



PUBLISHING ETHICS

The principles of publishing ethics were developed on the basis of the recommendations of the COPE Committee on Publication Ethics contained in the Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors and COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers (Ethical Guidelines of the Publication Ethics Committee for reviewers of scientific papers) and the study "Good Practices in Review Procedures in Science". With full acceptance of these recommendations, the principles of publishing ethics applicable to each of the parties - the editorial office, reviewers and authors involved in the publication process, were implemented for the purposes of the journal.

EDITORIAL DUTIES

Monitoring of ethical standards:

The editorial office ensures compliance with publishing standards and the principles of publishing ethics and prevents any practice that is inconsistent with the adopted standards. The editorial office systematically monitors publishing ethical standards commonly accepted at the international level. Members of the Editorial Board are obliged to respect the current legal regulations regarding copyright, personal data protection, defamation and plagiarism, as well as strive to eliminate cases of plagiarism as well as guest authorship and ghostwriting practices. All articles submitted for publication in the journal are checked for compliance with the principles of ethics, reliability, value, and scientific usefulness.

Publication decisions:

The editorial board is responsible for making the decision to accept or reject the work. This decision is based on the scientific value of the publication, its compliance with the topic presented in the journal, the originality of the approach to the topic and the clarity of the argument. Editors' decisions are made after considering the opinions of at least two independent reviewers who are experts in their field. Editors accept only original texts that have not been published before and have not been submitted, in whole or in part, for publication in other journals, and do not duplicate existing works.

Confidentiality:

Members of the editorial team are obliged to maintain the confidentiality of information obtained at every stage of the publication process, and therefore do not disclose any information about the articles submitted for publication to unauthorized persons. The only persons authorized to have this information are: authors, selected reviewers, members of the editorial office.

Scientific reliability:

Editorial team members are required to make every effort to maintain integrity in terms of scientific integrity of published articles. For this purpose, they can make appropriate corrections, and in the case of suspected unfair practices (plagiarism, falsification of research results), decide to withdraw the text from publication. In the event of discovering scientific misconduct, the editorial office follows the procedure recommended by COPE.

Text Withdrawal:

The editorial team may consider withdrawing a text if:

- there is evidence of the unreliability of research results, data fabrication, as well as in the case of unintentional errors (e.g., calculation errors, methodological errors),
- the research results have already been published,
- the work bears the signs of plagiarism, self-plagiarism, or violates the rules of ethics.

The notification of text withdrawal should be considered tantamount to the withdrawal of the article. This notification should contain information about the person (the header should contain at least the title and surname of the author (s)) and the reasons (in order to distinguish between unintentional errors and intentional abuse) deciding about the withdrawal of the text. The withdrawn texts will not be removed from the published version of the journal, but the fact of their withdrawal will be clearly marked.

Disclosure of information and conflict of interest:

Information obtained in the process of evaluating the publication, without the written consent of the author,

may not be disclosed by the editors to any other person than being a party to the publication process. Moreover, without the written consent of the author, none of the submitted texts, including its fragments and the rejected text, may be used for the own research (personal gain) of the reviewers and editorial staff.

Discrimination:

Articles are assessed on the basis of their quality and relevance to the journal, regardless of the author's origin, nationality, ethnicity, political views, disability, gender, race or religion.

Access to the content of the journal:

The editorial office provides constant, free access to published articles on the website: <http://journal.ptezg.pl>.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF REVIEWERS

Editorial decisions:

The reviewer participates in the works of the editorial team and influences the decisions made by the editors, as well as influences the final shape and improvement of published works.

Feedback:

The reviewer should consent to the evaluation of only those works in the field of which he has adequate knowledge, enabling him to issue an appropriate opinion within a specified time. The reviewer is obliged to deliver the review within the set time limit. If for some reason (content-related, lack of time) he is unable to undertake the review or meet the deadline, he should immediately inform the editors about it.

Objectivity Standards:

In order to increase the scientific value of the text, reviews should be made objectively, in accordance with ethical standards, based on scientific arguments.

Personal critique of the author is considered inappropriate. Reviewers should clearly express their views, supporting them with appropriate arguments.

Confidentiality:

The reviewer is obliged to maintain the confidential nature of the scientific review and not to disclose any details of the article or review.

Anonymity:

All reviews are anonymous. The editors do not share the authors' data with reviewers, and vice versa.

Disclosure of information and conflict of interest:

Confidential information or ideas arising from reviews must be kept secret and not be used for personal gain. Reviewers should not review works in relation to which there is a conflict of interest resulting from the relationship with the author or institution related to the work.

Reliability of sources:

The reviewer should identify published papers that have not been cited by the author. Any statement that an observation, source, or argument has been previously discussed should be supported by an appropriate quote. The reviewer should also inform the editorial office of any significant similarity, partial overlapping of the content of the reviewed work with any other published and known work, or any suspicion of plagiarism.

AUTHORS DUTIES

Authorship of the work:

The author may submit only original works of his own authorship for publication. All references to works and research by other authors should be provided with appropriate footnotes and should be disclosed in the bibliography. In the case of multi-author texts, authors are required to disclose the contributions of individual authors with an indication of what exactly was the contribution of a given author to the overall work (authorship of the concept, carrying out empirical research, editing a specific part of the text, etc.). The author may submit for publication only unpublished works and works that have not been submitted for publication in other publishing houses. Submitting articles to more than one publisher at a time is considered unethical. Ghost authorship, guest authorship and gift authorship are considered scientific misconduct and are not accepted by the editorial office. In the event of such proceedings being detected, the editorial office shall notify the relevant entities, including institutions employing the author, scientific societies, scientists' associations and others, depending on the circumstances.

Scientific reliability:

The author is obliged to accurately describe the research work carried out and objectively discuss the results. The publication should contain information enabling the identification of data sources. Presenting and interpreting research results in a dishonest or inaccurate manner is unacceptable and may result in the withdrawal of the work.

The originality of the work:

The author submits only the original work, previously unpublished and unevaluated, to the editorial office. In the event that he uses research and / or the words of others, he should use appropriate citation markings. Plagiarism or the fabrication of data is unacceptable.

Access to the data:

The author is obliged to cooperate with the editorial office as part of the review process. In particular, at the request of the editorial office, he should provide the data on which he bases his research results and provide appropriate explanations, depending on the needs. The author is obliged to provide access to the data he refers to in his work, also after its publication. He should keep this data for one year from the moment of publication.

Disclosure of information and conflict of interest:

The author should disclose any conflicts of interest that may affect the research results or their interpretation. Disclose all sources of financial support for your work, including the grant number or other funding source reference.

Fundamental errors in published works:

The author notifies the editors in the event of noticing significant inaccuracies or errors in the published work of his authorship. The editorial office, depending on the circumstances, takes action in the form of clarification, correction or withdrawal of the article.

PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN CASE OF POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS

1. In the event of plagiarism, the editors reject the submitted article. If the text has already been published, the editorial office publishes information about the withdrawal of the text from publication and notifies the author, editorial office and publisher of the plagiarized article or book. The editorial office notifies the relevant entities about the matter, including institutions employing the author, scientific societies, associations of scientists and others, depending on the circumstances.
2. In the case of insignificant duplication of someone else's work, the editorial office contacts the author and presents its position. If the text is at the review stage, the editorial office asks for correction of the text part which constitutes copyright infringement. If the author reacts appropriately, the peer-review process is continued. If the text has already been published, the editors agree with the author the content of the correction, which will be published in one of the subsequent issues of the journal. According to the circumstances, the editorial board considers publishing information about the correction or modification on the journal's website, in particular when it is not possible to publish the correction in the journal.
3. In case of suspicion of duplicate publication, ie a copy of the author's own work, in the submitted or published manuscript, the editors reject the submitted article. If the text has already been published, the editors publish a declaration of repetition and notify the editors of the duplicate article. In the case of a slight degree of unauthorized repetitions, authorized repetitions with the author's previous work, also in terms of the methods adopted, or re-analysis of the research carried out, the editorial office contacts the author, presents its position and asks for appropriate references to the original work or to remove the copied material. If the author reacts appropriately, the peer-review process is continued. If the text has already been published, the editorial office shall agree with the author to the content of the correction containing a reference to the original work, which will be published in one of the subsequent issues of the journal. According to the circumstances, the editorial board considers publishing information about the correction or modification on the journal's website, in particular when it is not possible to publish the correction in the journal.
4. In the event of suspicion of the preparation of data, the editorial office contacts the author, asking for an explanation of the matter. If the author's explanations are convincing, the editorial office discontinues the procedure. If the author's explanations are unconvincing, the editorial office contacts the institutions with

which the author is affiliated, as well as those for which the research was conducted or those from which the research was financed, or supervisory institutions, asking them to investigate the matter. If the author is found guilty of infringement or pleads guilty, the editorial office rejects the submitted article and withdraws the text from publication. If it is proved that the author is not guilty, the editorial office apologizes to the author for the inconvenience caused and undertakes a suspended review process, if the suspicion arose at the stage of preparing the review. The editorial office informs the persons who reported the suspicion about the status of the case.

5. In case of receiving a request to add an author to the list of authors, the editors explain the reason for the change and make sure that all authors agree to the change. Demonstrating that the reason for the change is unjustified gives the editorial office the right to refuse to make the change, even if all authors agree.

6. In case of receiving a request to remove an author from the list of authors, the editorial office explains the reason for the change and makes sure that all authors agree to the change. Demonstrating that the reason for the change is unjustified gives the editorial office the right to refuse to make the change, even if all authors agree.

7. If it is found that one of the authors does not meet the authorship criteria, the editorial office asks for the written consent of all authors to remove the courtesy author or guest author from the list of authors. Editors also consider notifying the relevant entities, depending on the circumstances.

8. In the event of receiving an accusation that the reviewer used the author's work in an unauthorized manner, the editorial office examines the submitted article and the reviews prepared for it. If the doubts are justified, the editorial office asks the reviewer to explain the matter. If the reviewer's explanations are convincing, the editorial office discontinues the procedure after prior consultation with the author. If the reviewer's explanations are unconvincing, the editorial office, in cooperation with the reviewer's institution, determines the reviewer's fault or no fault. During the explanatory proceedings, the editorial office suspends the rights of the reviewer of the person against whom the proceedings are pending. If the reviewer is found guilty, the editorial office ends cooperation with the reviewer and notifies the relevant entities about the matter, including the institutions employing author's interests, scientific societies, scientists' associations and others, depending on the circumstances.

9. When considering infringements of copyright, the editorial office may use the help of an anti-plagiarism system plagiat.pl.