



**STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia**

Faculty of Law, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice  
Kováčska 26, P.O.BOX A-45, 040 75 Košice, Slovakia  
IČO: 00397768, IČ DPH: SK2021157050  
tel./ VoIP: +421 55 / 234 4172, fax: +421 55 / 622 53 65  
e-mail: redakcia\_SIC@upjs.sk, <http://www.pravo.upjs.sk>

**Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement  
of scientific journal**

**STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia**

**§1**

1. The rules of publication ethics applicable in *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* are in line with the guidelines set by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).
2. The editorial board of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* has implemented the guidelines of The Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) contained specifically in the *Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors* and in the *Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers*.
3. The editorial board of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* cooperates both with authors and peer reviewers towards promoting, developing knowledge and raising the awareness of the publication ethics rules defined by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).
4. All manuscripts submitted for publication in *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* are subject to verification in terms of their compliance with the rules of publication ethics.
5. The editorial board of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* recommends that authors and peer reviewers read not only the ethical rules presented below but also the materials posted on the website of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (<https://publicationethics.org>).

**§ 2**

All parties involved in the publishing process (the author, editors, peer reviewers and the publisher) are committed to adhering to the ethical rules at each stage of the publishing process in *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia*.

**EDITOR RESPONSIBILITIES  
Ethical rules compliance supervision**

**§ 3**

The editorial board of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* exercises supervision over the compliance with ethical rules related to publishing scientific texts in the journal and counteracts practices that are inconsistent with the ethical standards adopted.

## **Accountability**

### **§ 4**

1. The Editorial Board of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* is responsible for deciding which articles, reviews and reports from scientific conferences submitted to the journal should be published and is accountable for everything published in the journal.
2. The editor may confer with other editors or reviewers when making publication decisions.
3. The editor may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding issues such as libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism.
4. The editor should maintain the integrity of the academic record, preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards, and always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

## **Decisions regarding publications**

### **§ 5**

1. A decision on whether to publish or not to publish a submitted manuscript shall be made by the editorial board of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia*.
2. When making the decision, the editorial board takes into account both the content of peer reviews along with peer reviewers' recommendations and the significance, originality and transparency of the manuscript and conformity with the profile of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia*.

## **Anti-plagiarism system**

### **§ 6**

1. To prevent plagiarism or redundant, multiple (duplicate) publication, *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* uses the plagiarism checker software Turnitin (<http://www.turnitin.com>).
2. Prior to sending the manuscript to peer reviewers, the editorial board of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* checks all the texts submitted for publication using the Turnitin plagiarism checker.
3. In case of suspected plagiarism or a suspected redundant, multiple (duplicate) publication, the editorial board shall initiate a relevant procedure as described in detail at the *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* website under the tab Standards of proceeding in the event of suspected infringement of ethical rules, which is based on the guidelines presented in the form of flowcharts by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>).

## **Peer review**

### **§ 7**

1. The editor shall ensure that the peer review process is fair, unbiased, and timely.
2. Research articles must typically be reviewed by at least two external and independent reviewers, and where necessary the editor should seek additional opinions.
3. The editor shall select reviewers who have suitable expertise in the relevant field and shall follow best practice in avoiding the selection of fraudulent peer reviewers. The editor shall review all disclosures of potential conflicts of interest and suggestions for self-citation made by reviewers in order to determine whether there is any potential for bias.

## **Fairness**

### **§8**

1. The editor should evaluate manuscripts for intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s).
2. The editor will not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than the author(s), reviewers and potential reviewers, and in some instances the editorial board members, as appropriate.

## **Confidentiality**

### **§9**

The editor and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

## **Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

### **§ 10**

1. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author.
2. The editor is committed to ensuring that advertising, reprint or other commercial revenue has no impact or influence on editorial decisions.
3. The editor should seek to ensure a fair and appropriate peer review process. Editors should recuse themselves (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers. Editors should require all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication. If needed, other appropriate action should be taken, such as the publication of a retraction or expression of concern.

## **Involvement and cooperation in investigations**

### **§ 11**

1. Editors should guard the integrity of the published record by issuing corrections and retractions when needed and pursuing suspected or alleged research and publication misconduct.
2. When ethical complaints have been filed concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper, the editor should take reasonably responsive measures and initiate the procedure described at the website of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* under the tab Standards of proceeding in the event of suspected infringement of ethical rules. If there a conflict of interests within the editorial board, the ethical complaint should be filed with the Publisher (redakcia\_SIC@upjs.sk).
3. The editor will be guided by COPE's Guidelines for Retracting Articles (<https://publicationethics.org/retraction-guidelines>) when considering retracting, issuing expressions of concern about, and issuing corrections pertaining to articles that have been published in *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia*.
4. Editors should pursue reviewer and editorial misconduct.

## **Journal metrics**

### **§ 12**

The editor must not attempt to influence the journal's ranking by artificially increasing any journal metric. In particular, the editor shall not require that references to that (or

any other) journal's articles be included except for genuine scholarly reasons and authors should not be required to include references to the editor's own articles or products and services in which the editor has an interest.

### **Complaints and appeals**

#### **§ 13**

1. A complaint against *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* may concern the activity of the journal itself, members of the editorial board, members of staff of the journal or Pavol Jozef Safarik University in Kosice as Publisher.
2. The complaint may specifically address negligence or undue performance of tasks, as well as infringement of appellant's interests by *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia*.
3. A complaint against the journal, members of the editorial board or staff of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* must be submitted to the Head of Editorial Board (miroslav.strkolec@upjs.sk) or the Editor-in-Chief (radomir.jakab@upjs.sk).
4. A complaint against the Editor-in-Chief or Managing Editor or Pavol Jozef Safarik University in Kosice must be submitted to the rector of the Pavol Jozef Safarik University in Kosice (rektor@upjs.sk).
5. The competent supervisory body shall notify the person/entity whose activity is covered by the complaint of the content of the complaint and shall obligate the person/entity to respond to the allegations.
6. The entity competent for settling the complaint should settle the complaint not later than within a month from its submission, notifying the appellant of the manner of its settlement.

### **REVIEWER RESPONSIBILITIES**

#### **§ 14**

1. Detailed rules on reviewing has been described on the website of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* under the tab Peer Review Process.
2. When preparing a review electronically in reviewer's individual account on the website of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia*, the reviewer obtains, along with guidelines for reviewers, also full information on the ethical rules applicable in relation to the reviewing process.

### **Contribution to editorial decisions**

#### **§ 15**

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and, through the editorial communication with the author, may also assist the author in improving the manuscript.

### **Promptness**

#### **§ 16**

Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its timely review will be impossible should immediately notify the editor so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

### **Confidentiality**

#### **§ 17**

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the editor.

## **Standards of objectivity**

### **§ 18**

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable. Referees should express their views clearly with appropriate supporting arguments.

## **Acknowledgement of sources**

### **§ 19**

1. Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation.
2. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published data of which they have personal knowledge.

## **Disclosure and conflict of interest**

### **§ 20**

1. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.
2. Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the submission.
3. In the event of suspected occurrence of non-disclosed conflict of interest, the editorial board shall initiate the procedure described in detail on the website of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* under the tab Standards of proceeding in the event of suspected infringement of ethical rules, which is based on the guidelines presented in the form of flowcharts by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>).

## **AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **Reporting standards**

#### **§ 21**

Authors reporting results of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the manuscript. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

### **Data Access and Retention**

#### **§ 22**

1. Authors may be asked to provide the research data supporting their paper for editorial review and/or to comply with the open data requirements of the journal.
2. Authors should be prepared to provide public access to such data, if practicable, and should be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable number of years after publication.

### **Originality and Plagiarism**

#### **§ 23**

1. The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted.

2. The editors of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* consider plagiarism to be as either the acquisition of someone else's work in whole or in large part in its unchanged form or with minor modifications (explicit plagiarism), or the presentation of someone else's work in a modified form, while retaining the creative and individual characteristics given to it by the actual author (hidden plagiarism).

### **Redundant, multiple (duplicate), or concurrent publication**

#### **§ 24**

1. An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Parallel submission of the same manuscript to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.
2. The editors of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* consider a redundant, multiple (duplicate) publication to be understood as a manuscript in which the author reproduces his/her own previously published papers in the form of a literal or partial repetition of his/her own publications or the submission of a text published in another language.

### **Acknowledgement of sources**

#### **§ 25**

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.

### **Authorship of a manuscript**

#### **§ 26**

1. Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study.
2. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors.
3. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors (according to the above definition) and no inappropriate co-authors are included in the author list of the manuscript and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.
4. To prevent cases of '*ghostwriting*' and '*guest (gift) authorship*', when submitting a manuscript for publication in *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia*, a scan of the declaration on the percentage contribution to the publication signed by all co-authors must be attached as an additional file.
5. In the event of suspected occurrence of '*ghostwriting*' or '*guest (gift) authorship*', the editorial board shall initiate the relevant procedure described in detail on the website of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* under the tab Standards of proceeding in the event of suspected infringement of ethical rules, which is based on the guidelines presented in the form of flowcharts by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>).
6. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be named in an Acknowledgement section.
7. Authors take collective responsibility for the work. Each individual author is accountable for ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

### **Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

#### **§ 27**

1. All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or their interpretation in the manuscript.

2. The authors should inform the editorial board of *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* about the sources of funding for the publication, contribution of scientific research institutions, associations or other entities ('financial disclosure').

### **Fundamental errors in published works**

#### **§ 28**

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal's editor or publisher and cooperate with them to either retract the paper or to publish an appropriate erratum.

### **PUBLISHER'S CONFIRMATION**

#### **§ 29**

In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism the publisher, in close collaboration with the editors, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum or, in the most severe cases, the complete retraction of the affected work.

#### **§ 30**

The Pavol Jozef Safarik University in Kosice applies the rules of publication ethics according to the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and supports *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia* in this matter, in particular by consultancy and professional legal assistance, provision of access to the plagiarism checker software Turnitin (<http://www.turnitin.com>), access to and technical assistance for *Open Journal Systems* (OJS), which should allow the editorial board to manage the publishing process in accordance with the highest quality and ethical standards.

### **Standards of proceeding in the event of suspected infringement of ethical rules**

If any manifestation of scientific unreliability is detected, the Editorial Board shall apply the following rules of procedure, based on guidelines in the form of diagrams (<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>) developed by the *Committee on Publication Ethics* (COPE) and made available under licence CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.

#### **§ 1**

### **[Rules of procedure in the case of a suspected redundant (duplicate) publication]**

A redundant (duplicate) publication is to be understood as a manuscript in which the author reproduces his/her own previously published papers in the form of a literal or partial repetition of his/her own publications or the submission of a text published in another language.

Proceeding in the case of a suspected redundant (duplicate) publication in the submitted and published manuscript

#### **§ 2**

### **[Rules of procedure in the cases of suspected plagiarism]**

Plagiarism is defined as either the acquisition of someone else's work in whole or in large part in its unchanged form or with minor modifications (explicit plagiarism), or the presentation of someone else's work in a modified form, while retaining the creative and individual characteristics given to it by the actual author (hidden plagiarism).

Proceeding in the case of suspected plagiarism in a submitted and published manuscript

### **§ 3**

#### **[Rules of procedure in the case of suspected fabrication of data]**

Data fabrication occurs where the author of the manuscript presents the results of research work which has not taken place or changes the results of the research carried out in an arbitrary or unjustified manner.

Proceeding in the case of suspected fabrication of data in a submitted and published manuscript

### **§ 4**

#### **[Rules of procedure in the case of an application to modify the list of authors]**

Proceeding in the case where a correspondence author requests that another author be added or deleted before and after publication of a manuscript

### **§ 5**

#### **[Rules of procedure in the case of suspected ghost, guest or gift authorship]**

1. A ghost author is someone who is omitted from an authorship list despite qualifying for authorship.
2. A guest author is someone who is listed as an author despite not qualifying for authorship. Guests are people brought in to make the list look more impressive (despite having little or no involvement with the research or publication).
3. A gift author is someone who is listed as an author despite not qualifying for authorship. Gift authorship involves including colleagues on papers in return for being listed on theirs.

Proceeding in the case of suspected ghost, guest or gift authorship

### **§ 6**

#### **[Rules of conduct in the event of a suspected undisclosed conflict of interest]**

A conflict of interest shall be deemed to be the relationship arising from a competitive activity, cooperation or other personal, financial or professional relationships of the reviewer with any of the authors or institutions related to the manuscript submitted.

Proceeding in the case where the reviewer suspects an undisclosed conflict of interest in a submitted manuscript and where the reader suspects an undisclosed conflict of interest in a published article

### **§ 7**

#### **[Rules of conduct in the case of a suspected ethical problem with a submitted manuscript]**

Proceeding where the editor suspects that there is an ethical problem with a submitted manuscript

### **§ 8**

#### **[Rules of procedure in the case of a suspected misappropriation of author's ideas or data by the reviewer]**

Proceeding in the event of a suspicion that the reviewer has misappropriated the author's ideas or data

### **§ 9**

#### **[Rules for responding to whistleblowers]**

Rules for responding to whistleblowers who have raised their concerns directly or via social media