

ZESZYTY  
CYRYLO-  
METODIAŃSKIE  
CYRILLO-METHODIAN PAPERS

∴ PUBLICATION ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

Version 2.0: June 2022



---

## PUBLICATION ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

Cyrillo-Methodian Papers encourage original research and intellectual honesty. Submitted papers should formulate and possibly try to answer important academic questions, rather than reveal collected data.

The journal is committed to meeting high standards of ethical behaviour at all stages of the publication process. Our leading principles are:

- honesty in all aspects of research and academic discussions;
- thoroughness and scrupulous care in preparing a text for submission;
- transparency of presented thoughts and research, including methods applied, collected data, hypotheses and theories;
- respect and open communication with representatives and potential readers of the journal.

The journal aims to follow the [:core practices](#) of the [:Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#). We also consider the guidelines in Elsevier's [:Publishing Ethics Resource Kit \(PERK\)](#) for editors. Cases of possible misconduct are treated following the [:COPE flowcharts](#).

## PUBLICATION ETHICS

### ETHICAL CODE – THE EDITORIAL TEAM

All major decisions of the Editorial Team are sanctioned by the Editor-in-chief (see also the [:How We Operate](#) section).

Editors take the utmost care to ensure high quality of the submitted papers. Before sending a text for review, it is firstly scrutinized by editors for its formal and substantive qualities (compliance with the journal's values, Author Guidelines and thematic scope). The Editorial Team may decide to reject the manuscript before further reviewing. Only original, linguistically and methodologically correct materials are accepted for further stages of the publishing process. A text that has not been accepted for publication may be stored in the journal's archives, but in no way may it be used for any purpose without the author's consent.

Correspondence with authors on behalf of the Editorial Team is provided by the Editor-in-chief or the Deputy editor.

At all stages of the publication process the editors take into account substantive and linguistic criteria only. Assessments of personal nature, e.g. referring to the nationality, religion, worldview or gender of the authors are not permitted.

The editor assigned to process a submitted text is also responsible for blinding all elements that may potentially reveal the author's identity (e.g. the author's name and affiliations, self-references, author data in figures or metadata) before sending the manuscript to reviewers. If an editor has, by mistake or negligence, not blinded all elements concerning the author's identity, the offer for reviewing is withdrawn and another reviewer should be appointed.

Confidentiality of information received during all stages of the publication process is strictly observed.

Editors should avoid any conflict of interests, however this is unavoidable in situations when a paper is submitted by an author from the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University or by a member of the Editorial Team or the Editorial Board. In such instances the responsibility for ensuring transparent editing and reviewing lies with the Editor-in-chief and/or the Deputy editor (see also the [Peer Review Process step by step](#) section).

The Editorial Team takes seriously any allegation raised which, if substantiated, would violate the journal's policies.

### **ETHICAL CODE – AUTHORS**

By submitting a text to the Cyrillo-Methodian Papers, the author declares that his/her work is original and not currently submitted to another journal and that he/she has unlimited copyright to this work, including illustrations, graphics, charts, etc. which are then transferred to the journal. The submission of a text also means that the author agrees to the journal's core principles and ethical code, including the awareness of possible actions in cases of suspicion of plagiarism, guest authorship, or ghostwriting.

Authors take full public responsibility for their published works. In the cases of collective authorship, each co-author should be responsible for a particular section of the paper.

In the case of co-authorship, individual contributions (substantial, not percentage) of each author must be specified in the paper (in the opening chapters or in a footnote).

Also, in the cases of co-authorship the submitted text should be accompanied by a signed statement of each author that he/she agrees with the content of the work and its publication in the journal.

Authors are obliged to clarify all potential concerns raised by the Editorial Team about their name and affiliation, including the transcription of their names in the Latin script and the translation of their affiliations in English. If the submitted paper presents a modified version of an older publication, this should be clearly indicated with details on the first version thoroughly disclosed.

Authors are obliged to provide, where relevant, information about the sources of financing of the paper, the contribution of academic and research institutions and associations, or other entities. The main responsibility for the accuracy of this information lies with the author submitting the text.

Authors are obliged to provide corrections of mistakes / technical issues in their submitted texts. After the completion of the review process, each author is sent any substantial considerations made in the reviews. Then the author should accept or decline to make corrections / further development of his paper. If the Editorial Team insists on a certain correction / development to be made in the paper (by recommendation of a reviewer or the Editorial Team) and the author rejects to do so, the Editor-in-chief may formally withdraw the text from the publication process.

If an author notices any errors / significant flaws in his paper after it has been published, he/she is encouraged to prepare a corrigendum that should be published in the next journal issue. The final content of the corrigendum is sanctioned by the Editorial Team.

---

## ETHICAL CODE – REVIEWERS

Reviewers approached by the journal may accept to review a paper on good will. They are informed that the journal does not charge authors any fees for submitting, reviewing, processing and publishing their manuscripts.

By accepting to review a specific text a reviewer agrees to the journal's core principles and ethical code. He/she also accepts the responsibility to preserve maximum confidentiality during the reviewing process, including not sharing any substantial information in relation to the reviewed text with other parties.

The reviewer is obliged to inform the Editorial Team on any suspicion of misconduct. In case of strong suspicion that the reviewer recognizes the author of the paper offered for reviewing, the reviewer is obliged to contact the Editorial Team and decline the offer for reviewing.

Reviewers consider the invitation against their own expertise and availability. They then accept or decline to review the manuscript. It is possible for a reviewer to suggest another (more suitable) reviewer, or to signal the need for further reviewing of the manuscript.

Each reviewer sets time to read and review the manuscript. He/she discusses with the Editorial Team member the estimated time to complete the review. The usual practice of the journal is to wait for a review up to two months. In case of a delay, the matter of addressing another possible expert is resolved between the reviewer and the Editorial Team.

The reviewer is obliged to issue a substantive opinion on the reviewed text. After accepting to review a particular work he/she is sent the text along with a reviewer's form. His/her assessment should contain answers to the questions asked in the reviewer's form. The review may or may not include additional notes, considerations, questions and/or recommendations to the author or the Editorial Team.

The review must contain a clear conclusion as to whether the paper is recommended for publication in the current form, rejected by the reviewer or in need of minor or major corrections. The reviewer may suggest the text for additional reviewing after the suggested corrections have been made by the author.

As stated in the [Peer Review Process step by step](#) section, the reviewer's recommendations are not binding on the Editorial Team. Before making the overall decision on the submitted manuscript, the Editorial Team considers all the returned reviews and may further discuss their arguments. If the reviews differ considerably, the team may invite a third reviewer with a view to obtaining an additional opinion before making its final decision. All final decisions on actions whether to publish or reject a paper, or to start an investigation on possible misconduct belong to the Editor-in-chief.

Although it is recommended that the reviewer signs his review, it is possible to send an unsigned review form via the journal's online platform or by email (from an email address of the reviewer recognized by the Editorial Team) to a member of the Editorial Team. Under any circumstances the review must contain the names of the reviewer and the date of its completion.

All received reviews are catalogued in the journal's archives.

A reviewer shall not use the evaluated texts or parts of them for his/her own purposes without the written consent of the author.

A detailed description of the reviewing procedures is given in the [Peer Review Process step by step](#) section on the journal website.

---

## **ETHICAL CODE – EDITORIAL BOARD**

Editorial Board members take the responsibility to raise any concern over misconduct or malpractice noticed in the day-to-day running of the journal. In such instances they may approach the Editor-in-chief, the Deputy editor or the Director of the UMCS Publishing House.

Each Editorial Board member acts in accordance with the journal's policies and Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement, and may suggest further strengthening of the journal's practices and ethical rules. Board members take seriously any allegation raised that if true would violate the journal's policies.

Editorial Board members may act as peer-reviewers, should they be approached by the Editor-in-chief to review a particular paper, or to submit their own work for publishing in the journal. In such cases board members should have no knowledge or influence on the review process of their submitted work.

Editorial Board members are selected by the journal's co-editors. In case of substantial academic, criminal or moral damage of a board member's reputation, the Editorial Team may decide to exclude the board member. In such instances the Editor-in-chief informs in writing the board member that he/she will no longer hold the position in the Editorial Board of the Cyrillo-Methodian Papers. The formal letter should include the date of the withdrawal of the board member by the Editorial Team.

When approached by the Editorial Team, Editorial Board members treat all sensitive matters with strict confidentiality.

## **MALPRACTICE AND MISCONDUCT**

### **PREVENTING MISCONDUCT: GENERAL NOTES**

We categorize as misconduct any intent to incline others to accept as true something which is not true. The Editorial Team and Editorial Board of Cyrillo-Methodian Papers are sensitive to any potential risks of compromising research and academic discussions through misconduct.

In academic practice it is not always possible to distinguish between misunderstandings and unintentional discrepancies, and deliberate intentions causing misconduct. Nevertheless, the journal is relying on honesty as a leading principle of all contributors to the academic process (authors, editors, the Editorial Board members, reviewers and readers).

The following practices set by the journal constitute the basic actions that we take in order to prevent suspicions or allegations of malpractice and misconduct. As misconduct may take different, sometimes highly complex forms, our general rule remains the criterion for preserving honesty, openness, respect to all academic fellows, and maximum confidentiality.

### **PLAGIARISM**

We understand plagiarism as unreferenced use of others' ideas (regardless of these ideas being published or unpublished, in print or in electronic formats), e.g. when an author uses another author's work without credit or acknowledgment. Plagiarism may vary from literal copying of a whole work to paraphrasing key parts of another work.

Using unreferenced ideas of one's own work is considered auto-plagiarism (also known as self-plagiarism and duplication).

Cyrillo-Methodian Papers regard plagiarism and auto-plagiarism as grave misconduct, as they are attempts to present the submitted paper (or ideas expressed in it) as original and authentic novelty. Plagiarism can also occur in respect to other types of sources and media, such as illustrations, graphics, material downloaded from websites or drawn from manuscripts, presentations, lectures, etc. All authors submitting papers that contain additional material should disclose the sources and declare that these materials are not copyrighted.

After the submission of a paper to the journal the editors and reviewers are responsible to voicing all their concerns in regard to suspicion or obvious cases of plagiarism. If the Editorial Team validates these concerns, it is the duty of the Editor-in-chief to contact the author and demand explanation. In case of unsatisfactory explanation, written or orally disclosed, the journal rejects the submitted paper with the right to inform the author's institution about this misconduct.

In cases where detailed investigation on accusations of plagiarism is needed, the journal may use the help of Editorial Board members, external reviewers or other experts.

### **Actions taken in regard to suspicion of plagiarism in submitted texts**

The editor, suspecting or receiving information from a reviewer about any suspicion of plagiarism in a submitted text, takes the following procedural steps:

- The editor gets full documentary evidence if not already provided;
- The editor checks the degree of plagiarism, using among other means anti-plagiarism software, a simple comparison of the relevant texts, or more scrupulous analysis in cases of paraphrasing or self-plagiarism.

*In case the editor finds out that there is clear plagiarism*, he informs the Editorial Team. After that the Editor-in-chief demands written explanation from the author.

*If the author provides satisfactory explanation* (e.g. unintentional error, coincidence or any type of justifiable misunderstanding), the Editor-in-chief informs the reviewers and clarifies the situation in order to continue the reviewing process.

*If the author admits to plagiarism or his/her explanation is unsatisfactory*, the Editor-in-chief informs the editors and reviewers about the situation and rejects the submitted paper for further consideration. In cases of clear proof of plagiarism the Editor-in-chief may execute his right to inform the author's academic institution or/and the UMCS Publishing House suggesting further measures to be taken by the parties concerned.

*If a response is not provided by the author*, the Editor-in-chief informs the editors and reviewers and rejects the submitted paper. He may execute his right to inform the author's academic institution or/and the UMCS Publishing House suggesting further measures to be taken by the parties concerned.

*In cases of minor copying of other authors' works or misattribution*, the Editor-in-chief contacts the author and explains the need of possible re-editing or providing accurate attribution before the submitted text is further reviewed.

*In case the Editorial Team finds no evidence of plagiarism*, the Editor-in-chief informs the reviewers authorising the continuation of the review process.

All actions should be conducted with respect to the concerned parties and in accord with the principle of preserving maximum confidentiality.

## **Actions taken in regard to suspicion of plagiarism in published papers**

If a reader contacts the journal concerning noted plagiarism, the following procedural steps are taken:

- The editor informs the reader about the further investigation being initiated by the Editorial Team;
- The editor checks out the information provided by the reader, gathers full documentary evidence, and informs the Editorial Team about the case, his/her findings and initial conclusion;
- The Editorial Team may undertake further investigation on the matter using among other means anti-plagiarism software, a simple comparison of the relevant texts, or more scrupulous analysis in cases of paraphrasing or self-plagiarism.

*In case the Editorial Team confirms that there is clear plagiarism*, the Editor-in-chief demands written explanation from the author.

*If the author provides satisfactory explanation* (e.g. unintentional error, coincidence or any type of justifiable misunderstanding), the journal informs the reader in writing about the investigation and the final conclusion of the Editorial Team. The letter may contain detailed information about the procedure provided, as long as it does not violate the principle of confidentiality.

*If the author admits to plagiarism or his/her explanation is unsatisfactory*, the Editor-in-chief considers the withdrawal of the published paper. Information about the withdrawal should be clearly stated on the journal's website, as well as in the next issue. Furthermore, the journal informs the reviewers of the paper about the case of unsanctioned plagiarism. The Editor-in-chief may also execute his right to inform the author's academic institution or/and the UMCS Publishing House signalling further measures to be taken by the parties concerned.

*If a response is not provided by the author*, the Editor-in-chief considers the withdrawal of the published paper. Information about the withdrawal and the lack of author's response to the allegations of plagiarism should be clearly stated on the journal's website, as well as in the next issue. Furthermore, the journal informs the reviewers of the paper about the case of unsanctioned plagiarism. The Editor-in-chief may also execute his right to inform the author's academic institution or/and the UMCS Publishing House signalling further measures to be taken by the parties concerned.

*In cases of minor copying of other authors' works or misattribution*, the Editor-in-chief contacts the author and explains the journal's position on the case. The journal may find it appropriate to publish a corrigendum containing reference to the original article(s). If the Editorial Team has reason to believe that the failure to refer to an original text(s) was intentional, it may execute its right to inform the author's academic institution or/and the UMCS Publishing House about the case. Along with informing the reader that raised the suspicion of plagiarism, the journal should also contact the author(s) of the original work in order to clarify the situation.

*In case the Editorial Team finds no evidence of plagiarism*, the journal informs the reader about the Editorial Team's findings and its final conclusion to leave the publication unchanged.

---

## DATA ANALYSIS AND DATA MANIPULATION

Data should be analyzed in an open and honest way. This includes revealing the sources from which data have been collected, as well as clearly stated methodology of analysis. The discussion section of a paper should note any considered issues of possible bias and provide explanations how issues concerning data collection and their interpretation have been dealt with. Please note that inappropriate data analysis is not regarded automatically as misconduct, however fabrication or falsification of data are categorized as grave misconduct.

Along with the fabrication and falsification of data, we categorize as grave misconduct any attempts to manipulate research data. This includes, among others, deliberate neglect of previous research on the same topic, suspicious lack of references to relevant publications, deliberate misinterpretation of the presented data, the use of deliberately incomplete / inadequate research or interpretation methods.

After the submission of a paper to the journal the editors and reviewers are responsible for voicing all their concerns in regard to suspicion of data manipulation. If the Editorial Team validates these concerns, it is the duty of the Editor-in-chief to contact the author and demand explanation. In case of lack or unsatisfactory explanation, written or orally disclosed, the journal rejects the submitted paper with the right to inform the author's institution or/and the UMCS Publishing House about this misconduct.

## AUTHORSHIP

Authorship is credited for undoubted intellectual contribution to the conception, analysis, interpretation and writing of a paper. In our understanding any routine practice, such as the collection of data or presentation of previously published works should not be qualified as academic authorship. Authors take full public responsibility for their published works. In cases of collective authorship, each co-author should be responsible for a particular section of the paper.

**Contributorship:** In the case of more than one author contributing to the research, individual contributions (substantial, not percentage) of each author must be specified in the manuscript (e.g. *Particular authors' contribution: AB is responsible for the ideas in the research; CD collected the examples. Both authors participated in drafting the manuscript;* or: *The following declarations about the particular authors' contributions to the research have been made: concept of the study: first author; data analyses: second author; writing the manuscript: first and second author*). This information should be published in the article (in the opening chapters or in a footnote).

**Changes in authorship:** In accordance with the [COPE guidelines](#), any changes in authorship require written consent of all authors sent individually via direct email to the Editor-in-chief. Each of them must issue a statement on the acceptance of the proposed changes in the authorship of submitted manuscripts or published articles. The corresponding author takes responsibility for providing a clear reason for the change(s) and should coordinate interaction between the authors and the Editor-in-chief. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached among the authors, they must contact their parent institution(s) for a final decision; the editors take no responsibility to resolve such disagreements.

**Ghostwriting and guest authorship:** We treat as *ghostwriting* cases when a person who made substantial contributions to a publication is not credited as an author or, in the case of purely technical support insufficient for authorship, the person is not acknowledged in a publication. *Guest authorship* is the opposite situation, when a person appears in the



publication as an author despite insignificant contribution or even absence from the process of creating a scholarly paper.

**Author affiliation:** Any paper affiliations should represent the institution(s) with which each author is currently affiliated. We treat the concealment or misleading information regarding the author's affiliation as misconduct.

### **Actions taken in regard to issues with authorship**

Concerns, accusations and suspicion on authorship issues, such as improper contributorship, changes in authorship, ghostwriting and guest authorship, should be thoroughly investigated by the Editorial Team. The procedure is similar to the *actions taken in regard to suspicion of plagiarism in submitted texts and published papers*. In case of proven misconduct the Editor-in-chief rejects the submitted text or withdraws the published paper. An explanation for the withdrawal of the paper should be published in the next journal issue and on the journal's website. In cases categorized as minor misconduct, a corrigendum should be published in the next journal issue and on the journal's website.

### **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

A conflict of interest exists when an author (or the author's institution), reviewer, or editor has financial or personal relationships that may inappropriately influence his or her actions. Such relationships are also known as dual commitments, competing interests, or competing loyalties. These range from those with negligible potential to those with great potential to influence academic judgment. Competing interests may exist regardless of whether an individual is aware of it. Financial relationships, such as employment, consultancies, honoraria, paid expert opinions are the most easily identifiable conflicts of interest and ones most likely to undermine the credibility of the journal and the authors. However, conflicts may occur for other reasons, such as personal relationships, academic competition, and political and intellectual passion.

If any conflict of interests exists, it is obligatory that each author and reviewer declare it prior to submitting an article or accepting it for reviewing. The Editorial Team should evaluate any such individual case in order to decide whether to advance the publication process or to reject a paper for reviewing.

### **REDUNDANT PUBLICATION**

There are two major cases that the journal qualifies as *redundant publication*: a) when two or more papers share the same data, hypothesis, interpretation or conclusions without full cross reference, and b) when one paper (in whole or split into several parts) is submitted to two or more journals under the same or different title.

Cyrillo-Methodian Papers does not accept texts for repeated publishing. The journal however reserves the right to publish a translation of an already published paper, which is evaluated as significant by the Editorial Team. In such a case the journal should provide full description of the original source and date of publishing.

---

## CONFIDENTIALITY

Reviewers and editors are requested to treat submissions in strict confidence. Also, in cases of investigations concerning misconduct the Editorial Team should preserve maximum confidentiality. All sensitive cases demanding the revealing of someone's identity outside the persons engaged in the investigation within the Editorial Team should be sanctioned by the Editor-in-chief; such cases are not treated as breach of confidentiality.

*In case of breach of confidentiality*, the Editor-in-chief initiates an investigation within the Editorial Team and possibly the Editorial Board. If found guilty of misconduct, the accused person and his/her institution are informed by the Editor-in-chief in writing. If the person that committed misconduct is an employee of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, the Editor-in-chief may suggest disciplinary sanctions to be taken by the corresponding departments (e.g. Institute, Faculty or the Disciplinary Committee).

## ADVERTISING AND FINANCING

Cyrillo-Methodian Papers are published by :UMCS Press / Wydawnictwo UMCS. As a non-commercial e-journal it is financed in full by the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin.

The journal considers advertising, external financing and donations as options, however they do not affect the Editorial Team's aims and policies in any way. We refuse any advertisements or financing that mislead the audience or throw suspicion over the journal's ethical principles.

The journal does not charge authors any fees for submitting, reviewing, processing and publishing their manuscripts. Any cases of journal representatives demanding or even hinting any collection of fees or acquiring other benefits for the purpose of submitting / advancing the publication process are treated as grave misconduct and must be reported to a corresponding institution.

## AUTHOR SELF-ARCHIVING

Authors are permitted to post the publisher's version of their work online (e.g. in institutional repositories, on their personal website or elsewhere) after its initial publication in the Cyrillo-Methodian Papers.

## SANCTIONS

Sanctions may be applied only in cases of evidence of minor or grave misconduct. They may include: a letter of explanation to the author(s) in case of genuine misunderstanding of principles; a letter of warning as to future conduct; a letter to the head of academic or funding institution. In addition, information on cases of misconduct may be published in the next journal issue and on the journal's website. This information may follow the formal withdrawal of a submitted or published paper.

The journal is not involved in other disciplinary sanctions to authors that have committed proven misconduct. It can only raise concerns and suggest further actions to be taken by the relevant institutions.

In cases of misconduct committed by an editor or peer-reviewer, the Editor-in-chief sends a formal letter to both the offender and the head of his/her institution.

.....

In addition, any member of the Editorial Board or the Editorial Team should raise his/her concern on suspicion of individual or collective misconduct or malpractice by the Editorial Team (including the Editor-in-chief and Deputy editor).

### **HOW TO RAISE A CONCERN**

Anyone who believes that papers published by Cyrillo-Methodian Papers have not been carried out in line with the principles of our Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement should raise their concerns with the **Editor-in-chief**, or email the **Director of UMCS Press**.