

CYRILLO- METHODIAN PAPERS

ZESZYTY CYRYLO-METODIAŃSKIE

::: PUBLICATION ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

Version 3.0: June 2024



PUBLICATION ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

Cyrillo-Methodian Papers supports original research and intellectual honesty. Submissions should pursue important academic questions and attempt to answer them, rather than simply 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 submission;
- transparency of presented thoughts and research, including applied methods, collected data, hypotheses and theories;
- respect and open communication with representatives and readers of the journal.

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

PUBLICATION ETHICS

CODE OF ETHICS – 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 manuscript for review, it is carefully read 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 at that stage. Only original as well as linguistically and methodologically correct materials are accepted for review. A manuscript 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.

The Editors consider exclusively the content and language of each submission at all stages of the publication process. 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 submission 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's 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 is appointed.

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

.....

Editors should avoid any conflict of interest; however, this is unavoidable when a paper is submitted by an Author from Maria Curie-Skłodowska University or by a member of the Editorial Team or the Editorial Board. In such instances, the Editor-in-Chief and/or the Deputy Editor are responsible for ensuring transparent editing and reviewing (see also :[Peer Review Process step by step](#)).

All allegations of the journal's policy violation are taken seriously by the Editorial Team.

CODE OF ETHICS – AUTHORS

By submitting to *Cyrillo-Methodian Papers*, the Author declares that their work is original and is not being considered elsewhere for publication. Moreover, they declare that they have unlimited copyright to this work, including illustrations, graphics, charts, etc. which are then transferred to the journal. Submitting a manuscript also means that the Author agrees to the journal's core principles as well as code of ethics and is aware that action will be taken in the event of suspicion of plagiarism, guest authorship, or ghostwriting.

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

In the case of co-authorship, individual contributions of each Author must be specified in the paper in the opening sections or footnote. A concise description of the input, rather than the amount of text expressed by a percentage, is required.

Also, in the cases of co-authorship, the submission should be accompanied by a signed statement of each Author that they accept the entire content of the work and agree to its publication in the journal.

Authors are obliged to clarify any potential concerns raised by the Editorial Team about their name and affiliation, including the Latin transcription of their names and the translation of their affiliations into English. If the submitted paper presents a modified version of an older publication, this should be indicated; the details of the first version should be added.

Authors are obliged to provide information about the research funding as well the contribution of academic and research institutions, associations, or other entities (if applicable). The author of the submission is responsible for the accuracy of this information..

Authors are obliged to correct mistakes/technical issues in their submissions. After completing the review process, each Author is sent the Reviewers' comments regarding the content of the submission. Then, the Author accepts or declines the suggestions. If the Author refuses to make a correction or improvement recommended by the Reviewer or the Editorial Team which the Team finds critical, the Editor-in-Chief may withdraw the manuscript from the publication process.

If an Author notices any errors or significant flaws in their paper after it has been published, they are encouraged to prepare a corrigendum that should appear next to the paper abstract on the paper's web page. The final content of the corrigendum is accepted by the Editorial Team.

CODE OF ETHICS – REVIEWERS

Experts invited to review a paper submitted for the journal are also notified that the journal does not charge Authors any fees for submitting, reviewing, processing and publishing their manuscripts.

By accepting the invitation, the Reviewer agrees to the journal's core principles and ethical code. They also accept the responsibility to preserve maximum confidentiality during the reviewing process, including not sharing any substantial information concerning the reviewed manuscript with other parties.

The Reviewer is obliged to notify the Editorial Team of any suspicion of misconduct. If the potential Reviewer strongly suspects that they recognize the Author of the paper, they are obliged to contact the Editorial Team and decline the invitation.

Reviewers consider the invitation against their expertise and availability and accept or decline to review the manuscript. It is possible for a Reviewer to suggest another Reviewer or to suggest further reviewing of the manuscript.

Each Reviewer suggests the submission deadline for their review and discusses it with the Editorial Team. The usual practice of the journal is to wait for a review for up to two months. In case of a delay, inviting another Reviewer is discussed by the Reviewer and the Editorial Team.

The Reviewer is obliged to issue an opinion regarding the manuscript's content. After accepting the invitation, they are sent the manuscript along with a Reviewer's Form. They provide an assessment of the manuscript by answering 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 as is, rejected by the Reviewer or in need of minor or major corrections. The Reviewer may suggest that another review is needed after the suggested corrections have been made by the Author.

As stated in [Peer Review Process step by step](#), the Reviewer's recommendations are not binding on the Editorial Team. Before the final decision on the submitted manuscript, the Editorial Team considers all the reviews and may further discuss them. If the reviews differ considerably, the team may invite a third Reviewer to consider an additional opinion before making the 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 their 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. The review must contain the name of the Reviewer and the date of its completion.

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

A Reviewer shall not use the evaluated manuscripts or parts of them for their own purposes without the written consent of the Author.

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

CODE OF ETHICS – EDITORIAL BOARD

Editorial Board members are responsible for raising any concerns regarding publication misconduct 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 Press.

Each Editorial Board member acts in accordance with the journal's policies and Publication Ethics and Publication Misconduct Statement. They may suggest further improvements to the journal's practices and ethical rules. Board members take any allegations of violating the journal's policies seriously.

Editorial Board members may act as Reviewers should they be approached by the Editor-in-Chief with an invitation. They may also submit their own work to the journal. In such cases, the Board members should have no knowledge or influence on the review process of their submission.

Editorial Board members are selected by the journal's co-editors. Any member of the Editorial Board may be removed from it if their moral or academic reputation has been hurt or if criminal charges have been filed against them. In such instances, the Editor-in-Chief notifies the Board member in writing that they will no longer hold the position on the Editorial Board of *Cyrillo-Methodian Papers*. The formal letter should include the date of the removal of the member from the Board by the Editorial Team.

The Editorial Board members maintain strict confidentiality regarding any editorial matters.

PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT

PREVENTING MISCONDUCT: GENERAL NOTES

Any intent to incline others to accept as true something which is not true is considered misconduct. The Editorial Team and the 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 or unintentional discrepancies and deliberate 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 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 for all academic fellows, and maximum confidentiality.

PLAGIARISM

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

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

Cyrillo-Methodian Papers regards plagiarism and auto-plagiarism as grave misconduct, as they are attempts to present the submitted paper (or ideas expressed in it) as original. 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 an explanation. If the explanation (be it written or oral) is unsatisfactory, the journal rejects the submitted paper and may notify the Author's institution of this misconduct.

In cases where detailed investigation of 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 manuscripts

Since 2022, all articles submitted to *Cyrillo-Methodian Papers* are scanned using *iThenticate*.

The Editor suspecting or receiving information from a Reviewer about any suspicion of plagiarism in a submitted manuscript takes the following steps:

- The Editor receives 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.

If plagiarism is proven beyond a reasonable doubt, the Editor notifies the Editorial Team of that fact. After that, the Editor-in-Chief demands a written explanation from the Author.

If the Author provides a satisfactory explanation (e.g. unintentional error, coincidence or any type of justifiable misunderstanding), the Editor-in-Chief notifies the Reviewers and clarifies the situation in order to continue the reviewing process.

If the Author admits to plagiarism or their explanation is unsatisfactory, the Editor-in-Chief notifies the Editors and Reviewers about the situation and rejects the submission. If plagiarism has been proven, the Editor-in-Chief may execute his right to notify the Author's academic institution or/and the UMCS Press suggesting further measures to be taken by the parties concerned.

If a response is not provided by the author, the Editor-in-chief notifies the Editors and Reviewers and rejects the submitted paper. They may execute their right to notify the Author's academic institution or/and the UMCS Press 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 for possible re-editing or providing accurate attribution before the submitted manuscript is further reviewed.

If the Editorial Team finds no evidence of plagiarism, the Editor-in-Chief notifies the Reviewers of that fact, thereby authorising the continuation of the review process.

All actions should be conducted with respect to the concerned parties and in accordance 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 plagiarism they noticed in a published work, the following steps are taken:

- The Editor notifies the reader of the further investigation being initiated by the Editorial Team;
- The Editor checks the information provided by the reader, gathers full documentary evidence, and notifies the Editorial Team of the case, their 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.

If plagiarism is proven beyond a reasonable doubt, the Editor-in-Chief demands a written explanation from the Author.

If the Author provides a satisfactory explanation (e.g. unintentional error, coincidence or any type of justifiable misunderstanding), the journal notifies the reader of the investigation and the final conclusion of the Editorial Team in writing. 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 their 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 notifies the Reviewers of the case of unsanctioned plagiarism. The Editor-in-Chief may also execute their right to notify the Author's academic institution or/and the UMCS Press suggesting 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 the 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 notifies the Reviewers of the paper of the case of unsanctioned plagiarism. The Editor-in-Chief may also execute their right to notify the Author's academic institution or/and the UMCS Press 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 journal's position on the case. The journal may find it appropriate to publish a notification 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 notify the Author's academic institution or/and the UMCS Press of the case. Along with notifying 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.

If the Editorial Team finds no evidence of plagiarism, the journal notifies the reader of 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 stating the methodology of analysis clearly. The discussion section of a paper should include a mention of possible bias and provide explanation as to how issues concerning data collection and interpretation have been dealt with. Please note that inappropriate data analysis is not regarded automatically as misconduct; however, fabrication and falsification of data are categorized as grave misconduct.

Along with the fabrication and falsification of data, any attempt to manipulate research data is considered misconduct as well. 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 or inadequate research and 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. If the explanation (be it written or oral) is unsatisfactory or if it is not provided, the journal rejects the submitted paper with the right to notify the Author's institution or/and the UMCS Press of this misconduct.

AUTHORSHIP

Authorship is credited for undoubted intellectual contribution to the conception, analysis, interpretation and writing of a paper. 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.

Input: In the case of co-authorship, individual contributions of each Author must be specified in the paper in the opening sections or footnote. A concise description of the input, rather than the amount of text expressed by a percentage, is required. For example: *A particular author's 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 sections or 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: *Ghostwriting* is understood as a situation in which 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 the manuscript. *Guest authorship* is the opposite situation, in which a person appears in the

publication as an Author despite an 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. Concealing or providing misleading information regarding the Author's affiliation is considered misconduct.

Actions taken in regard to issues with authorship

Concerns, accusations and suspicion on authorship issues, such as improper input, 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 manuscripts* or *Actions taken in regard to suspicion of plagiarism in published papers*. In case of proven misconduct, the Editor-in-Chief rejects the submitted manuscript or withdraws the published paper. An explanation for the retraction of the paper should appear above the paper abstract on the paper's web page, and the paper title is marked by the notice [RETRACTED] wherever it appears on the journal's website. In cases categorized as minor misconduct, a corrigendum should be published as soon as possible next to the paper abstract on the paper's web page.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A conflict of interest occurs when an Author (or the Author's institution), Reviewer, or Editor has financial or personal relationships that may inappropriately influence their 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 and paid expert opinions are the most easily identifiable conflicts of interest which are 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 affiliations.

If any conflict of interest occurs, 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 review.

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 manuscripts for repeated publishing. However, the journal 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 a full description of the source and its publication date.

ERRATA, CORRIGENDA AND PAPER RETRACTION

Cyrillo-Methodian Papers follows the COPE Retraction Guidelines (:Version 2: November 2019).

The journal recognizes the responsibility to publish an **erratum** (a notification of an important error made by the journal) or **corrigendum** (a notification of an important error made by the author(s)) in cases when a significant mistake is found, or a form of minor misconduct is confirmed in a published paper. Corrections are introduced as soon as possible next to the paper abstract on the paper's web page. They are published after discussions among the Editors and with the author(s) agreement. In cases of co-authorship, all co-Authors must accept the wording of the corrigendum and sign it.

A **retraction of a published paper** will be considered in proven cases of significant flaws (data misinterpretation, data manipulation, plagiarism, or any form of grave misconduct). Retraction may be requested by an author(s), by readers, by an institution, or by a member of the Editorial Team. In all cases, retractions concern a separate journal paper and are issued by the Editorial Team. The final decision to retract a paper belongs to the Editor-in-Chief.

Any paper retraction: a) does not mean elimination of the paper from the journal's website; b) is identified by the following elements:

- a notice [RETRACTED] before the paper title anywhere it may appear on the journal's website;
- a watermarked notice [RETRACTED] on each page of the paper's PDF.

Retractions should take place as soon as possible after the Editorial Team is convinced that the paper is seriously flawed. Any retraction process should include a discussion with the author(s) and among the Editors. Whenever possible, the wording of the explanation for the retraction decision is agreed with the author(s).

Each retraction of a paper should be:

- clearly identified as a retraction;
- issued by the Editorial Team;
- stating the reason(s) for retraction.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Reviewers and Editors are requested to ensure the confidentiality of submissions. 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 breaches 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 their institution are notified by the Editor-in-Chief in writing. If the person who 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).

USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Cyrillo-Methodian Papers does not encourage the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in data analysis and manuscript content concerning the aim, scope, hypotheses and conclusions of the paper. As we find it extremely difficult to prove the usage of AI tools in a submitted manuscript, we recognize our inability to implement any sanctions on suspicions of AI-assisted research in the humanities. The journal holds the Authors fully responsible for the content of their work, and thus liable for any breach of publication ethics.

ADVERTISING AND FINANCING

Cyrillo-Methodian Papers is 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 optional; 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.

CHARGES

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 at any collection of fees or acquiring other benefits for 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 website or elsewhere) after its initial publication in *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 a genuine misunderstanding of principles, a letter of warning as to future conduct or a letter to the head of the 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 for Authors who 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 Reviewer, the Editor-in-Chief sends a formal letter to both the offender and the head of their institution.

In addition, any member of the Editorial Board or the Editorial Team should notify of their suspicion of individual or collective misconduct or malpractice by the Editorial Team (including the Editor-in-Chief and Deputy Editor).

.....

HOW TO RAISE CONCERNS

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 Publication Misconduct Statement should raise their concerns with the **Editor-in-Chief**, or email the **Director of UMCS Press**.