

Code of Publishing Ethics

The principles of publishing ethics set out below apply to all types of publications, publishing series and magazines published by the Warsaw University of Life Sciences Press (hereinafter: "publisher").

The term "editorial" refers collectively to the editors of individual journals, publishing series and individual publishing items (scientific monographs, academic textbooks, scripts and other types of published books).

General principles

1. The publisher shall ensure compliance with publishing standards and publishing ethics rules and shall do everything to prevent any practice contrary to accepted standards.
2. The publisher systematically monitors internationally accepted publishing ethical standards. In particular, the standards developed by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, <https://publicationethics.org>) are regarded as reference.
3. The publisher makes publicly available rules of conduct in the event of charges of acts contrary to the principles of publishing ethics. The allegations may relate to both the entire publisher office and any of cooperating editors.
4. The publisher implements the procedures for dealing with individual infringements of the rules of publishing ethics described in the section "Procedures for dealing with potential infringements". It is based in this regard on the standards developed by COPE.
5. The editors make publicly available detailed guidelines to authors and reviewers. These materials provide an explanation of the editorial processes and inform about the rights and obligations of authors and reviewers.
6. The editorial board ensures that appropriate reviewers are selected for submitted manuscripts taking into account their qualifications in the research area concerned.
7. The publisher has the right to withdraw publication after its release if:
 - (1) there is evidence of falsification of data, as well as in the case of unintended errors, but which significantly reduces the reliability (value) of the studies;
 - (2) the work is plagiarism or significantly violates the principles of publishing ethics.

Authorship

8. The author is obliged to maintain standards of scientific integrity and conform to the principles of publishing ethics.

9. The author may submit only original works of his own authorship. Any reference to the work and research of other authors should bear appropriate footnotes and should be disclosed in the bibliography. In the event of non-compliance with the above principles, the editors shall notify the relevant entities, including institutions employing the author, scientific societies, associations of scientists and others, depending on the circumstances.

10. The author may submit only unsubmitted and unpublished works for publication in other journals. Submitting manuscripts to more than one title at the same time is considered an unethical behavior.

11. The author is obliged to cooperate with the editors during the review process. In particular, at the request of the editors, they should provide the data on which the results of his research are based and provide appropriate explanations if required.

12. The author is expected to provide access to the experimental data presented in their work, even after publication of the study.

13. The author should disclose any conflicts of interest which may affect the results or interpretation of the research. Examples of such potential conflicts of interest are: fees, educational grants or other forms of funding, membership of organizations and associations, employment relations, consultative activities, ownership of shares or other patents, licensing agreements, personal or professional relationships.

All sources of financial support for work, including a grant number or other reference number of the source of funding, should be disclosed.

14. In the case of multi-authored texts, authors are required to disclose the contributions of individual authors, indicating exactly what the contribution of the author concerned was to the whole work (authorship of the concept, conducting empirical studies, editorial a specific batch of text, etc.).

15. Ghost authorship, guest authorship and gift authorship are considered scientifically and are not accepted by the publisher. In the event of detected cases of such proceedings, the editorial shall notify the relevant entities, including the institutions employing the author, scientific societies, the association of scientists and others, depending on the circumstances.

16. The author shall notify the editors if he or she is aware of significant inaccuracies or errors in the published work of his authorship. The editors, depending on the circumstances, take action in the form of an explanation, correction or other appropriate on the next issue.

17. The scientific editors of monographs ensure the scientific integrity of the works published therein. To this end, it may make appropriate amendments. If you suspect a non-publishing ethics conduct, it signals this issue to the publisher and decides to withdraw the text from the publication.

18. The scientific editors of monographs are obliged to ensure that the authors of individual chapters accept their form after amendments have been made at the scientific editorial stage.

19. The editors shall take immediate action in the event of suspicion of non-compliance with the principles of publishing ethics by the author of the manuscript submitted or published article. The editors consider each reported act of unethical publication behavior, even if it is detected long after the date of publication. If unethical conduct is found, the publisher shall publish a correction, account, withdraw the text from the publication or take other, circumstances- appropriate, action.

Peer review process

20. The review procedure is subject to generally accepted academic standards for double-blind peer review (the reviewer does not know the author's name and the author does not know the name of the reviewer).

21. Descriptions of review processes are public and accessible to the public. In the event of significant derogations from the review procedures adopted, the editorial board should explain their reasons.

22. Reviews are confidential and are made available only to persons involved in the editorial process.

23. Reviewers and other persons involved in the publishing process may not benefit from the research contained in unpublished manuscripts without the expressed consent of their author. The information obtained during the review process is confidential and cannot serve the personal benefit of those participating.

24. Reviews must be objective. Any reviewers' comments should be substantively argued. Personal comments or based on divergences with the author's scientific views are unacceptable in the reviews.

25. When a possible conflict of interest is detected, the reviewer shall indicate that fact to the editors and return the text to the office. The reviewer also has the option to opt out of reviewing the text for other reasons.

26. The reviewer may not delegate the task of drawing up the review to another reviewer without the prior consent of the editors.

27. Reviewers and editors signal any instance of dishonesty regarding the unauthorized use of intellectual property. They also inform the publisher if you suspect an ethical violation.

Publishing independence

28. Decisions concerning the publication of texts fall within the exclusive competence of the editorial board and shall be taken after taking into account the views of at least two independent experts in their field.

29. Decisions on acceptance for print may not be amended unless there are reasonable objections to the submitted manuscript.

30. The editors shall assess the manuscripts solely on the basis of their substantive value and thematic coherence with the publishing series or journal, regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, nationality, religious and political beliefs and the affiliation of authors.

31. The editors do not disclose any information about the submitted manuscript to anyone other than the author, reviewers, advisory editors and the publisher.

Plagiarism

32. If plagiarism is suspected in the manuscript or published article, the editorial board gathers evidence and takes further action depending on the degree of the infringement.

33. If plagiarism is found before publishing, the editorial board rejects the manuscript submitted. If the text has already been published, the relevant editors post on the website information about the withdrawal of the text from the publication and notify the author, the editorial staff and publisher of the plagiarized article or book. The editors shall notify the relevant entities, including institutions employing the author, scientific societies, associations of scientists and others, depending on the circumstances.

34. In the absence of an infringement, the editorial board shall inform the reviewer, the reader or any other person suspected of plagiarism of the fact that the editors did not take further action on the case.

35. In the event of suspicion of duplicated publication, the editors gather evidence and take further actions depending on the degree of the infringement.

36. In the event of a significant degree of unauthorized repetitions, the editorial office rejects the manuscript submitted. If the text has already been published, the editorial office publishes on its website information about the withdrawal of the text from the publication or a statement of repeated publication, as well as notify the editors and publisher of the duplicated article or book. The editors shall notify the relevant entities, including institutions employing the author, scientific societies, associations of scientists and others, depending on the circumstances.

37. In the absence of a finding of an infringement, the editorial board shall inform the reviewer, the reader or another person suspected of duplicating the publication of the fact that the editors did not take any further action in the case.

38. If the data are suspected of falsifying, the editors shall gather evidence and begin analysis, asking, if necessary, the opinion of an additional reviewer. After processing the evidence, the editors contact the author.

39. When the author's explanations are convincing, the editors thank them for clarifying the case, apologizes for the inconvenience caused and informs the person who reported the suspicion. If the suspicion arose at the stage of the review, the editors undertake a suspended review process.

40. If the author's explanations are unconvincing, the editorial staff contacts the institutions at which the author is affiliated, as well as those for which the examination was carried out or those from which the study was financed, supervisory authorities, asking for an investigation. If the author is found guilty of a falsification or pleads guilty, the editors reject the manuscript submitted or withdraw the text from the publication. If the author's lack of guilt is proven, the editors apologize to him for the inconvenience caused and undertakes a suspended review process if the suspicion arose at the review stage. The editors inform about the state of the case of persons who reported the suspicion.

41. If a request to add an additional name to the authors list is issued, the editors explicate the reason for the change and make sure that all authors agree to make an amendment. Demonstrating that the reason for the change is unjustified gives the editorial board the right to refuse to make a change, even in the case of the agreement of all authors.

42. In the event of the consent of all authors, the editors inquire the additional author to complete the author's declaration, update the list of authors, complete the list of contributions of the individual authors and continue the editorial process or publish the correction, if the text has already been published.

43. In the event of disagreement between all authors, the editorial board suspends the editorial process until the authors have resolved the issue. If this is not possible, the editors settle the dispute through the institution's case- appropriate. If it is demonstrated that the change is justified, the editorial board shall continue the editorial process or publish a correction if the text has already been published.

44. If a request to remove the author from the list of authors is issued, the editors explicate the reason for the change and make sure that all authors agree to make a change. Demonstrating that the reason for the change is unjustified gives the editorial board the right to refuse to make a change, even in the case of the agreement of all authors.

45. With the consent of all authors, including the author concerned, the editors update the list of authors, supplement the list of contributions of the individual authors and continue the editorial process or publish an adjustment if the text has already been published.

46. In the event of disagreement between all authors, the editorial board shall suspend the editorial process until the authors have resolved the issue. If this is not possible, the editors settle the dispute through the appropriate institution. If the change in the authors list concerns published text and the lack of consensus among authors is due to a different interpretation of the studies carried out, the editors make available the possibility of publishing polemic letters.

47. Where the analysis of the documents submitted and the content of the manuscript raises doubts as to the actual composition of the authors, the editorial board asks for additional information and explanations concerning the participation of individuals.

48. If it is found that one of the authors does not meet the criteria of authorship, the editors ask for the written consent of all authors to remove the author or guest author from the list of authors. The editors are also considering notifying the relevant entities, depending on the circumstances.

49. Where the allegation is received that the reviewer had used the author's work without authorization, the editors examine the manuscript submitted and the relevant reviews. When doubts are justified, the editors ask the reviewer to clarify the case. If

the reviewer's explanations are convincing, the editors discontinue the reviewing process, after prior consultation with the author. If the reviewer's explanations are unconvincing, the editorial office, in cooperation with the reviewer institution, determines the guilt or absence of the reviewer's guilt. During the investigation, the editorial board suspends reviewer's duties. If the reviewer is found guilty, the editorial office terminates cooperation and notifies the relevant entities, including institutions employing the author, scientific societies, associations of scientists and others, depending on the circumstances.

50. When considering copyright infringements, the editors benefit from a reliable anti-plagiarism software.