

Ethical and scientific standards applicable to peer-review labels

Graphic logo and name



RELIABLE PUBLISHER ACCREDITED BY THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PRESSES

Conformance with good publication practice guidelines

- 1 – The publisher conforms to good publication standards by discouraging dishonest practices. The publisher observes good publication practice guidelines developed by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), in particular:
1. The authors and co-authors are required to state their contribution to the writing and revising of the scientific work. The names of all authors, co-authors and contributors are visibly displayed (on the cover, title page or editorial page).
 2. The publisher discourages dishonest practices such as ghostwriting and guest authorship. If such practices are discovered, they must be communicated to scientific editors (monographs) or scientific editors / editors-in-chief of scientific journals.
 3. Funding sources, financial contributions made by research and scientific institutions, associations and other entities, as well as conflicts of interest that may influence research results or their interpretation must be disclosed.
 4. The sources of data used in the scientific work (primary and secondary sources) must be presented; doubtful sources must be validated.
 5. Duplicate, redundant or competitive manuscripts (e.g. describing the results of the same research in more than one journal or translations of published works) are not published.
 6. Publications which have influenced the presented research must be cited and referenced;
 7. The publisher undertakes active measures against defamation, copyright violation and plagiarism (the authors, co-authors, reviewers and editors are notified of any copyright violations). Scientific works that violate these standards are rejected.
 8. Reviewers are appropriately selected, and the review process is coordinated by the publisher. Reviewers may not have financial or professional affiliations or close

personal relationships with the authors. The review process is impartial, and scientific works are reviewed by independent reviewers who are experts in a given field of study.

9. Articles submitted for publication in scientific journals undergo a double-blind review process.

II – The entire publishing process, from peer review to printing, conforms to ethical standards and good publishing practice guidelines:

1. The reviewer/reviewers are appointed by designated persons, such as scientific editors (monographs) or scientific editors / editors-in-chief of scientific journals. Manuscripts that have been previously reviewed are not accepted for publication.
2. Reviews are presented in writing and contain the reviewer's final opinion regarding the acceptance or rejection of the manuscript. Reviews should be substantial, objective and constructive. Any suspicions of plagiarism, duplicate publications and errors/manipulation of data must be reported. Reviewers must keep all information exchanged during the review process in strict confidence until the date of publication.
3. Reviews are forwarded to the authors. The person appointing a reviewer/reviewers must read the reviews. The author must consider the reviewer's suggestions in the revision process. If requested by the reviewer, the revised manuscript must be resubmitted for re-review. Authors who do not agree with the review must prepare a written rebuttal which will be forwarded by the publisher to the reviewer. Manuscripts with a negative review will be rejected. The publisher does not print manuscripts which have received a negative review.
4. Manuscripts are edited by scientific and language editors who are employed by or who collaborate with the publisher (language or editing experts).
5. Manuscripts are typeset and graphic designs are prepared by professional typesetting and graphic design services in accordance with editing and typographic standards.
6. Proofs are sent to the authors, and all manuscripts have to be approved for print by the authors.
7. The publisher observes editing standards, copyrights (citations, illustrations and photographs from other sources, etc.) and good publication practice guidelines during the entire publication process.
8. The publisher has the right to withhold the publication and distribution of a monograph/manuscript if disciplinary proceedings have been initiated against the author/authors.

III – The publisher can adopt detailed rules that are consistent with internal regulations. The use of review forms (sample enclosed) is recommended.

Rules for applying/approving peer-review labels

1. A peer-review label may be applied only by publishers who are members of the Association of University Presses and who abide by the “Ethical and scientific standards applicable to peer-review labels” (described above).
2. A peer-review label indicates that a manuscript has been reviewed and that the review process has been monitored by the publisher. All documents relating to the review process are archived by the publisher.
3. A peer-review label is displayed on the editorial page of a book or under an article printed in a journal. In monographs, a peer-review label replaces the names of reviewers or (in special cases) is displayed together with the reviewers’ names.
4. The decision to approve a peer-review label for a book is made by the publisher. Not all monographs/publications printed by the publisher must have peer-review labels.
5. If a peer-review label has been applied several times in violation of good publication practice standards, the Management Board of the Association of University Presses, upon due consideration, may deprive a publisher of the right to apply a peer-review label for a period of 2 years.

Developed by: Iwona Pisiewicz
Edited by: Aurelia Grejner

Appendices:

- Review form – monograph written by a single author
- Review form – monograph written by multiple authors

Developed by: Ewa Bluszcz, Anna Kędziorek