

Publication Ethics

The Editorial Boards of the Upper Silesian Museum journals and editions has accepted and upholds the standards of publication ethics which are in line with COPE Guidelines (COPE – Committee on Publication Ethics). In case of a discovered misconduct on the author's part, such as plagiarism, falsifying data or double publication, the journal Editorial Team will call for explanation and then undertake appropriate steps by following the COPE flowcharts. This may eventually include notification of authorities at the author's institution, withdrawal of the article in question and exclusion of any further submissions by the same author from being processed by the journal.

1. The obligations of the Editorial Board

The Editorial Board is determined to use the highest publication standards. Each instance of scientific misconduct is documented, and information about it is transferred to relevant entities.

The Editorial Board treats the authors equally regardless of their degree or academic title, age, gender, affiliation and any other features, including race, nationality or citizenship, ethnicity, worldview or disability. The substantive features of the text and its connection with the subject matter of the journal are decisive. The decision on the publication is the result of the review process carried out in accordance with the established standards (see below).

Members of the Editorial Board refrain from using the submitted materials in any way that was not agreed with the author.

2. The responsibilities of the authors

In order to ensure the highest substantive level of the journal and the implementation of the ethical principles, it is required to disclose the contribution of all authors and institutions that supported them in the creation of the text. In particular it is unacceptable to omit authorship of the people who have contributed to the creation of the text and to attribute it to those who did not offer any contribution. Each author, together with the article filed for the publication, is obliged to submit a statement in which he or she confirms that:

- the text is an original one and it does not infringe on the copyright rights of any third party; that it has not been published before and the publication process in another journal is not taking place;
 - all and only those who are the authors of the transmitted text are disclosed;
- Authorship.** Authorship credit should be based on: substantial contributions to conception or analysis and interpretation of data; drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and final approval of the version to be published.

“Ghostwriting” and “guest authorship”

The following authorship problems should be prevented before submitting a paper: “ghostwriting” and “guest authorship”. “Ghostwriting” refers to a case 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 scientific process.

Contributorship

In 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: DF is responsible for the ideas in the research; BK 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 will be published in the article.

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 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. If a change in authorship pertains to an already published paper, it will be executed by publishing a correction article.

- all sources of funding that led to the creation of the text have been disclosed;
- there is no conflict of interest between the author or authors; the conflict of interest is defined as a direct personal relationship between the reviewer and the author, professional dependency relations or direct scientific cooperation in the last two years preceding the year of the submittal of the article for the publication; in the event that such a conflict exists, the author is disclose the names of such persons.

Competing interests. A conflict of interest exists when an author (or the author’s institution), reviewer, or editor has financial or personal relationships that 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 scientific 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, the authors, and science itself. However, conflicts may occur for other reasons, such as personal relationships, academic competition, and political and intellectual passion.

If any conflict of interest exists, it is obligatory that each author and reviewer declare it.

Individuals who have participated in some of the important aspects of the research project – but their contribution is not significant enough to consider them to be co-authors – should be mentioned in the acknowledgments.

If a fundamental error is discovered in the text, the author should cooperate with the editors in order to correct the error or withdraw the text.

3. Responsibilities of the reviewers

The reviewers are objective and evaluate only the substantive value of the text. If a conflict of interest is detected – as the authorship is discovered as well – the reviewers are required to immediately inform the Editorial Board about it. The reviewers send their reviews on time; if the text goes beyond their knowledge, the reviewers immediately inform the Editorial Board about such a fact. The reviewers inform the Editorial Board about any suspicion of plagiarism. The reviewers treat the texts as confidential and do not use the text in their own research until the final decision on its publication is made.

Review procedure:

All papers undergo two blind written reviews by distinguished specialists in area of suitable sciences. The reviewers are from outside the unit that the article author comes from and their activities do not present a conflict of interests. An article is published, if it received two positive reviews. If one of the reviews is positive and the other is not, a third review is commissioned. If a text receives two negative reviews, it is rejected. If an altered version of a rejected article is again sent to the editors, the review process starts from the beginning.