

## **Osteologicky Bulletin**

**ISSN / E-ISSN: 1211-3778 /**

Publisher: Trios, Czech Republic

Publication ethics and malpractice statement.

The journal's rules comply with COPE Code of Conduct;

<http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines> ; Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK) for Editors

### **1. Publication and authorship:**

- Authors must certify that their manuscript is their original work.
- Authors must certify that the manuscript has not previously been published elsewhere, or even submitted and been in reviewed in another journal.
  - Authors must indicate whether or not they have a financial relationship with the organization that sponsored the research. If yes (directly or indirectly), this fact must be stated at the end of manuscript.
  - Manuscripts submitted for publication must contain a statement to the effect that all human studies have been approved by the appropriate ethics committee. In case of research animal studies, it should be presented a statement that they were performed in accordance with all institutional or national regulations about animal breeding and experiments.
  - Statement mentioned above should be sent with date and original sign of the main author.
  - Publication should contain: list of references, financial support;no plagiarism, no fraudulent data;It is forbidden to publish same research in more than one journal.

### **2. Authors' responsibilities**

- Authors must participate in the peer review process and follow the comments.
- Authors are obliged to provide retractions or corrections of mistakes.
- All Authors mentioned in the paper must have significantly contributed to the research. Level of their contribution also must be defined in the "Authors' Contributions" section of the article.
- Authors must state that all data in the paper are real and authentic.
- Authors must notify the Editors of any conflicts of interest.
- Authors must identify all sources used in the creation of their manuscript.
- Authors must report any errors they discover in their published paper to the Editors.
- Authors must not use irrelevant sources that may help other researches/journals.
- Authors cannot withdraw their articles within the review process or after submission, or they must pay the penalty defined by the publisher.

### **3. Peer review / responsibility for the reviewers:**

- Judgments should be objective;
- Reviewers should have no conflict of interest with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders;
- Reviewers should point out relevant published work which is not yet cited;
- Reviewed articles should be treated confidentially.

### **4. Editorial responsibilities include the following:**

- Editors have complete responsibility and authority to reject/accept an article;

- Editors should have no conflict of interest with respect to articles they reject/accept;
- Editors should only accept a paper when reasonably certain; and when errors are found, promote publication of correction or retraction;
- Editors preserve anonymity of reviewers.
- **Editors should be responsible for everything published in their journals.**
- They should:
  - strive to meet the needs of readers and authors;
  - constantly improve the journal;
  - ensure the quality of the material they publish;
  - champion freedom of expression;
  - maintain the integrity of the academic record;
  - preclude business needs from compromising intellectual standards;
  - always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.
- **Editors' relations with readers**
- Readers should be informed about who has funded research and on the role of the funders in the research
- **Editors' relations with authors**
- Editors should take all reasonable steps to ensure the quality of the material they publish, recognising that journals and sections within journals will have different aims and standards.
- Editors' decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based only on the paper's importance, originality, and clarity, and the study's relevance to the remit of the journal.
- A description of peer review processes should be published, and Editors should be ready to justify any important deviation from the described processes.
- Journals should have a declared mechanism for authors to appeal against Editorial decisions.
- Editors should publish guidance to authors on everything that is expected of them. This guidance should be regularly updated and should refer or link to this code.
- Editors should not reverse decisions to accept submissions unless serious problems are identified with the submission.
- New Editors should not overturn decisions to publish submissions made by the previous Editor unless serious problems are identified.
- **Editors' relations with reviewers**
- Editors should publish guidance to reviewers on everything that is expected of them. This guidance should be regularly updated and should refer or link to this code.
- Editors should have systems to ensure that peer reviewers' identities are protected — unless they have an open review system that is declared to authors and reviewers.
- **Editors and the peer-review process**
- Editors should have systems to ensure that material submitted to their journal remains confidential while under review.
- **Editors and complaints**
- Editors should follow the procedure set out in the COPE flowchart.
- Editors should respond promptly to complaints and should ensure there is a way for dissatisfied complainants to take complaints further. This mechanism should be made clear in the journal and should include information on how to refer unresolved matters to COPE.
- **Editors' role in encouraging debate**
- Criticisms of published work should be published unless Editors have convincing reasons why they cannot be.
- Authors of criticised material should be given the opportunity to respond.
- Studies that challenge previous work published in the journal should be given an especially sympathetic hearing.
- Studies reporting negative results should not be excluded.
- **Encouraging academic integrity**

- Editors should ensure that research material they publish conforms to internationally accepted ethical guidelines.
- Editors should seek assurances that all research has been approved by an appropriate body (e.g. research ethics committee, institutional review board). However, Editors should recognise that such approval does not guarantee that the research is ethical.
- **Editors' role in protecting individual data**
- Editors should protect the confidentiality of individual information (e.g. that obtained through the doctor–patient relationship). It is therefore almost always necessary to obtain written informed consent from patients described in case reports and for photographs of patients. It may be possible to publish without explicit consent if the report is important to public health (or is in some other way important); consent would be unusually burdensome to obtain; and a reasonable individual would be unlikely to object to publication (all three conditions must be met).
- **Editors pursuing misconduct**
- Editors have a duty to act if they suspect misconduct. This duty extends to both published and unpublished papers.
- Editors should not simply reject papers that raise concerns about possible misconduct. They are ethically obliged to pursue alleged cases.
- Editors should first seek a response from those accused. If they are not satisfied with the response, they should ask the relevant employers or some appropriate body (perhaps a regulatory body) to investigate.
- Editors should follow the COPE flowcharts where applicable.
- Editors should make all reasonable efforts to ensure that a proper investigation is conducted; if this does not happen,
- Editors should make all reasonable attempts to persist in obtaining a resolution to the problem. This is an important duty.
- **Editors' role in ensuring the integrity of the academic record**
- Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.
- If, after an appropriate investigation, an item proves to be fraudulent, it should be retracted. The retraction should be clearly identifiable to readers and indexing systems.
- **Editors' relations with journal owners and publishers.**
- The relationship of Editors to publishers and owners is often complex but should in each case be based firmly on the principle of Editorial independence. Notwithstanding the economic and political realities of their journals, Editors should make decisions on which articles to publish based on quality and suitability for readers rather than for immediate financial or political gain.
- **Editors and commercial considerations**
- Editors should have declared policies on advertising in relation to the content of the journal and on processes for publishing supplements.
- Misleading advertisements must be refused, and Editors must be willing to publish criticisms, according to the same criteria used for material in the rest of the journal.
- Reprints should be published as they appear in the journal unless a correction is to be added.
- **Editors and conflict of interest**
- Editors should have systems for managing their own conflicts of interest as well as those of their staff, authors, reviewers and Editorial board members.

#### **5. Ethics issues contain (see also sub 4):**

- Monitoring/safeguarding publishing ethics by editorial board;
- Guidelines for retracting articles;
- Maintain the integrity of the academic record;
- Preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards;
- Always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.
- Accept no plagiarism, no fraudulent data.

