

**THE EDITORS OF THE JOURNAL “GALICJA. STUDIA I MATERIAŁY”
CONDUCT THEIR PUBLISHING ACTIVITY
ON THE BASIS OF COPE STANDARDS**

The authors are obliged to submit texts in compliance with the principles found in the bookmark “For authors”. The verification of submitted texts will be performed by the editors (at the initial stage) and 2 reviewers (at the reviewing stage). The outcome of the verification determines the decision whether the text is allowed for further edition. If irregularities are detected at the initial stage, a text is not allowed for the reviewing stage and is rejected. Also after a text is published, the editors can verify any signals concerning the irregularities related to its academic circulation (especially the suspicion of duplication or plagiarism).

Detailed procedures of editorial actions in most frequent cases:

I. Suspicion of self-plagiarism at the stage of verification by the editorial staff.

- a. After the detection of duplication, on the basis of the evidence the editors check the extent of duplications (by means of internal IT tools).
- b. If the scale of duplications is extensive, the text is rejected and returned to the author with the justification.
- c. If the scale of duplications is small, the text is returned to the author with the justification and the suggestion to eliminate the duplications or to supplement it with references (if there is no positive response on the side of the author, the text is rejected).
- d. If there are only few similarities of accidental nature, the text is allowed for submission to further editorial stages.

II. Suspicion of self-plagiarism after a volume is published.

- a. When an external signal is sent to the editors, they commence verification based on the delivered evidence and internal IT tools.
- b. If the scale of duplications is extensive, the evidence is submitted to the author who is requested to provide explanation.
- c. A satisfactory explanation (unintentional mistake or unauthorised publication) does not lead to a negative outcome and is transferred to the person who signalled the problem to the editors.
- d. Admission of guilt, unsatisfactory explanation or persistent avoidance of providing an explanation (after several attempts at establishing contact) entail informing the editorial staff of the other journal involved, publishing a statement about a duplicated publication in the next volume and notifying the author’s superiors.
- e. The outcome of the procedure will be reported to the person who signalled the duplicated publication to the editors and to the author.
- f. If there are only few duplications of accidental nature (e.g. lack of references, lack of inverted commas) and the explanation of the author is satisfactory, in the next volume the editors will publish a correction/erratum agreed with the author.
- g. If the editors do not detect duplications sufficient to question the text (see above), such information with the justification will be submitted to the person who signalled the duplicated publication to the editors.

III. Suspicion of plagiarism at the stage of verification by the editorial staff.

- a. Procedure as in the case (I. a-c).
- b. Confirmed plagiarism, unsatisfactory explanation or persistent avoidance of providing an explanation entail notifying the author’s superiors and rejecting the text.

IV. Suspicion of plagiarism in a published article.

- a. Procedure as in the case (II. a-g).

V. Doubts concerning authorship.

a. According to the ethical standards pertaining to the elimination of “ghostwriting” (non-disclosure of authorship or co-authorship of a text) and “guest authorship” (adding co-authors whose contribution to the preparation of a text was insignificant or none), the editors of the journal “Galicja. Studia i materiały” require that all the authors should disclose the actual contribution to the preparation of a publication. Such information should be sent to the correspondence address of the editorial office in the form of a written statement with the affiliation and the degree of authorial contribution in multi-author publications (see: bookmark “For authors”). Such statements are verified with the information about authors on the basis of ORCID.

b. If, on the basis of provided evidence, it is externally signalled that indication of authorship was omitted or there was a case of ghostwriting, the evidence is submitted to the author(s) with the request for explanation.

c. A satisfactory explanation (unintentional mistake or unauthorised publication) does not lead to a negative outcome and is transferred to the person who signalled the problem to the editors along with the editors’ comments. If the text has already been published, in the next volume the editors will publish the author’s statement containing a proper explanation.

d. Admission of guilt, unsatisfactory explanation or persistent avoidance of providing an explanation (after several attempts at establishing contact) entail publishing a statement about a detected irregularity in the next volume and notifying the author’s superiors.

VI. Suspicion of the occurrence of an ethical problem with a submitted text at the stage of verification by the editorial staff.

a. The same procedure as in case of suspicion of plagiarism (see III).

VII. Suspicion of the occurrence of an ethical problem with a submitted text after it has been published.

a. The same procedure as in case of suspicion of plagiarism (see IV).

VIII. Suspicion of undisclosed conflict of interests.

a. It concerns cases in which an author utilised in a text materials without the permission of authorised entities (e.g. iconographic material requiring a license; the image of living persons who are not public figures without their permission).

b. In case of detection of any irregularities, the editors require that the author should provide appropriate documents confirming their authorisation. If the author does not provide the required documentation, the text can be published with the exclusion of the contentious elements.

c. If an irregularity is detected after publishing the text and the attached documentation (VIII. b) is false or devoid of legal effect, the superiors of the author will be notified about the case. In the next volume the editors will publish a proper statement, while the person signalling the irregularity will receive proper explanation.

IX. Suspicion of falsifying or fabricating data.

The editorial procedure is the same as in case of suspicion of plagiarism (see III, IV)

X. Amendments to the list of authors.

a. Amendments to the list of authors are performed solely upon a written statement with the consent of all the authors.

b. If the amendment is to be implemented after the publication of texts, the editors will include a proper erratum in the next volume.

XI. Procedure implemented if an author suspects that a reviewer has appropriated the author’s ideas.

a. After a suspicion has been signalled by an author, the editors evaluate the submitted evidence. It is recommended to use an opinion of an expert on the same or related area of

research. In case of justified accusations, the editors request that the reviewer should provide explanation.

b. In case of satisfactory explanation, the editors contact the author and request that they should provide their position on the matter in question.

c. In case of unsatisfactory explanation provided by the reviewer, the editors request that the institution represented by the reviewer should examine the matter in detail. If the accusations are confirmed, the reviewer is removed from the reviewers' list, while the author is notified about the final outcome of the case.

When preparing the above procedures, diagrams found on the following websites were utilised:

<https://publicationethics.org/files/Full%20set%20of%20Polish%20flowcharts.pdf>

[accessed on: 23.10.2019];

http://ekulczycki.pl/warsztat_badacza/podnoszenie-standardow-wydawniczych-polskich-czasopism-diagramy-cope/ [accessed on: 23.10.2019].