

# PUBLICATION ETHICS

*Orbis Idearum. European Journal of the History of Ideas* is an academic journal that has no political, ideological, or confessional affiliation. All parties to the process of the scientific communication found in the journal (authors, reviewers, editors and Editorial Board members) should make every reasonable effort to adhere to the following ethical code that has been developed in compliance with international best practices in scholarly publishing and following the recommendations of the [Committee on Publication Ethics](#) (COPE).

## 1. Authorship

When submitting a manuscript to be considered for publication in *Orbis Idearum* the author thereby confirms his/her authorship. In the case when a manuscript, or the study presented in the manuscript, has been produced in collaboration, one of the authors handles the submission process provided that all co-authors have been named and given full credit. Each co-author should have participated sufficiently in the research to be named as a co-author. Authorship credit is based on a substantial contribution to either research design and conception, data collection and treatment, the analysis and interpretation of the results, or drafting the manuscript.

The authors are responsible for providing correct information about all funding and supporting sources. Appropriate gratitude statements to the colleagues who have made significant contribution to the work should be given in the manuscript subsection "Acknowledgements".

All sources of information used in the process of research and manuscript preparation should be properly cited. The authors bear full responsibility for the correct bibliographic description of the sources.

Any changes to a text that has already undergone peer review and has been accepted for publication can be made only upon consent of the Editor-in-Chief. The authors have the right to withdraw their paper from publication only at stages preceding editing and typesetting work (unless some compelling reasons have appeared).

## 2. Plagiarism

Any form of plagiarism, including auto-plagiarism, constitutes unethical practice and is, therefore, unacceptable. Simultaneous submission of the same manuscript to more than one journal is considered to be unethical behaviour.

All the manuscripts submitted to *Orbis Idearum* are checked for incorrect borrowings and plagiarism by means of the software OSA (Otwarty System Antyplagiatowy) provided by the Jagiellonian University (<https://www.osa.uj.edu.pl>)

Plagiarism may take diverse forms, such as:

- the use of any information published in other editions without indicating the primary source;
- the use of images, pictures, photographs, tables, diagrams, schemes or any other forms of graphical information without indicating the primary source;
- the use of any materials published in scientific and popular editions without approval of the copyright holder;
- incorrect citation, including incomplete bibliographic description of the source, which prevents its identification;
- reference not to the primary source of the borrowed text without clear indication of this fact, which may result in mistakes with the determination of the primary source;
- the absence of in-text references to the sources listed in the bibliography of the paper;
- excessive citation not justified by the objectives and genre of the paper.

In the case when any form of plagiarism has been detected or suspected, the Editorial board of *Orbis Idearum* shall withdraw such papers from any stage of the publication process, even if the paper has already been published.

### **3. Retraction policy**

A retraction mechanism in compliance with the COPE protocol shall be applied when the Editorial board:

- receives evidence of the fraudulent or erroneous nature of the published information as a result of either the author's conscious actions or bona fide errors (e.g., non-intentional errors in calculations);
- receives evidence of multiple publications or multiple submissions;
- learns of a deliberate or unintentional concealment of a conflict of interest, which could have affected the interpretation of the data or the arguments put forward in the manuscript.

Retraction is aimed at correcting errors in publications and informing the readership about those papers comprising erroneous or otherwise problematic data.

Retraction does not imply deletion of the publication from the Journal's website or other bibliographic databases. A retraction note is published alongside the original publication. The original article is retained unchanged (with its DOI), except for a watermark on the .pdf indicating "retraction". This is considered important, since the paper may have already been cited by third parties. Information about retracted papers is presented on the Journal's website.

#### **4. Conflict of interest**

The Editorial Board of *Orbis Idearum* requires that authors disclose any relations with industrial or funding organizations that may have affected the interpretation of their data analysis or the arguments put forward in their manuscript. This information should be disclosed in the paper subsection "Conflict of interest" (if relevant).

Reviewers should not accept manuscripts to review if they have a conflict of interest resulting from competitive or other relations with any of the authors, companies or institutions involved in the research.

The Editor-in-Chief should leave the assessment (administration, management) of a submitted manuscript to another Editorial Board member if he/she is aware of a conflict of interest resulting from competitive or other relations with any of the authors, companies or institutions involved in the presented research.

Articles submitted by the members of the Editorial Board or the Editorial Council are treated in the same way as an outside submission.

#### **5. Ethical code for all the parties to the publishing process**

##### ***5.1 Ethical code for the Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Board members***

The Editor-in-Chief bears full personal responsibility for the content published in *Orbis Idearum*. The Editor-in-Chief is guided by the ethical code presented herein, as well as by legal requirements with regard to defamation, copyright infringement and plagiarism.

The Editor-in-Chief and the Editorial Board members should adhere to the following ethical principles:

- they should base their decisions solely on the validation of the work in question and its scientific rigour;
- they should evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to the race, sex, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, ethnic origin, citizenship, social status, and political preferences of the authors;
- they must not disclose any information about submitted manuscripts to anyone other than those involved in the publication process;
- they must not use information or ideas contained in the submitted manuscripts for their personal benefit;
- they must guard the confidentiality of Reviewers' information;
- they should guarantee the confidentiality of the entire peer-review process;
- they should ensure that the submitted manuscripts be processed in a timely and efficient manner;
- they should be aware that the Journal's primary goal is to contribute to the benefit of science, not to gain profit;
- they shall withdraw manuscripts with suspected plagiarism from the publication process.

## *5.2 Ethical code for Reviewers*

Reviewers' work is aimed at providing a rigorous scientific review of materials submitted to the Journal. Therefore, their behaviour should be unbiased, which is expressed as adherence to the following recommendations. Reviewers should:

- consider a manuscript under review as a confidential document, which cannot be forwarded to third parties without the Editor-in-Chief's prior consent;
- provide an unbiased and objective assessment of the paper under review;
- express their opinions clearly and comprehensively, refraining from any personal criticism of the author;
- never use information contained in the paper under review for their personal purposes;
- excuse himself/herself from the review process if they feel unqualified to review the proposed paper, or if there is any doubt that they might not complete the review within the specified time period;
- never suggest that authors include citations of the Reviewer's work merely to increase the Reviewer's citation count;
- declare any potential conflicts of interest (which may, for example, be personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious) prior to agreeing to review a manuscript, including any relations with the author that might potentially bias their decision.

## *5.3 Ethical code for Authors*

Authors bear personal responsibility for the content of their manuscripts and are expected to follow these ethical principles. Authors should:

- present an accurate account of their research work. The submission of knowingly false or fraudulent results is considered to be a case of malpractice and is, therefore, unacceptable;
- guarantee that their manuscript is their own original and independent work;
- ensure that all persons who have made a significant contribution to the research presented in their manuscript are named as co-authors;
- ensure that all named co-authors have expressed their consent to the publication of the manuscript and to being named as a co-author;
- ensure that all co-authors have approved of the final version of the manuscript and expressed their consent to publication;
- give credit to the authors of cited documents by providing correct bibliographic references to the sources;
- if needed, provide access to the raw data, which has relation to the work, both at all stages of the publication process and after the paper has been published;

- never submit manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal of primary publication;
- refrain from making defamatory statements in their articles, which could be construed as impugning any person's reputation;
- indicate correctly all sources of financial support, particularly if these could have had an impact on the research results, their interpretation, the Reviewers' argumentation, or otherwise suggest any possible conflict-of-interest situations;
- inform the Editor-in-Chief about any errors that have been revealed in their work, at any stage of the publication process;
- disclose any intangible or tangible conflicts of interest.