


The ethical rules of Zeszyty Naukowe Sądownictwa Administracyjnego

The ethical rules of the “Zeszyty Naukowe Sądownictwa Administracyjnego” journal that have been developed based on  [COPE Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors](#) apply to authors, editors, reviewers and the publisher.

All papers submitted to be published in the ZNSA journal are verified in terms of their compliance with the principles of ethics applicable to publishing, academic integrity and values.

Rules applicable to the editorial board

- *Supervising the compliance with ethical standards:* members of the ZNSA editorial board ensure that applicable standards and rules of ethics are observed and that any practices inconsistent with the standards adopted are prevented.
- *Fair play:* race, sex, religion, origin, nationality or political views of authors do not affect the assessment of papers in any way whatsoever. Papers are assessed solely on their merits.
- *The acceptance criteria:* The editorial board decides which materials will be published. When accepting papers to be published, the following are taken into account: the academic value of the paper, original approach to the issue discussed, clarity, consistency with the journal's profile.
- *The principle of confidentiality:* members of the editorial board do not disclose any information on the submitted papers to unauthorised persons. Persons authorised to receive such information are: the author, appointed reviewers, members of the editorial board, editors and the publisher/publishing partner.
- *The prevention of the conflict of interest:* unpublished papers cannot be used by the members of the editorial board or any other persons involved in the publishing process without a written consent of authors.
- *The principle of academic integrity:* members of the editorial board take care to ensure academic reliability of published papers. To this end, they may make adequate changes and modifications. When unfair practices are suspected (plagiarism, falsifying test results), they are obliged to take decision to withdraw the paper from the journal. If necessary, the editorial board is required to publish adequate corrigenda, explanations or apologies.
- *Withdrawal:* The editorial board is entitled to withdraw the paper after it is published, if:
 - there is evidence to substantiate lack of reliability of test results or to prove data fabrication, as well as if unintended errors are made (e.g. errors in calculations, methodological errors);
 - test results were published earlier somewhere else;
 - the work seems to be plagiarised or infringes the rules of publishing ethics.

A note on withdrawal should be understood as the withdrawal of the paper. The note should include the information about the author (the headline should include at least the title of the paper and the names of authors) and reasons for withdrawal. Unintended errors should be distinguished from intentional fraud that led to the withdrawal. The papers withdrawn are not removed from the published version of the journal, but the fact of their withdrawal should be clearly marked.

Rules applicable to authors

- *The rule of academic reliability:* the authors of papers are obliged to provide a sound description of research carried out and objective interpretation of the results. The paper should include information enabling the identification of data sources and research replication.

Presenting and interpreting data in a manner that is inconsistent with the rules of publishing ethics is unacceptable and may result in the paper being withdrawn.

- *The rule of originality*: authors may submit only their own original texts. If any research or information of other academics are used in the paper, they should be clearly marked in a manner indicating a quotation. Plagiarism or data fabrication is unacceptable.
- *The rule of data sharing*: authors asked to provide raw test results used in the text are obliged to ensure access to such data, also after the paper is published.
- *The rule of counteracting the conflict of interest among authors*: Authors should not publish texts that describe the same research in more than one journal. Submitting the same papers to more than one journal is considered unethical.
- *The rules of authorship*:
 - authors submitting any papers written by more than one author are required to disclose the contribution of specific authors (along with the affiliation of authors and information who is the author of the concept, assumptions, methods, protocol, etc., used for the purpose of preparing the paper);
 - *ghostwriting, guest authorship* are examples of academic dishonesty and any cases thereof should be disclosed, with relevant entities being notified, such as institutions that employ authors, academic societies, associations of academic editors, etc.;
 - authors submitting the paper are responsible for ensuring that any person who contributed to the paper accepts its final version.
- *The rule of reliable sources*: authors are required to enumerate in the bibliography attached any publications used in the process of preparing the paper.
- *The rules of dealing with errors*: if authors discover significant errors or inconsistencies in their papers, they are required to notify the editorial board immediately so that the paper may be withdrawn or errors may be corrected.

Rules applicable to reviewers

Reviewers assess papers as requested by the editorial board. Therefore, they influence decisions taken by the editorial board members. They may also, by providing comments to the paper reviewed, shape the final version of papers published and contribute to their improvement.

- *The rule of punctuality*: reviewers are required to provide reviews by the agreed date. If for some reasons (related to subject-matter or organisational ones), they are unable to meet the deadline or prepare a review, they should immediately notify the editorial board.
- *The rule of confidentiality*: all papers reviewed and their reviews are confidential. Disclosing papers to any third parties is unacceptable (excluding persons who take part in the publishing process).
- *The rule of maintaining the standards of objectivity*: reviews should be objective. Personal criticism of authors is considered inadequate. Any comments by a reviewer should be substantiated properly.
- *The rule of reliable sources*: if necessary, reviewers should also specify relevant sources related to the topic that were not quoted by the author. The reviewer should specify and notify the editorial board of any similarities between the paper reviewed and other publications.
- *The rule of preventing conflicts of interest on the part of the reviewers*: the reviewers cannot use the papers reviewed for their personal needs and for their personal benefit. They should not review papers if a conflict of interest with the author/authors may arise.