

PUBLISHING ETHICS

STUDIA COMENIANA ET HISTORICA || ISSN: 0323-2220

INTRODUCTION:

The journal [Studia Comeniana et historica](#) is focused on comeniology, history of 16th–18th century and regional history of Moravian-Slovak border region.

Contributions dealing with the following questions are **eligible for application**: comeniology, Czech translations of Comenius' texts, information about comeniological literature (both Czech and foreign), topical reports on comeniological conferences or exhibitions, history of 16th–18th century, philosophy and literature of Early Modern Age and related areas, history of the region, theology.

The journal has been published continually since 1971. It is published once a year as a double issue.

Publisher of the journal is Muzeum Jana Amose Komenského v Uherském Brodě (John Amos Comenius' Museum in Uherský Brod).

The Publishing Ethics is based on the Code created by the [Committee on Publication Ethics](#) (COPE) and we also follow standards and best practice guidelines set by other relevant industry associations.

EDITORIAL PROCESS:

We are committed to editorial independence, and strive in all cases to prevent this principle from being compromised through conflicts of interest, fear, or any other corporate, business, financial or political influence. Our editorial processes reflect this commitment to editorial independence.

We do not discriminate against authors, editors or peer reviewers based on personal characteristics or identity.

Submitted contributions are initially reviewed by the editors. If the proposal is suitable for consideration by the publisher (Muzeum Jana Amose Komenského v Uherském Brodě), the contribution will be sent to a minimum of two external and independent peer reviewers. The peer reviewers' assessments are used to inform the editor's decision as to whether or not to publish the contribution in the journal *Studia Comeniana et historica*.

DUTIES OF THE EDITORS:

Editors should ensure that all the submitted papers are peer reviewed.

Editors are responsible for the content of the journal and the quality of the published papers.

Editors should evaluate the paper objectively. They should disclose interests that might appear to affect their ability to evaluate the papers. Editors should follow the main criteria of the selection of the papers, which are: scientific quality and importance of the particular paper; compliance of the paper with the focus of the journal.

Editors should ensure that all those who carry out peer review on behalf of the journal understand and adhere to the need for confidentiality relating to the peer-review process. The identity of the author must not be disclosed to the reviewer and vice versa.

Together with the editorial board, the editors deal with the possible appeals of the authors concerning the reviewer's comments and other complaints.

Editors make the final decision about admission or refusal of the paper. Editors' decision 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.

We strive to follow COPE's [Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing](#).

The process for selecting service providers such as printers must be fair and as transparent as possible while safeguarding confidential information and include mechanisms for managing potential conflicts of interest.

We will never be complicit in censorship. We are fully committed to the principle and promotion of freedom of speech and expression. We support COPE's [Statement on Censorship](#).

PEER REVIEW PROCESS:

The model of peer review adopted by the journal *Studia Comeniana et historica* is a double blind peer review, peer reviews are not published and they are facilitated by the journal.

Reviews should provide speedy, accurate, courteous, unbiased and justifiable reports.

Peer reviewers are external experts chosen by editors to provide written opinions, with the aim of improving the study.

The submitted manuscript is a privileged communication and must be treated as a confidential document. Reviewers should not make personal or professional use of the data or interpretations.

The submitted manuscript should not be retained or copied.

Reviews should be constructive and courteous and the reviewer should respect the intellectual independence of the author.

Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate.

If the reviewers cannot judge a paper impartially, they should not accept it for review or you should notify the editor as soon as they appreciate the situation. They should contact the editor also if they believe that they are not qualified to evaluate the article or they do not have enough time to evaluate it.

If the reviewers should have any affiliations that may be perceived as a conflict of interest in reviewing the paper, they should not accept it for review. Among these affiliations, there are: professional, financial or personal benefit of the reviewer connected with the positive or negative review of the paper; cooperation on the subject in question in the last five years; substantial difference in opinions on the subject in question.

If the editors are not notified about any of the above-mentioned issues, the editors shall assume that there is no conflict of interests.

The reviewers should notify the author in case they find some of the substantial literature concerning the subject in question missing in the paper. They should notify the editors in case they find any substantial similarity of the paper to other published paper.

EDITORIAL BOARD:

The Editorial Board strives to maintain excellence with respect to the academic quality of the journal and supports plurality of opinions. Based on its debate, the Editorial Board may publish possible corrections, appeals and apologies.

The Editorial Board has the authority to comment on the peer-review process in all of its stages.

The Editorial Board inspects observance of this statement on publication ethics and malpractice.

AUTHORS AND AUTHOR'S RESPONSIBILITIES:

All authors must take public responsibility for the content of their paper.

The authors are obligated to submit their paper for the review process. They should respond to the reviewer's comments and make appropriate corrections based on these comments. In case of a substantial contradiction, they should contact the editors or they can withdraw the paper.

They must follow the *Publishing Ethics* as well as the given citation format.

By sending the manuscript for the review, they automatically declare that all the data in the paper are true and original. In case they have used works or formulations of other authors, they shall quote them appropriately.

In case they discover a substantial mistake or inaccuracy in the published paper, they shall immediately notify the editors and cooperate with them on the removal or revision of the paper.

PLAGIARISM:

Plagiarism is defined as “using someone else’s ideas, words, data, or other material produced by them without acknowledgement”.

Plagiarism can occur in respect to all types of sources and media, including: text, illustrations, material downloaded from websites or drawn from manuscripts or other media; published and unpublished material, including lectures, presentations and grey literature.

We do not tolerate plagiarism in any of our publications, and we reserve the right to check all submissions through appropriate checking tools. Submissions containing suspected plagiarism, in whole or part, will be rejected. We expect our readers and reviewers to raise any suspicion of plagiarism by contacting the editors.

DUPLICATE AND REDUNDANT PUBLICATION:

Duplicate or redundant publication, or “self-plagiarism”, occurs when a work, or substantial parts of a work, is published more than once by the author(s) of the work without appropriate cross-referencing or justification for the overlap. This can be in the same or a different language.

We do not support substantial overlap between publications, unless: it is felt that editorially this will strengthen the academic discourse; and we have clear approval from the original publication; and we include the citation of the original source.

We expect our readers and reviewers to raise any suspicions of duplicate or redundant publication by contacting the editors.

When authors submit manuscripts to our journal, these manuscripts should not be under consideration, accepted for publication or in press within a different journal, book or similar identity.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

Authors submitting a journal manuscript are required to declare any potential conflicts of interest that could interfere with the objectivity or integrity of a publication. Conflicts of interest are situations that could be perceived to exert an undue influence on the

presentation, review or publication of a piece of work. These may be financial, non-financial, professional, contractual or personal in nature. We expect anyone who suspects an undisclosed conflict of interest regarding a work published or under consideration by the Muzeum Jana Amose Komenského should inform the editors.

LIBEL, DEFAMATION AND FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION:

Freedom of expression is critical to us, but we do not support publishing false statements that harm the reputation of individuals, groups, or organizations.

CORRECTIONS AND RETRACTIONS:

If an author is found to have made an error, the journal will issue a corrigendum. If the journal is found to have made an error, they will issue an erratum. Retractions are usually reserved for articles that are so seriously flawed that their findings or conclusions should not be relied upon. Any substantive corrections will be carried out in line with COPE's [Retraction Guidelines](#).

IMAGE MANIPULATION:

Where research data are collected or presented as images, modifying these images can sometimes misrepresent the results obtained or their significance. We recognize that there can be legitimate reasons for modifying images, but we expect authors to avoid modifying images where this leads to the falsifications, fabrication, or misrepresentations of their results.

DEALING WITH MISCONDUCT:

The general principle confirming misconduct is intention to cause others to regard as true that which is not true. The examination of misconduct must therefore focus, not only on the particular act or omission, but also on the intention of the researcher, author, editor, reviewer or publisher involved.

Editors should not simply reject papers that raise questions of misconduct. They are ethically obliged to pursue the case.

If accusations of serious misconduct are not accompanied by convincing evidence, then editors should confidentially seek expert advice. If the experts find no evidence of misconduct, the editorial process should proceed in the normal way.

Authors should be given the opportunity to respond to accusations to any charge of minor or serious misconduct.

If convinced of wrongdoing, editors may wish to adopt some of the sanctions outlined in the COPE's [Guidelines on good publication practice](#).