

CAAS JOURNALS ETHICAL STANDARDS

All 11 journals published by the Czech Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS): Czech Journal of Animal Science, Veterinární Medicína, Agricultural Economics, Plant, Soil and Environment, Czech Journal of Food Sciences, Journal of Forest Science, Soil and Water Research, Horticultural Science, Czech Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Plant Protection Science and Research in Agricultural Engineering are subject to the highest ethical standards. All authors, reviewers, and editors and co-editors are required to conform to the following ethical rules. In case of any doubts regarding the Ethical Standards, do not hesitate to contact the Executive Editors of the particular journal: <http://www.agriculturejournals.cz/web/>.

The CAAS Ethical Standards are in accordance with the COPE¹ standards, particularly the Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.

CAAS is the GDPR's² personal data controller. In connection with the editorial processes, these are personal data (name, surname, degree, institution, email address, dedication) of authors, editors, associate editors, which are processed only to a necessary extent. CAAS is obliged to monitor not only the type of recorded personal data, but also the purpose for which the data are recorded, processed and transferred to other entities, and for what purpose those entities will use them. The purpose of the processing of personal data within the CAAS is to ensure an independent assessment of the quality of the scientific article.

Authors' responsibilities:

The Authors are expected to be aware of, and comply with the best practice in publication ethics, especially with the regard to authorship, duplicate submission, plagiarism, figure manipulation, competing interests, and compliance with the standards of research ethics.

- The Author(s) **are required to** carefully read and follow the Instructions for Authors of each CAAS journal before the submission of the manuscript.
- The Author(s) **are required to** declare that the submitted manuscript (or any of its part) is currently not being considered for publication elsewhere or has been already published (or, if so, the relevant works must be cited in the manuscript).
- The Author(s) **guarantee** that the manuscript is original, prepared to a high scholarly standard and fully referenced using the prescribed referencing convention.

¹ COPE = Committee on Publication Ethics

² GDPR = General Data Protection Regulation

- The Author(s) **are required to** ensure that all the authors participated actively on the manuscript preparation and contributed substantially to study planning, data collection or interpretation of results and wrote or critically revised the manuscript and approved its final submitted version.
- The Author(s) **are required to** ensure that all persons listed as authors of the manuscript are aware of and have agreed to be listed and no person who meets the authorship criteria has been omitted.
- The Author(s) **are required to** ensure that all the Authors participating in the preparation and writing of the manuscript agree to the manuscript publication in the particular CAAS journal both online Open Access and the printed version after any amendments arising from the peer review, and that the names of the Authors, their affiliations and email address of the corresponding author will be published together with the article.
- The Author(s) **are required to** accurately acknowledge the funding sources related to the submitted manuscript.
- The Author(s) **are required to** carefully read all the conditions included in the copyright form and to accept the copyright during the submission process.
- The Author(s) **are required to** declare that all the data used in the manuscript were acquired following the ethical research standards. They must ensure that all the experiments performed comply with the current Czech and EU laws and regulations and WMA relating to the transport, housing and use of animals in research if applicable.
- When submitting the manuscript, the Author(s) **are required to** suggest a maximum of three reviewers at least, preferably from other institutions or countries, to avoid any conflict of interest. The contact emails of the suggested reviewers should be institutional (not public email addresses such as gmail.com etc.).
- The Author(s) **are required to** declare any potential conflict of interest at any state during the publication process.
- The Author(s) **are required to** cooperate with the editors in correction or retraction of the manuscript if necessary. The Author(s) must immediately inform the editors whenever any obvious error in the published article is identified.
- The manuscript needs to be formatted according to the journal's requirements prior to the first insertion into the system. Should the article fail to comply with the editorial guidelines, it may be rejected by the Editor of the Journal.

Obligations of Editors-in-Chief and Associate Editors:

- The Editor is appointed by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. The Editor and Associate Editor are subordinate to the Publishing Board.

- The Editor-in-Chief has the responsibility and authority to approve the submitted manuscript or reject it. The Editor-in-Chief may delegate this responsibility to the Associate Editor on the basis of the Statute and the Rules of Procedure of the Publishing Board.
- The Editor (both Editor-in-Chief and Associate Editors) is required to confirm receipt of the submitted manuscript within ten working days and ensure an efficient, fair and timely review process.
- The Editor is required to make sound editorial decisions within a reasonable period of time and communicate them in a clear and constructive manner.
- The Editor is required to consider only the manuscripts that are fully within the scope and aim of the particular CAAS journal.
- The Editor is required to treat all the submitted manuscripts equally, irrespective of the race, gender, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship or political philosophy of the Author(s).
- The Editor and Associate Editors are required to avoid any conflict of interest, see the CAAS Internal Anti-Corruption Programme.
- The Editor is required to approve the review process and publication of manuscripts of the highest quality only.
- The Editor and the editorial staff will not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration or its disposition to anyone other than those from whom professional advice is sought.
- The Editor and the editorial staff are required to excuse themselves from processing any manuscript if they have any conflict of interest with any of the authors or institutions related to the manuscripts.
- The Editor is required to respect the intellectual independence of Author(s).
- In case the Editor-in-Chief is an author of the article, the editorial responsibility will be delegated to an Associate Editor.
- The Editor is required to avoid situations of real or perceived conflicts of interest.
- The Editor is required to appoint a minimum of two relevant reviewers for every manuscript submitted. In order to ensure objectivity in case of conflicting reviewer's comments, the manuscript needs to be reviewed by a third independent reviewer; yet another institution or the Editor is required to decide as the third reviewer. As relevant can only be considered a review which is written in English and contains at least a brief statement about manuscript orientation, originality and scientific / research value, article goal, methodology, achieved results, discussion, references and quality of professional English. The Editor must appoint appropriate reviewers for the particular manuscript (which has been approved for the review process), considering their area of expertise.
- The Editor is required to assign the reviewers in a responsible manner. For the proper ways how to spot potential manipulation of the peer review process see the [COPE flowchart](#).
- The Editor is required to ensure that all the reviewers' identities are kept confidential.

- The Editor must not use any part of the content of the submitted manuscript for his or her own future research as the submitted manuscript is not published yet, except with the consent of the author.
- The Editor is required to respond immediately and take a proper action when an ethical problem occurs concerning a submitted manuscript or published article.
- The Editor is required to follow the COPE flowcharts in cases of suspected misconduct or disputed authorship.

Review process

The CAAS journals review process is a “**Double blind**” process, which means that both the reviewer and author identities are concealed throughout the review process. The reviewers are assigned by the Editor of the Journal or Associate Editor, however the suggestions for the reviewers may come from the authors (at the time of the manuscript submission they may suggest a minimum of three potential reviewers) and also from other assigned reviewers. The assignment of reviewers by the Editor or Associate Editor is subject to control or even control by individual responsible editors (see Internal Anti-Corruption Programme), who check that there is no conflict of interest. Any suspicion of conflict of interest is immediately reported to the Publishing Board, director of the CAAS and the President of Presidium by a person who suspects any conflict of interest.

Reviewers’ responsibilities:

- The Reviewer(s) are required to review only manuscripts for which they have the expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner.
- After receiving the invitation to review the manuscript, the Reviewer(s) are required to immediately notify the Editor(s) whenever they feel unqualified to review the assigned manuscript or sees difficulties to meet the deadline for the completion of the review. After the manuscript has been accepted for the review, the Reviewer(s) are required to prepare the review within three months at the latest.
- The Reviewer(s) are required to write all reviews in English and include comments on article orientation, originality and scientific / research value, article goal, methodology, achieved results, discussion, references and quality of professional English.
- The Reviewer(s) are required to inform the Editor(s) if there is any possible conflict of interest related to the assigned manuscript. For example, in case the reviewer is invited to review the manuscript of his or her colleague from the same institution etc.

- In case the Reviewer(s) cannot review the manuscript, they are asked to suggest another expert from the field of expertise. However, they are not allowed to delegate the review to their colleagues without notifying the Editor(s).
- The Reviewer(s) are required to treat the manuscript in a confidential manner and not to use any part of the content of the reviewed manuscript for their future research as the reviewing manuscript is not published yet.
- The main task of the Reviewer(s) is to help improve the quality of the manuscript with the appropriate care and attention, review the manuscript objectively and be constructively critical.
- The Reviewer(s) are required to inform the Editor(s) whenever they find similarities between the reviewed manuscript and another article either published or under consideration to another journal.

Procedures for dealing with unethical behaviour

All allegations of the ethical misconduct are taken seriously, and full investigation will take place. All suspected ethical misconduct will be solved according to the Core Practices and COPE flowcharts recommendation.

Identification of unethical behaviour

- Misconduct and unethical behaviour may be identified and brought to the attention of the Editor(s) and Publisher at any time, by anyone.
- Whoever informs the Editor or Publisher of such conduct must provide sufficient information and proof so that the matter to be investigated. All allegations will be taken seriously and treated equally, until an appropriate decision or solution is reached.

Investigation and resolution

The Editor is obliged to take appropriate action in case any suspect of any misconduct is discovered and reported by anyone. He/she may discuss his/her decision with the Publisher if required. This obligation is applicable to both published and unpublished articles. The Editor(s) and Reviewer(s) must prepare review comments which have educational rather than punitive effect.

Minor breaches

- Minor misconduct should be dealt without the need to be consulted more deeply. In any event, the Author(s) must be given the opportunity to respond to any allegations and must be given the chance for reasonable explanation.

Serious breaches

- Serious misconduct might require that the Employer(s) of the Accused be informed. The Editor(s), in consultation with the Publisher, must make the decision whether or not to involve the Employer(s), either by examining the available evidence themselves or by further consultation with a limited number of experts.

Final resolutions (in increasing order of severity) may be applied individually or in conjunction with:

- informing and educating the Author(s) or Reviewer(s) where a misunderstanding or misapplication of acceptable ethical standards is significant;
- a more detailed warning letter to the Author(s) or Reviewer(s) covering the misconduct to inform about the possible future consequences;
- publication of an editorial detailing the misconduct;
- sending an official letter to the Head of the Author's or Reviewer's department or funding institution;
- formal retraction or withdrawal of a publication from the journal, in conjunction with informing the Head of the Author or Reviewer's department, Abstracting & Indexing services and the readership of the publication. Imposing a formal embargo on contributions from an individual for a certain period.
- reporting the case and outcome to a professional organisation or a higher authority for further investigation and action.

Approved by the Publishing Board on: 22nd August 2018

The Presidium was informed on: 30th August 2018