

## 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 subjected 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 **COPE** standards, particularly the Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.

CAAS is the GDPR's personal data controller. In connection with the editorial processes, these are personal data (name, surname, degree, institution, email address, dedication) of authors, lecturers, 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 of authorship, dual submission, plagiarism, figure manipulation, competing interests, and compliance with the standards of research ethics.

- The Author(s) must carefully read and then follow the Instructions for Authors of each CAAS journal before the submission of the manuscript.
- The Author(s) must 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) must ensure that the manuscript is original, prepared to a high scholarly standard and fully referenced using the prescribed referencing convention.
- The Authors must 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 Authors must 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) must 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) must accurately acknowledge the funding sources related to the submitted manuscript.
- The Author(s) must carefully read all the conditions included in the copyright form and to accept the copyright during the submission process.
- The Author(s) must 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) should provide at least 3 reviewers, who must be from different institution or country, to avoid any conflict of interest. The contact emails of the provided reviewers should be institutional (not public email addresses such as gmail.com etc.).
- The Author(s) must declare any potential conflict of interest at any state during the publication process.
- The Author(s) must 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 manuscript is identified.
- The article must always 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 a responsibility and authority to approve the submitted publication 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) must confirm the receipt of the submitted manuscript within ten working days and ensure an efficient, fair and timely review process.

- The Editor makes editorial decisions promptly and will communicate them in a clear and constructive manner.
- The Editor must identify the manuscripts that are fully within the scope and aim of the particular CAAS journal.
- The Editor must 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, Associate Editor and Editors are required to avoid any conflict of interest, see the CAAS Internal Anti-Corruption Programme.
- The Editor must 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 must excuse himself or herself from processing any manuscript if he or she has any conflict of interest with any of the authors or institutions related to the manuscripts.
- The Editor must respect the intellectual independence of Author(s).
- In case the Editor-in-Chief is an author of the article, the editorial responsibility must be delegated to an Associate Editor.
- The Editor must avoid situations of real or perceived conflicts of interest.
- The Editor must ensure in minimum two relevant reviewers for every article submitted. In order to ensure objectivity in case of conflicting reviewer's comments, the manuscript must be reviewed by the third independent reviewer from the other institution or the Editor must make a decision 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 article 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 the area of expertise of the reviewer.
- The Editor must assign the reviewers carefully. For the proper ways how to spot potential manipulation of the peer review process see the [COPE flowchart](#).
- The Editor must ensure 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 must respond immediately and take a proper action when ethical problem occurs concerning a submitted or published manuscript.

- The Editor must 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 suggest at least 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) must only agree to review the manuscripts for which he or she has the subject of expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner.
- The Reviewer(s) after receiving the invitation to review the manuscript must immediately notify the Editor(s) whenever he or she feels unqualified to review the assigned manuscript or sees difficulties to meet the deadline for the completion of the review. After the article has been accepted, the Reviewer(s) must prepare the review within 3 months at the latest.
- Reviews written by Editors, Associate Editors and Reviewers must always be written in English and must contain comments on article orientation, originality and scientific / research value, article goal, methodology, achieved results, discussion, references and quality of professional English.
- The Reviewer(s) must 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, he or she is asked to suggest another expert from the field of expertise. However, he or she must not delegate the review to his or her colleagues without notifying the Editor(s).
- The Reviewer(s) must treat the manuscript in a confidential manner and not use any part of the content of the reviewed manuscript for his or her 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 being constructively critical.
- The Reviewer(s) must inform the Editor(s) whenever he or she finds 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 in order for 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: 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2018

The Presidium was informed on: 30<sup>th</sup> August 2018