

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

Croatian Statistical Association (CSA), as the publisher of the Croatian Review of Economic, Business and Social Statistics (CREBSS), is committed in ensuring the integrity, transparency and ethical behavior of all parties involved in publication process: authors, editors, reviewers, and the publisher itself. The CREBSS journal publishes only scientific articles (original research papers, review papers or preliminary communications) which contribute to theoretical and applied statistics. Publication ethics and malpractice statement is based on Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors. All submitted manuscripts undergo a rigorous and independent double-blinded peer-review process, evaluating articles originality, scientific contribution, clarity, and relevance to the scope of the journal. There is no submission fee or any other article processing charges associated with this journal.

1. Author's responsibility

1.1. Authorship

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors. The corresponding author should ensure that all co-authors are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have agreed to paper submission and have approved the final version of the paper for publication.

1.2. Consent to Review

When submitting an article for publishing in this journal, the authors agree to participate in peer review process, but do not entail any form of commitment on their part. Accordingly, corresponding author as well as co-authors will be assigned both roles; author and reviewer.

1.3. Reporting Standards

Authors' manuscripts of original research should present an accurate work performed as well as an objective discussion of its relevance for the CREBSS journal. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. The authors should organize their paper such that it follows the IMRAD structure. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior are unacceptable.

1.4. Multiple and Concurrent Publication

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

1.5. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

All authors are required to disclose any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or their interpretation in the manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

1.6. Plagiarism and Originality

The authors should ensure that their work is entirely original, and if the work and/or words of others are used, proper citation or quotation and permission must be obtained. Plagiarism in any form is considered unethical and unacceptable.

1.7. Data Access and Retention

Authors may be required to provide raw data related to their manuscripts for editorial review and public access. Authors should be prepared to provide such data for a reasonable time after publication. When submitting the article, the authors confirm that all data are real and authentic.

1.8. Corrections and Retractions

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal's editor or publisher and cooperate with them to either retract the paper or to publish an appropriate erratum.

1.9. Acknowledgement of Sources

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.

1.10. Copyright and Licensing

Authors retain copyright of their work, and manuscripts are published under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) license that allows others to freely download and share (read, copy, print, distribute or search) the full texts and transmit the contributions of the articles as long as they attribute the author(s) for the original creation, but they can't change it in any way or use it commercially. This is in accordance with the BOAI definition of open access. Upon acceptance of an article, all co-authors are required to sign an agreement, consenting to transfer the publishing rights to the CSA, agreeing to retain copyrights and warranting that the article is original, authored by the given author(s), and has not been previously published or submitted elsewhere for publication before its acceptance.

2. Editor's responsibility

2.1. Publication Decisions

The editors of peer-reviewed journal have complete responsibility and authority to reject/accept an article and they are responsible for deciding which articles are suitable for publication. The decision is based on the manuscript's originality, significance, clarity, and relevance to the scope of the journal as well as legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. In case of any doubt, when the editors suspect the unethical behavior of the author, editors may confer with editorial board of CREBSS.

2.2. Editorial Board

The editorial board of CREBSS is composed of experts in their respective fields which are responsible for maintaining the integrity and the highest quality standards and ensuring objectivity in the decision-making process. The editorial board should always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed, and allow no plagiarism, or fraudulent data.

2.3. Fairness

Editors evaluate manuscripts solely based on their academic and scientific merit without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s). Editors will not use unpublished material from submitted manuscripts for their research without the authors' explicit consent.

2.4. Confidentiality

All information regarding a submitted manuscript is kept confidential. Editors and any member of editorial team must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, and the publisher. The editors are also obliged to preserve anonymity of reviewers.

2.5. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

The editors will be guided by COPE's Guidelines when considering retracting, issuing expressions of concern about, and issuing corrections pertaining to articles. Editors must disclose any conflicts of interest that may affect their ability to fairly evaluate a manuscript. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer-review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. The editors should seek to ensure a fair and appropriate peer-review process. Editors should recuse themselves (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers.

3. Reviewer's responsibility

All submitted manuscripts undergo a rigorous blinded peer-review process by two independent reviewers, external to the editorial board. Reviewers evaluate the scientific merit, methodology, originality, and significance of the work. The review process is confidential, and reviewers are expected to declare any potential conflicts of interest.

3.1. Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and, through the editorial communication with the author, may also assist the author in improving the manuscript.

3.2. Expertise and Promptness

The peer reviewers should only agree to review manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper evaluation and which they can assess in a timely manner. Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process.

3.3. Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

3.4. Standards of Objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively, and their judgments should be objective. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

3.5. Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the submission. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

3.6. Reviewer Misconduct

Any reviewer who feels unqualified to review a manuscript or has a conflict of interest should promptly notify the editors and decline the review.

3.7. Allegations of Misconduct

In cases of alleged misconduct, such as plagiarism, data fabrication, or ethical violations, the journal will follow the guidelines and recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

3.8. Acknowledgement of Sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published data of which they have personal knowledge.

4. Publisher responsibility

4.1. Editorial Independence

Publishers must uphold the editorial independence of the editorial team. They should refrain from interfering in the editorial decision-making process and ensure that editorial decisions are based on the merit of the work and not influenced by commercial considerations.

4.2. Publication Ethics Policies

Publishers should develop and implement publication ethics policies that address issues such as plagiarism, data fabrication, image manipulation, and conflicts of interest. These policies should be clearly communicated to authors, reviewers, and editors.

4.3. Authorship and Contributors

Publishers should ensure that authorship is appropriately attributed and that all individuals who have made significant contributions to the work are acknowledged. They should encourage transparency in authorship and discourage guest authorship and ghostwriting.

4.4. Education and Training

Publishers should educate and train their editorial teams, authors, and reviewers about ethical standards and best practices in scholarly publishing. This helps in promoting a culture of integrity and ethical conduct within the publishing community.

This Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement is subject to revision if required.

Last updated February 10, 2024.