

## **Editing Rules of Journal *Policija i sigurnost***

Compliance with ethical and professional principles in publishing scientific journals is essential for successful scientific work and the development of science. These rules define general ethical and professional guidelines intending to promote the work of participants in the editorial affairs of the Journal *Policija i sigurnost* based on responsibility and ethics, in line with the highest standards of scientific and professional work. Publishing rules and principles encourage responsible scientific and professional research and teaching activities in higher education.

The Journal seeks to ensure the highest ethical standards throughout all editing and publishing stages. It adheres to guidelines related to best practices in ethical expectations, violation of ethical standards, and measures against unethical behaviour. By sustaining the criteria of socially functional scientific dialogue in criminal investigation and public security, the Journal represents a constituent entity for developing national and regional awareness of the need for scientific research. In drafting these rules and principles, the editorial board relied on relevant international and national documents containing the highest standards of professionalism and ethics in publishing, guidelines and recommendations of publishers' associations, ethics committees, guidelines with best practices, behaviour codes, and other standards. Recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) are included in all areas. The editorial board can directly apply new standards of the mentioned bodies.

Writing and publishing scientific articles is one of the primary activities of scientists and teachers. The teachers at the University of Applied Sciences in Criminal Investigation and Public Security participate in this process as authors, reviewers, or members of the editorial board.

### **I. AUTHORS OF SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES**

1. Authors of scientific papers must carry out scientific research in line with ethical and professional principles and rules, accurately presenting the methods used and the results obtained and relevant scientific literature and objectively discussing the significance of their research. Authors must present their work in line with the accepted manner of drafting scientific and professional papers and present the results sufficiently meticulously and unambiguously.
2. Authors need to write scientific papers to ensure data clarity and accuracy. Authors of scientific papers have to present the results and scientific contributions of their work accurately and objectively. The article has to be detailed and substantiated with corresponding literature. Original scientific papers are fundamental for exchanging ideas and data in a scientific community. Scientific papers have to be designed, structured, and written to minimise the possibility of false interpretations.
3. Authors of papers are obliged to adhere to Instructions for Authors. If necessary, authors can seek the assistance of relevant experts (such as translators and language editors) when working on the version of the manuscript they are considering submitting to the Journal.

4. When submitting their manuscript for publication in the Journal, authors must also submit a written statement that the paper is an original work, that each co-author has given their consent, that the manuscript has not been submitted to another journal simultaneously, and that they accept the responsibility for their work. In particular, originality refers to the content of the paper, hypotheses, methods, and data gathered through the research.
5. The editorial board encourages potential authors to publish the first formal publication of their latest research results as a peer-reviewed paper in the scientific Journal *Policija i sigurnost*. The peer review process of scientific manuscripts seeks to ensure an objective evaluation of the work, providing a positive role for the Journal, author, and readers. The peer review process can give rise to suggestions on the need to change the original manuscript, ranging from minor modifications not imposed as a requirement for publishing to major modifications requiring compliance to have the paper published.
6. Authorship has to be based on a significant intellectual contribution and sufficient extent of participation in research or manuscript drafting. An author of a paper can be a person who meets the following criteria: considerable contribution in designing the concept, researching, analysing or interpreting data, participation in writing a paper or its modifications, approving the final version of the paper to be submitted to the Journal, and accepting responsibility for all parts of the paper regarding the accuracy and integrity. Persons who do not meet these criteria can be listed in acknowledgements as contributors.
7. The list of co-authors contains persons responsible for the content and to whom more detailed questions related to scientific research can be referred. Providing and placing material necessary for research or other ancillary activities at the author's disposal does not constitute a justified cause for including others as co-authors.
8. In the event there are more participating co-authors, they are listed according to the significance of their contribution to the paper. Once defined on the submitted manuscript, the list and order of co-authors cannot be subsequently changed without the approval and consent of each co-author. Any instance of scientific fraud by any co-author or non-compliance with an obligation on the part of a co-author is deemed an exception to this rule. There is no limitation to the number of co-authors listed on a manuscript.
9. Any person who participated only in collecting funds for carrying out research or for project application, or who holds leading positions of organisational units and has not had any significant role in planning or conducting research and writing a paper, or who has only supervised the gathering of data, cannot be listed as a co-author. A footnote should reference intellectual, technical, and other assistance rendered by others who do not qualify as paper authors but deserve acknowledgement (contributors). Omitting an author who made a substantial contribution to a manuscript (ghost author), nor including authors who have neither contributed to a paper to qualify for authorship nor have contributed to the research, cannot be accepted.
10. In relation to papers written by multiple co-authors, a co-author who takes primary responsibility for communication with the editorial board has to be designated as the corresponding author. The corresponding author is responsible for handling the manuscript and correspondence during the publication process and for the integrity of the final version of the paper. The corresponding author is responsible for including all persons who qualify

as co-authors and excluding those who do not qualify as such, obtaining the consent of all co-authors to be listed as such, and obtaining their consent to the final version of the manuscript, as well as informing the co-authors of the manuscript status throughout the review and publication process and returning peer review comments.

11. Co-authors are responsible for the work submitted to the Journal under their names. They should be informed about the status of the manuscript during the review process, including reviewers' comments and suggestions regarding necessary changes. If the manuscript has been revised based on reviewers' suggestions and resubmitted to the Journal, co-authors must be informed about the changes and allowed to express their opinions on the revisions. If the manuscript is withdrawn, all co-authors must be notified and consent to the author's decision.
12. Co-authors have the right to withdraw their names from the paper at any time before the paper is accepted for publication. In cases where scientific fraud is suspected, it is not permissible to remove a person from the list of co-authors without their consent or without the editor's approval. After the paper has been accepted for publication, changes to authorship are only possible with the editor's permission.
13. Authors must submit a cover letter to the editorial board along with the manuscript, briefly describing the significance of the results, authorship details, conflicts of interest, and other information required by these editorial rules.
14. Duplicate or multiple submissions of identical or largely overlapping manuscripts to multiple journals simultaneously are prohibited. The Journal does not accept manuscripts already published in other printed or electronic sources.
15. Authors should acknowledge organisations, scientific projects, or institutions that supported the research. Authors must describe the funding source for their work and the role of the entities that financed the research in preparing the manuscript, highlighting any potential conflicts of interest. Financial support can represent a potential conflict of interest, and authors must inform the journal editor, reviewers, and readers to assess the objectivity of the published research.
16. Authors must inform the editorial board of any circumstance that could represent a conflict of interest in the manuscript. Examples of conflicts of interest include an author's involvement as a consultant for a company that funds the research or manufactures equipment tested in the research, financial interest in such a company, intellectual property rights that could be affected by the results published in the article, and other grounds specified in the Journal's Code of Ethics.
17. If the manuscript relates to research involving humans or other beings, the author must provide a statement that the research was approved by the ethics committee of the author's institution and that the individuals consented to participate in the research (informed consent). This statement can be included in the article text. In exceptional cases, the editor may accept a manuscript on research that does not have the institution's ethical approval if it is believed that the rights of participants or other beings were adequately protected. The editor may reject an article if the research is considered unethical, regardless of the institution's ethical approval. If additional explanations are needed, the editor may request clarifications from the author regarding the ethical aspects of the research.

18. When submitting the manuscript, authors should also submit an anonymised version of the paper that does not include names, addresses, or other data in the file that could reveal the authors' identities. The author should write the paper so that the author's identity is not apparent from the content.
19. The review process consists of two or more reviews of a single author's article. Reviewers must be outside the Journal's editorial circle. The Journal uses a double-anonymised review process. This means that communication between the reviewers and the author is conducted through the editorial board. To increase impartiality and the quality of peer review, the editorial board does not reveal the identity of either the author or the reviewers during the review process.
20. Scientific methods in the paper should be described in sufficient detail to enable the scientific community to evaluate, replicate, or verify the results. Other researchers should be able to assess and replicate the findings of the published work objectively and, if necessary, develop and continue work based on previous results. Authors must clearly state the sources of all materials and significant equipment in the article, especially those not commercially available materials.
21. In the article, authors must indicate any risks associated with handling specific equipment, procedures, or weapons and the risks involved in applying particular methods included or used in their scientific research. If the paper includes the use of chemicals, procedures, or equipment that are hazardous, the author must highlight this in the manuscript and ensure that any research involving humans or animals complies with national, local, and institutional regulations.
22. Authors must inform the editorial board about any subsequently discovered errors in their paper. If a significant error is identified after the manuscript has been submitted for review, accepted for publication, or already published, authors must promptly notify the journal editor and collaborate to determine the appropriate way of correcting the error, depending on the stage of the publication process. In cases of disagreement among co-authors regarding the correction, the journal editor is responsible for determining the course of action.
23. If an article in the Journal is designated as a peer-reviewed article, it is understood that reviewers and the editor have positively evaluated it. If the manuscript has been reviewed and returned to the authors for revisions and then resubmitted by the authors after revisions, all significant changes to any part of the manuscript must be indicated, and the previous and new versions of the manuscript must be presented in comparison mode.
24. The Journal *Policija i sigurnost* does neither accept nor tolerate plagiarism. Plagiarism is the publication of other authors' texts, results, methods, or ideas under one's name. Authors are obliged to properly cite the works of others, including abstracts or summaries from scientific conferences and seminars and materials posted on websites.
25. The editorial board should take appropriate measures to use digital systems to detect similarities in papers and maintain academic integrity. These systems can be used regularly or in specific cases, giving rise to suspicion. By submitting a manuscript to the Journal, the author agrees to all necessary authenticity checks that the manuscript will undergo during the evaluation or publication process. The editorial board will support authors whose

copyright has been infringed by a manuscript or who are victims of plagiarism. In cases of ethical complaints, the editor will act following the Journal's rules and provide authors with an opportunity to respond to all allegations.

26. Authors are responsible for explicitly attributing (citing) the authorship of all ideas, results, or methods adopted from other authors, except for content accepted as common knowledge. When drafting their papers, authors must respect the plurality of opinions, avoid hate speech or discrimination on any grounds, and avoid conflicts of interest.
27. Authors should avoid forgery or fabrication of research results, manipulation, alteration, or omission of data in the manuscript. Fabrication of research results and intentional falsification of obtained results are unacceptable. The manuscript must not include data that were not collected or observed, nor is the changing of data permissible.
28. Authors must not duplicate publications or unjustifiably fragment them. Duplicated publications may lead to incorrect conclusions that previously published research has been replicated.
29. Authors must provide accurate references for published articles when they cite their publications or manuscripts. Authors must obtain permission to reproduce images, documents, and other copyright-protected materials. Materials protected by copyright may only be transferred with the copyright holder's permission. If the personal data of individuals are disclosed in the paper, explicit consent for transmission is required. Publishing personal data without explicit consent may be permissible only when the public interest outweighs the rights of the individuals involved or if obtaining consent is not feasible.
30. When submitting a manuscript for review, authors must notify the journal editor of any other thematically similar manuscript under review or in press at another journal and explain the relationship between them. Authors should also provide the editor with a copy of the other manuscript for examination.
31. If the authors decide to submit a full article that expands on and continues a previously published preliminary report of the same research, they are obligated to notify the editor of the prior preliminary report and cite it as such in the manuscript of the current paper.
32. Authors must retain all data and analyses related to the scientific research published in the article for at least three years after publication. If necessary for peer review or editorial evaluation, authors may be asked to provide materials used in the research (survey forms, questionnaires, structured interview forms, tables, statistical analyses, databases, etc.) upon which the results or content of the manuscript are based.
33. All data in the article should be presented to minimise the possibility of misinterpretation. Authors must present their findings in such a form and manner of expression that avoids misinterpretation. Should the research be based on experiments or similar investigations, authors should disclose all details about their experiments in the manuscript to enable verification of the conduct and assessment of the research and results under internationally accepted guidelines.
34. Statistical tests in data analysis should be used while complying with all conditions for applying the appropriate methodology to a specific dataset. Should authors not be

sufficiently skilled and experienced in applying statistical procedures, they may seek assistance and advice from a qualified expert. They should disclose this in the acknowledgements or notes.

35. Authors may use information obtained through private correspondence or personal communications (e.g., conversations, correspondence, discussions, etc.) only with explicit permission from the source of that information. The person who provided such data should be cited in the article as having given a personal communication.
36. Informal communication of results includes presenting a portion of the material at scientific meetings or exchanging pre-publication versions of the manuscript. It facilitates information exchange, discussion, and improvement of the final manuscript. Informal communication of preliminary research results does not preclude publication in a journal as long as a significant portion of the work is not accessible to the public.
37. The Journal rejects manuscripts that have been published in electronic format and are accessible to the public. Prior communication of results or pre-publication of a manuscript diminishes the significance of formally publishing the same results in the print journal.
38. The editor-in-chief may reject a manuscript without peer review if they deem that the proposed article's topic is outside the scope of the Journal; if the article is of poor quality; if it does not meet the basic requirements for submission; if the research is inadequate; if the statistical analysis is inappropriate; if unfounded conclusions are drawn; or for similar reasons. When making a decision on the initial version of the manuscript, the editor considers the potential impact of subsequent revisions.
39. Authors must not personally attack other researchers in their manuscripts. Authors may connect their results with those published in the previous literature. A justified critique of another scientist's work is acceptable if presented rationally without personally attacking the other scientist. The submitted manuscript must not contain any defamatory, derogatory, obscene, or unlawful material.
40. Authors must refrain from discussing the manuscript under review with reviewers. The review process should proceed without direct interactions between authors and reviewers, aiming to maintain impartiality. Communication should only occur indirectly through the editorial board of the Journal.
41. Authors and reviewers should refrain from discussing the manuscript if they discover each other's identities after the review process has been completed or the manuscript has been published. An author must not allow a reviewer's opinion on their work to influence their future actions regarding that reviewer or their work.
42. An author is entitled to request the editor of the Journal not to recommend a specific individual as a reviewer of their work.
43. By submitting manuscripts for publication in the Journal, authors agree that their articles will be published digitally under open access on the Journal's website and other indexing or bibliographic databases. Open access provides unrestricted online access to digital scientific data that can be legally accessed for reading, storing, indexing, and other activities.

## II. REVIEWERS

44. The peer review process ensures critical, constructive, and objective evaluation through the assessment of manuscripts by peers. Peer assessment is an evaluation conducted by two or more scientists at the same or higher level than the author. It constitutes an integral part of formal scientific procedures and provides for scientific methodology.
45. The editorial board will adopt the peer review assessment methods most suitable for the Journal and the scientific community it serves, observing the existing practices of advanced scientific institutions that could improve the Journal.
46. Reviewers should carefully and conscientiously evaluate manuscripts. They should consider the originality, quality, and significance of the experimental and theoretical parts of the work, the method, presentation of results, logical foundation, and strength of the interpretation of results, as well as the presentation style in relation to maintaining high standards of scientific communication. Reviewers should clearly and argumentatively express their opinions. They must also consider the confidentiality of the review process and all the information provided to them by the editor.
47. For the preparation of reviews, the editorial board prepares a review form containing essential parts needed for the evaluation of the work and provides an anonymised copy of the manuscript. Reviews may include constructive suggestions for revisions or additions to the manuscript. The review also considers ethical characteristics and evaluates ethical issues in the manuscript. The reviewer must inform the editorial board of any suspicion of ethical rule violations when implementing research or drafting papers. The editor is obliged to promptly notify the author of such remarks. Ethical issues that should be reported include unethical treatment of subjects, fabrication and falsification of data, inappropriate data analysis, duplicate publication, inappropriate citation, or lack of citation, including plagiarism.
48. The reviewer should recognise and alert the editor to any relevant published content significantly similar to or overlaps with the manuscript's content, which the authors have not cited as a source. The reviewer must provide an appropriate source or argumentation for every statement, observation, or suggestion mentioned. The reviewer should identify important work on the subject that the author has not cited. The reviewer should not unjustifiably suggest that the author cite their work.
49. Scientists are encouraged to accept the task of reviewing. Expanding the responsibility for reviewing manuscripts to a wider circle of experts is essential for ensuring the expertise of scientific assessment and for encompassing diverse opinions.
50. Reviewers should remain anonymous to each other and the author. Authors and reviewers are obliged to adhere to the principles of confidentiality. It is not permissible to reveal the reviewers' identities to each other or the authors. The identity of the authors should be unknown to the reviewers to ensure greater objectivity in assessing the quality of the manuscript.
51. Reviewers should be selected based on their high qualifications and objectivity regarding the subject matter of the manuscript. Reviewers are chosen according to the scientific field of the manuscript or its parts. When selecting reviewers and evaluating their reviews, the

editorial board takes note of key indicators of their scientific work (citations, publications, etc.). Abstracts of the papers are sent to proposed reviewers for preliminary review. Should a reviewer feel that they are not sufficiently familiar with the subject matter of the paper, are not qualified, or cannot complete the review in a timely manner, they are obliged to inform the editorial board thereof.

52. Should reviewers discover the identity of the author of the manuscript in the course of the review, they should inform the editor. They must not communicate with the authors about the manuscript they are reviewing. The editor will decide whether the reviewer should continue the review if they have discovered the author's identity. The journal editor will not disclose the identities of the reviewers of any article except to competent authorities who have the authority to verify the legality of the process.
53. Reviewers must clearly inform the editor of any actual or potential conflict of interest regarding the manuscript submitted for review. A potential conflict of interest may also exist if the manuscript challenges the opinions and results of the reviewer. Based on the information provided by the reviewer, the editorial board will assess whether that reviewer can do the review.
54. Reviewers should approach the evaluation of the manuscript responsibly, constructively, and objectively. They should notify the editor-in-chief if they feel they are not sufficiently qualified regarding the subject matter of the manuscript.
55. Reviews can be critical. However, they should be polite and constructive and must not contain rude or offensive comments or expressions about the author or others.
56. Reviewers should submit their reviews to the editor within 14 to 21 days of agreeing to review and receiving the manuscript from the editorial board. A reviewer should not work on multiple reviews simultaneously.
57. Depending on the possibilities and the subject matter of the manuscript, choosing at least one reviewer from another country is to be advised (international review). Generally, one reviewer should be affiliated with an institution different from the authors. Reviewers should preferably be selected from scientists with scientific-teaching ranks (jobs) of assistant professor or higher or with equivalent scientific ranks. The reviewer's rank should equal or exceed the author's (peer review). As an exception to the previous rule, if the subject matter falls within a field not many scientists have expertise in, reviewers may exceptionally be scientists with a doctoral degree and appropriate teaching rank. The editor-in-chief may consult with members of the editorial board regarding the selection of reviewers for each article.
58. The editorial board develops and maintains a database of reviewers. It keeps it regularly updated and adds new reviewers, entering the reviewer information regarding the quality and timeliness of their reviews. The editorial board systematically monitors the work of reviewers and the quality of their reviews, taking actions to ensure a high standard of the review process. When finding new reviewers, the editor-in-chief seeks to ensure a broad representation of reviewers from the Journal's scientific field (e.g., bibliographic databases, recommendations from other scientists, etc.). Reviewers whose reviews were not of sufficient quality will not be considered for reviewing new manuscripts in the upcoming period.



59. Should a reviewer receive a manuscript when a thorough and conscientious review is not feasible, they can inform the editor about possible delay and propose another deadline by which they can complete the review. The editorial board is to decide whether the proposed deadline is acceptable.
60. Reviewers must not use data and results from the manuscript to promote their research or personal financial interests (privileged position). Reviewers must not use data from the manuscript to advance or initiate their research unless those data are already available to the scientific community.
61. The reviewed manuscript is confidential; reviewers must not show it to others. If a reviewer needs to seek additional opinions from another expert for a successful review, they can propose this to the editorial board, deciding whether to involve additional reviewers. Reviewers must not share manuscripts for review with junior colleagues at their institution or elsewhere.
62. The reviewer to whom the manuscript was initially submitted is responsible for its accuracy and for ensuring that no other individuals have compromised the integrity of the review process.
63. The reviewer assesses whether the manuscript is acceptable for publication, whether revisions or amendments are necessary, whether the revisions or amendments are requirements for the manuscript to be published, and what the categorisation of the paper should be. If the reviewer advises changes or modifications to the manuscript, they may request a new version be submitted for reassessment. The editor may decide to send the latest version back to the reviewer even if it was not explicitly asked.
64. The editor may return an incomplete or shallow review to the reviewer for revision or assign it to another reviewer.
65. Reviewers' comments are sent to the authors as written, save for sections intended for the editorial board or inappropriate content.

### **III. EDITORIAL BOARD**

66. The editorial board of the Journal *Policija i sigurnost* respects and adheres to high ethical and scientific standards in publishing.
67. The editorial board conducts its activities solely based on academic and intellectual merits, adhering to the Journal's standards and the intellectual and thematic content of manuscripts, regardless of race, gender, nationality, ethnic origin, religious beliefs, political affiliation, or other characteristics of the authors.
68. The editor-in-chief is responsible for the operation of the editorial board, finding competent and qualified reviewers, and determining the dynamics of the proper and timely implementation of the review process. The editor-in-chief needs to ensure that only papers of high quality are accepted. Furthermore, the editor-in-chief must ensure the objectivity and confidentiality of the review process and editorial review. The primary duty of the editor is to ensure that all manuscripts are evaluated based on their importance, quality, and

relevance to the Journal's objectives. The editor provides the confidentiality of all data and ideas in submitted manuscripts until publication.

69. The term "editor" in the context of these rules refers to any editor involved in the editorial activities of manuscript editing in the journal unless explicitly specified to which editor the rule applies (editor-in-chief, executive editor, editor). The executive editor and editor perform tasks for editing the journal as assigned by the editor-in-chief.
70. The editor-in-chief should select reviewers with an appropriate level of expertise and objective judgment. The editor should ensure that reviewers understand their duties and responsibilities, especially regarding confidentiality and timely completion of reviews.
71. The editor should forward reviewers' suggestions to the authors, allow them to respond to reviewers' critiques, and facilitate the submission of a revised version of the manuscript. The editor should provide authors with a reasonable deadline for responses and revisions.
72. The editor-in-chief is obliged to request authors to adhere to high standards regarding citing the work of other authors and literature. The editor should not encourage authors to cite articles published in their Journal.
73. The editor-in-chief must consider the author's request that specific individuals not be assigned as reviewers for their manuscript. The editor decides on such a request after verifying the information provided in the request. Reasons for excluding specific reviewers may include prior bias against the author, rivalry on particular topics, rudeness in previous reviews, or other valid reasons. If the editor determines that despite the author's request, the expertise of those individuals is crucial for an appropriate review of the manuscript, they may suggest those individuals as reviewers.
74. Once done, reviews serve as advice to the editor and constructive feedback to the author. The editor-in-chief should carefully consider the reviewers' advice and make the final decision independently. If the reviewers have provided inconsistent advice, the editor-in-chief must decide which advice to accept. If the editor-in-chief decides differently from the consistent advice of both reviewers, they must justify their decision. If the editor-in-chief decides to reject a manuscript despite the reviewers' recommendations for acceptance, they must provide a specific justification for that decision. In case of difficulties in determining the acceptability and categorisation of a manuscript within the editorial board, the matter is referred to the final decision of the Journal's expert board.
75. The editor-in-chief makes the final decision on the article's acceptance and categorisation, considering the quality of the reviews and the characteristics of the reviewers. Exceptionally, in cases of conflicting opinions between two reviewers where one review is negative, the editor-in-chief may decide on a third reviewer. The editor will reject the manuscript if the third review is also negative.
76. The editor-in-chief is responsible for accepting or rejecting the reviewed manuscript. The editor-in-chief's decision regarding revisions may be that the manuscript does not need revisions, requires minor revisions, or requires significant revisions. The editor's decision on the impact of revisions may be that revisions are a condition or not a condition for accepting the manuscript or a specific categorisation. When making the final decision on the publication of the manuscript, the editor considers the opinions of the reviewers and

members of the editorial board. Editors must not change decisions regarding the acceptance, categorisation, or rejection of a manuscript except in the event new facts arise.

77. The editor-in-chief rejects the manuscript if extensive revisions or new data are needed and advises the authors to resubmit the article to the Journal once they revise it. Such a resubmitted article is considered a new submission and undergoes the peer review process from the beginning. The editor rejects a manuscript the author has revised twice without incorporating the necessary changes or revisions.
78. If, after review, different papers by an author are rejected, or if the author has withdrawn them two or more times within a period of up to two years, the editorial board may propose a precautionary measure against the author that amounts to the rejection of submissions from the author for a period of up to two years. The precautionary measure of rejecting submissions can be applied, according to the decision of the editor-in-chief, in cases of ethical violations detected within up to five years. An author can appeal the decision of the editor-in-chief, which will be decided upon by the expert board.
79. The editor must propose an anonymous peer review process where bias is minimised to the greatest extent possible. The editor must support an impartial evaluation of every submitted manuscript, regardless of the authors' age, nationality, gender, race, religion, sexual orientation, and similar characteristics.
80. The editor should refrain from deciding on a manuscript in which they have a potential or actual conflict of interest. Possible conflicts of interest may arise if the manuscript's author is the editor, their collaborator, a student, a person working on projects with the editor, or someone with similar relationships related to the author or the manuscript's subject matter.
81. The editorial board may announce the need for manuscripts on a specific topic to scientists and employ other means to attract and encourage authors to write papers for the Journal. Editors can encourage authors to create manuscripts on required topics. In such cases, special attention must be paid to the impartiality of the peer review process. Such an article cannot receive preferential treatment in the peer review or editorial evaluation.
82. The editor must ensure that all manuscripts are submitted within the same timeframe and undergo the same peer review and publication process, with consistent urgency and adherence to deadlines.
83. The editorial style of the Journal should be based on factors that enhance the quality and consistency of scientific reporting (structured abstracts, standardised citation style, article structure, graphical elements, etc.).
84. Published papers contain a reference to the submission and acceptance dates of the manuscript. The editor should aim to observe the chronological order in which papers are received or accepted for publication. An exception can be made for the topical relevance of the manuscript. Such manuscripts may undergo evaluation outside the chronological order in which they are received or reviews completed.
85. If a highly significant manuscript is received that requires organising a fast-track process, the editor must justify this need. In a fast-track process, reviewers, copyeditors, and other involved participants can be requested to complete their tasks within deadlines shorter than usual. Such papers should be marked in the digital system.

86. The editor cannot in any way notify the author in advance of the presumed outcome of the review process. A comprehensive evaluation of the manuscript is necessary to complete the assessment process.
87. The editor-in-chief makes the decision to accept the article for publication after positive reviews. The editor who has been involved in handling the particular manuscript can draft a proposed decision.
88. The editor must provide authors with a written explanation of their decisions during the manuscript handling process. Transparency promotes the future preparation of higher-quality manuscripts and supports the expertise of editorial procedures.
89. Before sending reviewers' comments to authors, the editor may remove insulting and inappropriate expressions or personal attacks on the author. The editor is responsible for informing the reviewer about the need to remove such content. If such elements are present in the review, it may constitute grounds for seeking a third-party review.
90. Editors and editorial board members are obliged to treat manuscripts as privileged and confidential documents before publication.
91. If a potential or actual conflict of interest arises within the editorial board or among other employees associated with the Journal, the individual involved should report it to the editor-in-chief. Depending on the situation, they may need to be excluded from further involvement.
92. The editor or any other person associated with the Journal must not use unpublished data presented in a submitted manuscript for their own research or personal financial gain.
93. The editor is responsible for ensuring the integrity of academic work and must publish corrections, clarifications, or apologies as necessary. They should correct errors in manuscripts identified before printing and publishing or publish corrections if errors are identified after printing and once the manuscripts are published.
94. Authors, reviewers, editors, or others may point to manuscript errors. The editor may request the author's statement regarding it and seek opinions from other scholars to verify the existence of an error. If someone else informs the editor of an error, the editor must inform the author and request verification of the claims, determining the next steps accordingly. If complaints pertain to an unpublished manuscript, that manuscript is to be suspended until the issue is resolved.
95. Should an error be discovered in a paper that significantly changes the content or conclusion, the editor-in-chief may decide to publish a correction or retract the paper, depending on the severity of the error and its impact on the content of the entire work. If the editor determines that there has been misconduct, a notice of this should be forwarded to the author's institution for further ethical review.
96. Authors must be allowed to respond and inform the scientific community about a reported significant error. If the authors do not do so on time, the editor may publish a notice about the identified error in the Journal. If the work has already been published, the editor-in-chief may, in addition to the previously mentioned measures, decide to publish a report on the error or its correction in the Journal.

97. A notice of correction or retraction must be published in the Journal under a separate title, and the complete bibliographic reference to the original work must be included.
98. Anyone submitting a complaint to the editor about unethical behaviour must provide sufficient information and evidence to initiate an ethics investigation. All complaints will be treated seriously and impartially until the situation is clarified. In the event of an ethics investigation, information is collected while avoiding the dissemination of details beyond those who need to be involved.
99. The editor is responsible for addressing all complaints about ethical or scientific misconduct. Authors of the manuscript must be asked to respond to the allegations in the complaint. If the editor cannot conduct the investigation independently, they may notify the institution where the research was conducted and request that the institution carry out the necessary checks. Minor violations can be resolved without involving the author's or reviewer's institution. More severe violations must include notifying the institution of the author or reviewer who committed the violation.
100. For confirmed violations, the editor-in-chief can impose the following measures: a warning, publication of a notice regarding the inappropriate behaviour, publication of an editorial with details about the inappropriate behaviour, notifying the institution that funds the author or reviewer, and refusal of collaboration for a period of up to five years. The editor must respond promptly to complaints and notify dissatisfied complainants of the possibility of forwarding their complaints to higher authorities.
101. The editor must not reject manuscripts that raise suspicions of scientific misconduct without further investigation. Ethical guidelines mandate the duty to investigate such cases further, regardless of their rejection for publication.
102. At the beginning of the year, the editor-in-chief gives an annual plan and a multi-year development strategy for the Journal. At the end of the year, the editor prepares a report on the activities carried out and, based on the achieved data, prepares the annual plan for the following year. In the report, the editorial board publishes data about the Journal and the review process of submitted articles (number of received manuscripts, average review time, percentage of rejected or accepted papers, percentage of withdrawn papers, etc.).
103. To ensure quality, the editorial board may use methods of gathering opinions or evaluations from authors, readers, reviewers, and other relevant parties about the circumstances crucial for assessing the Journal's quality. The editor should actively seek feedback from authors, readers, and reviewers on ways to improve the Journal. The editorial board encourages initiatives to enhance scientific and research integrity and introduces new standards in publishing and editing.
104. The editorial board is open to scientific research that questions specific results. The editorial board will be willing to accept reasoned criticism of published work and facilitate the publication of commentaries or critical reviews to which the author can respond.
105. Promotional content is not allowed in the Journal. The Journal is financed by the publisher and from other funds allocated to scientific publishing.
106. Authors have the right to object to editorial decisions, especially decisions to reject a manuscript. If an author objects due to a perceived lack of expertise or bias on behalf of the

reviewers, detailed arguments supporting such claims must be provided. The editorial board should keep a record of all objections or complaints regarding journal operations and respond to these accordingly. All complaints should be considered regardless of when the original publication decision was made. Documentation related to complaints should be retained. Cases where consensus cannot be reached may require seeking the opinion of expert international bodies (such as COPE or similar). For procedures not covered by these rules, editors should follow the flowcharts provided by COPE.

107. The editorial board will undergo continuous education on new guidelines, recommendations, and examples of best practices in journal editing and management. It will systematically monitor the development of standards in scientific publishing and digital technologies. The editor-in-chief should ensure that new editorial board members are instructed on the editorial policies and other necessary rules. The editorial board participates in seminars, courses, and other forms of education related to publishing activities.
108. To maintain high standards and evaluate the ethical aspects of individual manuscripts, the editor may appoint an ethics advisor who can assist in exceptional cases. The Journal's ethics advisor may periodically review the Journal's guidelines and policies.
109. These rules can, to an appropriate extent, also apply to other editions of serial publications at the University of Applied Sciences in Criminal Investigation and Public Security and the Police Academy *Prvi hrvatski redarstvenik*.