

PUBLICATION ETHICS AND PUBLICATION MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

The journal *Zbornik Lovranščine* acts in accordance with accepted practices dealing with ethical issues in science. The journal dedicates a significant amount of attention to the prevention of misuse in academic publishing. The following are the standards of expected ethical behaviour for all parties involved in publishing in the journal *Zbornik Lovranščine*: the journal editor and editorial board, the peer reviewer, and the author.

These guidelines are based on the existing Elsevier's Standards of Publishing Ethics for Editors and COPE's Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.

1. Duties of the Editor and the Editorial Board

Publication Decisions. The editor-in-chief is responsible for deciding which of the papers submitted to the journal should be published. The editor-in-chief is guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding issues such as libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editor-in-chief may confer with other editors or reviewers (or society officers) in making these decisions.

Peer review. The editor-in-chief shall ensure that the peer review process is fair, unbiased, and timely. All papers positively evaluated shall be reviewed by two external and independent reviewers.

Fair play. The editor-in-chief should evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

Confidentiality. The editor-in-chief must protect the confidentiality of all material submitted to the journal and all received information relating to it.

2. Duties of Reviewers

Contribution to Editorial Decisions. Peer review assists the editor-in-chief in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.

Timeliness. 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 decline to participate in the review process.

Confidentiality. Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. Reviewers must not share the review or information about the paper with anyone or contact the authors directly without permission from the editor.

Standards of Objectivity. Reviewers should review the submitted manuscript objectively and present clearly their views and arguments.

Alertness to Ethical Issues. A reviewer should bring to the attention of the editor any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which the reviewer has personal knowledge.

Declaration of Competing Interests. If there is any potential conflict of interest related to the paper accepted for review, the reviewer should immediately inform the editor-in-chief.

3. Duties of Authors

Reporting Standards. Authors of reports of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work.

Originality and Plagiarism. The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others, that this has been appropriately cited or quoted and permission has been obtained where necessary.

Multiple Publication. The authors should ensure that the submitted paper is not submitted for consideration in another journal. The authors should not publish works dealing with essentially the same research in multiple journals.

Acknowledgement of Sources. Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite all data sources and publications that have influenced the reported work.

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 substantial contributions should be listed as co-authors. The 4 corresponding author should ensure that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

Declaration of Competing Interests. All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial, personal or other substantive competing interest regarding their paper that might be construed as an inappropriate influence in the results or interpretation of their manuscript.

Notification of Fundamental Errors. If at any point the author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor-in-chief or publisher and cooperate with the editor-in-chief to retract or correct the paper if deemed necessary by the editor.

4. Appeals, Complaints and Misconduct

The following procedure applies to appeals to editorial decisions, complaints about long delays in handling papers and complaints about publication ethics. The complaint should in first instance be handled by the editor-in-chief responsible for the journal. If they are the subject of the complaint, please approach the publishing contact. Appeals and complaints should be submitted by email, so that they can be best audited. A complaint will be acknowledged within 7 working days of receipt and the complainant will be kept updated with the expected process and timelines from that point until a resolution is found.

Appeals to editorial decisions: appeals will be handled by the editor in chief, who will audit the decision making process to assess whether there are grounds for an appeal. Should the appeal be deemed valid, additional review will be requested from the editorial board and/or peer reviewers until a new editorial decision can be made based on the feedback received. The complainant is informed of the decision. Decisions on appeals are final.

Complaints about delays in reviewing processes: the editor-in-chief will investigate the matter. The complainant will be given appropriate feedback. Feedback is provided to relevant stakeholders to improve processes and procedures.

Complaints about publication ethics: the editor-in-chief follows guidelines in this statement. The editor-in-chief may consult other members of the editorial board and/or publisher in handling difficult or complicated cases. The editor-in-chief decides on a course of action and provides feedback to the complainant.