

Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

Authorities of the journal Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis adhere to the highest standard of scholarly research work publications ethics. Publication ethics and malpractice statement is guided by COPE's „Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors“.

I. Duties fo Editors and Co-editors

1. **Publication Decision:** The editors of Acta are responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be reviewed or published in their respective areas of expetise. Expert coeditors are assigned new submissions by the technical editor based on their area of expertise.
2. **Review of Contribution:** Two reviews are typically requested for each contribution. As a general rule only the manuscripts with two positive reviews can be published. One negative review can be grounds for rejection. The final decision lies with Editors and Co-editors. If the decision about a manuscript can not be made based upon two required reports, additional opinion can be requested from another reviewer. Authors will be informed about the decision on their manuscript as promptly as possible.
3. **Fair Review:** The editor shall at all times evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to religious belief, ethnic origin, race, gender, sexual orientation, political views etc. of the authors.
4. **Confidentiality:** Editors and Co-editors bear responsibilities for the preservation of anonymity of all reviewers in the review process. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. The Editors and any editorial staff of Acta must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the authors, reviewers, other editorial advisers and the publisher, as appropriate.
5. **Disclosure and Conflict of Interest:** Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in the Editor's own research.

II. Duties of Authors

1. **Authorship of the paper:** Authorship should be limited to but must include all those, who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. The corresponding author ensures that the submission for publication of the manuscript in question has been approved by all of the authors and by the institution where the work was carried out.
2. **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.
3. **Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication:** The authors must ensure that no paper submitted to Acta has been published or is under consideration for publication in other journals (except as an abstract, a part of a: lecture, review or academic thesis).

4. **Acknowledgement of sources:** Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. The citations must include all sources that have been used to determine the nature of the reported work. No extra sources, which have not been used, may be cited.
5. **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. Any fraudulent or deliberately inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.
6. **Disclosure and conflicts of interest:** All submissions must include disclosure of all relationships that could be viewed as presenting a potential conflict of interest. All sources of financial support used to achieve the results must be disclosed.
7. **Fundamental errors in published works:** If 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 Editor or Publisher and cooperate with the Editor to retract or correct the paper by means of corrigendum or erratum.

III. Duties of Reviewers

1. **Contribution Quality:** Peer review assists the Editor or Co-editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communication with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.
2. **Standards of Objectivity:** Reviewers should conduct their reviews objectively, avoiding personal criticism and subjectivity. Criticism of the author's personality or the topic is unprofessional and inappropriate. Reviewers should explain their recommendations clearly and explicitly and provide rational support and justification.
3. **Confidentiality and Conflicts of Interest:** Reviewers should refuse the review of manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest emerging from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships and connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscripts. A Reviewer obliges to keep all received manuscripts in strict confidentiality and must not use them for personal advantage.
4. **Identification of Relevant Sources:** Reviewers should identify relevant published content that has not been cited by the authors and bring it to the attention of the author(s) via notifying the Editor or Co-editor.
5. **Promptness:** Reviewers who believe that they are not qualified to review a received manuscript, or would not have the time to do so within the designated deadline, should inform the editor promptly and decline the review request.