**PUBLICATION ETHICS AND PUBLICATION MALPRACTICE STATEMENT**

(Based on COPE's Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors)

 The publication of articles in the double blind peer-reviewed journal "***Logos et Littera: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Text***" aims to contribute to the process of permanent knowledge improvement and advancing research and knowledge in linguistics and literature. The articles published employ and embody the scientific method. This is why it is important to agree upon standards of expected ethical behaviour for all parties involved in the act of publishing: the authors, journal editors and reviewers.

* **Duties of authors**

***• Reporting standards***

 Articles should contain and present:

 - an accurate account of the work conducted,

 - objective discussion of its importance,

 - accurate data,

 - sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work.

***Fraudulent and knowingly inaccurate statements represent unethical behavior and are unacceptable.***

• ***Data access and retention***

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data from the paper for editorial review and retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

***• Originality and plagiarism***

Articles should be entirely original works and, if the authors have used the work and words of others, cite and quote them properly.

***Plagiarism in all its forms is unethical and unacceptable.***

***• Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication***

An author should not publish manuscripts describing the same research in more than one publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal at the same time is unethical and unacceptable.

***An author should not submit for consideration a previously published paper.***

***• Acknowledgement of sources***

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Information obtained privately may not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source.

***• Authorship of the paper***

Authorship ought to be limited to those who have made a substantial contribution to the conception, design, execution or interpretation of the findings. All those who have made such significant contributions should be listed as co-authors.

Others who have participated in certain aspects of the research project ought to be acknowledged as contributors.

***• Fundamental errors in published works***

If an author discovers a substantial error in the published work, they have to promptly inform the journal editors and cooperate with them to retract or correct the paper.

* **Duties of editors**

***• Publication decisions***

The editor of a peer-reviewed journal is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published.

***• Fair play***

An editor should evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content regardless of the race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship or political philosophy of the authors.

***• Confidentiality***

The editor may not disclose any information about a submitted paper to anyone other than the corresponding author and reviewers.

***•Disclosure and conflicts of interest***

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted paper may not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author.

***• Cooperation in investigations***

An editor should take responsive measures when ethical complaints are presented regarding a submitted or published paper. Such measures generally include contacting the author and giving due consideration of the complaint made. If the complaint is upheld, a correction, retraction or an expression of concern may be published.

* **Duties of reviewers**

***• Contribution to editorial decisions***

Peer reviewer assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.

***• Promptness***

Any reviewer who feels unqualified to review a paper or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process.

***• Confidentiality***

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents.

***• Standards of objectivity***

Reviews should be conducted objectively.

***• Acknowledgement of sources***

Reviewers ought to identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. A reviewer should also point to any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

***• Disclosure and conflict of interest***

Unpublished data disclosed in a submitted paper may not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author.