

'Progress in Economic Sciences'

– Code of Ethics

1. Author/authors

The text submitted to publication shall have a title corresponding to the content and abstract and belongs to one of three categories: research article, scientific report or review article. In introduction the author/authors should define the research subject. The abstract should contain not more than 200–250 words in homogenous text without subheadings.

Author/authors are obliged to indicate the financial sources of researches discussed in the article and to state (in case of co-authors) the degree of contribution of co-authors in preparation of the submitted scientific text. It is not allowed to submit articles with more than 5 authors and including persons who did not share in the submitted scientific text. Authorship of an article shall not involve stylistic, but essential changes. In submitted texts all authors have to be listed. In acknowledgements the author shall list all persons who contributed into researches (after their agreement) who were not recognized as co-authors.

The author is obliged to disclose all information associated with the conflict of interests.

Using other work is allowed only with respect of copyright principles.

Data on which the article was based shall be gathered in honest way and authors promise to store and share source data used in the article for a period of 5 years from date of issue of the article.

The author shall submit an original text for publication, not published earlier and during the editing process it may not be sent for publishing in another periodical.

The authors do not use arguments criticizing other works and abide to rules set by the periodical including those referring to text structure and bibliography construction.

Texts submitted to publishing should be prepared in comprehensible way avoiding rare terminology and contain all data allowing to understand the text and information about all limitations associated with industrial propriety. Additionally, the authors shall avoid citing works of limited range.

Articles submitted to publication shall be tested with anti-plagiarism systems.

In case of suspicion about author/authors' dishonesty in the submitted text, in the first place, the author/authors will be requested to explain doubts.

Such action will be aimed at stating whether the allegation of misconduct is entitled.

In case a detection of misconduct, especially plagiarism, the published article will be removed from electronic version of the periodical and it will be replaced with detailed information about the kind of misconduct. Additionally, legal steps provided by law will be undertaken.

Any kind of ghostwriting and guest authorship shall be treated by editorial board as a manifestation of scientific misconduct, so detected events of such activities will result in their disclosing and reporting to appropriate authorities.

2. Reviewers

Reviewers are obliged each time before starting the reviewing process to know the actual policy of the periodical.

Reviewers shall undertake evaluation of texts about which they possess knowledge, competence and experience. Additionally, they promise not accepting review of articles based on research similar to those within their research interest.

The reviewers shall declare that the identity of article's author is unknown to them. If despite getting for reviewing an article which does not allow identification of authorship definitely, the reviewer is able to recognize the author, he is obliged to report this fact to the chief editor of the periodical, in such case the article shall be directed to another reviewer.

The review shall be prepared in clear, essential and objective way and finished with unequivocal recommendation.

The reviewer is obliged not to use texts which he was entrusted with. He is obliged to prepare the review within the specified deadline and to inform editors about delays in reviewing process.

It is not allowed to contact article authors without editor mediation.

3. Editors

The chief editor of the periodical checks brevity and informativity of article's title, abstract and text. In the texts submitted to publication special attention shall be paid to usage of conventional symbols, abbreviations, and unified bibliography description. Additionally, the chief editor checks whether the author has defined its type.

The editors shall not block negative results of research under condition of preparing the article with such researches in all published articles. In case of critical articles it is allowed to publish substantive polemic on the published article.

The periodical editors are allowed to disclose in written form all connections with authors of articles submitted to publication. In case of reporting of such connections, the editors shall not participate in editing process of the authors connected in any way with the periodical editors. Special attention should be paid to family, professional and social connections.

New editors of the periodical shall be familiar with the ethical code binding for the periodical, especially with rules of conduct in case of detecting dishonest practices.

The editor ensures the right choice of reviewers for evaluation of scientific texts and maintain necessary care in ensuring correct reviewing process. Special attention shall be paid to preparation of the review within specified deadlines and if it is essential.

Decisions made the chief editor are independent of the editing office which is also a subject which finances the periodical.

'Progress in Economic Sciences' Review Procedure

1. All publications submitted to 'Progress in Economic Sciences' undergo review procedure by at least two independent reviewers outside the entity where the author is affiliated.
2. The author/authors of the publication and reviewers do not know their identities (*double-blind review process*).
3. If the reviewer knows the author's identity, he is obliged to sign a declaration of non-existence of the conflict of interests. The conflict of interests exists when there are personal relations (marriage, second stage affinity) professional dependence between the author and reviewer, or direct scientific cooperation during last two years preceding the review preparation.
4. The written review contains an unequivocal recommendation of the reviewer concerning conditions of allowing the article to publication or its refusal to publish.
5. Qualifying or refusing criteria with the review form are available on the periodical website and in printed version in Appendices.
6. The names of reviewers of particular publications are not disclosed.

THE ARTICLE REVIEW

I declare, that:

I do not know the identity of the author of the reviewed article

I know the identity of the author, but there is no conflict of interests for which it is considered:

direct personal relationships (kinship, legal, conflict)

employee relation

direct scientific cooperation in the past two years

Title:

- I. Issue rating** (the formulation of the research problem, the problem of research on the background of current scientific achievements, innovation, timeliness – at least 5 sentences, but not more than 10 sentences)

Number of points 0–20

- II. Evaluation of the method** (article layout, terminology, applied research methods, the use of literature – at least 5 sentences, but not more than 10 sentences)

Number of points 0–20

- III. Evaluation of substantive content** (degree of pursuing the research, originality of research results, the implications for science and practice – at least 5 sentences, but not more than 10 sentences)

Number of points 0–50

IV. Evaluation of the work (language style, technical side of the article – at least 5 sentences, but not more than 10 sentences)

Number of points 0-10

Total number of points

V. Final conclusion of the review

The article can be published

The article cannot be published

The article can be published after considering the comments submitted below

Suggested changes and corrections

.....

.....

Name, title (academic degree)

Address

Mobile

E-mail

.....

Signature of reviewer