



Guarantor: Rector's office

Ref.: REK000420/2021-UPA/486

Košice 22th February 2021

## **Rector's decision no. 5/2021, issuing the principles of good practice in scientific publication at Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice and its parts**

In accordance with the provisions of § 15 par. 1 letter m) of Act no. 131/2002 Coll. on Higher Education Institutions and on Amendments to Certain Acts, as amended, I hereby

### **I s s u e**

this decision, which issues the principles of good practice of scientific publishing at the Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice and its parts.

### **Preamble**

Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice (hereinafter referred to as the "University"), as a research-oriented university that strategically supports promising scientific research directions, respects the ethical aspects of scientific work and strives to shape a correct and ethical environment in all aspects of scientific research.

One of the most important means of publishing scientific results is scientific publication. Respecting the ethics of publishing is the responsibility of every author, opponent of the scientific text and the editors, and at the same time it creates a picture of the institution and the integrity of its research. A scientist who uses controversial or unethical methods in his / her publishing activities is exposed to the dishonesty of his / her scientific activity and endangers the reputation of his / her institution.

The recommendations set out in this policy are not intended to limit the freedom of academic research and publishing, but to declare the University's position on publishing ethics while providing guidance to its staff and doctoral students on how to maintain good publishing practice in accordance with internationally recognized principles of good scientific publishing. The aim of these principles is also to contribute to the fact that each employee and doctoral student, when publishing the results, pay attention to the observance of internal standards of quality assurance functioning as a manifestation of loyalty to the University.

The recommendations in this policy are also a source of information for University staff on publishing practices, taking into account general ethical standards and practices that affect decision-making processes within the University, as well as increasing the credit of the University's external research results. The University staff member and doctoral student

ensure that they follow the recommendations set out in this policy in their publishing activities. These policies are usually available in the guidelines of any quality publisher. In the event of a discrepancy or conflict between the recommendations set out in this policy and the rules for publishing in a particular publishing platform (magazine, proceedings, etc.), the recommendations set out in this policy are of a subsidiary nature.

The following recommendations take into account generally accepted international standards and principles of good scientific publishing practice. Last but not least, they should contribute to meeting and ensuring ethical standards in research integrity, the principles of The Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R) and the principles of the University's internal quality assurance system.

### **Article 1 Good practice in scientific publishing**

1. Good practice in scientific publishing is based on the general principles of ethics and integrity applicable to research and publishing activities, on the basis of which the teaching staff, researcher and doctoral student:

- conducts its research responsibly and reliably, records and stores primary data and appropriate documentation for all relevant results,
- carries out research exclusively through scientific methodology,
- adequately respects every object of scientific research, including man, animals and the environment,
- considers it self-evident to publish the results of its research and development activities under the conditions customary for the field in question, unless they are the subject of intellectual property rights;
- accepts responsibility for the quality and credibility of the results of its research and development activities,
- rejects plagiarism, falsification, fabrication and misuse of results,
- rejects the unjustified delay in publishing the results, especially in the case of publicly funded research and development, as well as in the case of the results of younger and / or subordinate colleagues;
- applies an objective and fair approach in assessing the authors' own contribution and the contribution of other authors, in particular in assessing the creative contribution to the published results and in assessing the quality and extent of the contribution to the actual research that led to the results,
- critically evaluates the breakdown of research and development results, resp. their modification or addition, to several published works.

2. The University supports maximum transparency and openness in scientific publishing, provided that intellectual or industrial property rights are not endangered. The creation of a scientific text must follow the principles that are usually available in the guidelines of any reputable publisher. These are in particular:

- the authors publish the research results clearly, honestly, without manipulation and falsification of data,
- the authors guarantee that the published text is original, has not been published elsewhere and refers to all sources used and relevant previous research,
- all authors agree with the final version of the publication before submitting it for review,
- all authors take responsibility for the published text,
- the authorship stated in the publication truly reflects the scientific / intellectual contribution of the individual to the published work,
- inadmissible practices of manipulation of authorship are: rejection or omission of persons from the author's team on the basis of personal antipathies, purposeful constructions in the order of authors and unmerited and / or reciprocal attribution of authors to publications.

## **Article 2 Authorship**

1. Authorship is an explicit expression of responsibility for the results, their interpretation and the entire content of the publication.
2. Based on internationally valid good practice, an author is considered to be a person who meets any of the following criteria:
  - has a significant share in the creation of the concept, resp. study design,
  - plays a significant role in the production of research results,
  - is responsible for the study or its relevant parts, responsibility for the correctness, completeness and accuracy of the interpretation of the results,
  - has a significant share in the compilation of the manuscript or its critical revision leading to significant professional enrichment,
  - participates in the final approval of the text to be published.
3. Persons who do not meet these criteria are not listed as authors. Persons who have not contributed significantly to the professional content of the study should be acknowledged. This usually applies to the following situations:
  - securing financing, routine technical assistance, administration,
  - data collection not requiring scientific qualifications, routine activities in the workplace, which by their nature do not have a significant impact on the professional content of the publication,
  - so-called honorary authorship, reciprocity or position of power / authority (eg head of department).

4. It is not permissible for persons who have otherwise made a significant contribution to the professional content of the publication to be deliberately omitted from the list of authors, e.g. students or persons not listed due to potential conflicts of interest.
5. The order of the authors may largely reflect the practices of the particular field in which the publication originated. The most common practice is that the order of the authors indicates the degree and importance of the share in the professional content and form of the publication. There are departments in which the authors are listed alphabetically or other rules apply. In this regard, teaching staff, researchers and doctoral students respect the rules common in the field, resp. departments in which the publication originated.
6. If it is customary in the relevant field for the order of the authors to indicate the extent and importance of the contribution to the professional content and form of the publication, then all the authors of the publication must agree on the order of the authors. In such a case, the following rules shall apply to the determination of the order of authors:
  - the first author is the author who contributed the most to the results of the publication,
  - the order of the following authors reflects the extent of their contribution to the results and text of the publication,
  - the last place is usually mentioned by the author, usually a prominent expert in the field, who significantly contributed to the concept of research in which the work was created and meets other criteria of co-authorship,
  - the corresponding author is the author who ensures communication with the editors during the review process, usually listed last or first; there is only one corresponding author, but the co-authors should receive information about the whole correspondence from the corresponding author for a possible statement,
  - specific activities of individual authors who contributed to the published study are listed in the publication, if required by the rules for publishing a specific publishing platform.
7. If the publisher of the publishing platform requires the definition of the contribution of individual authors but does not specify the format, it is recommended to follow the internationally recognized publishing rules within the field in which the publication takes place (eg EASE - The European Association of Science Editors; ICMJE - International Committee of Medical Journal Editors).

**Example from ICMJE principles:**

*XX contributed to the conception and design of the work; the acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data; XY, XZ contributed to the analysis and interpretation of data; XA contributed to the conception and design of the work and interpretation of data. XX and XZ wrote the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

8. Accurate identification of authors and distinction of authors with the same names is a necessary prerequisite for the correctness of bibliometric data and is of key importance in tracking the publication footprint in databases. By regularly updating the list of publications, the personal identifier contributes to a better presentation of the results of

the scientific work and facilitates the evaluation of the author and the institution. The establishment of personal identifiers is in the interest of the University and its staff and doctoral students. To this end, it is recommended in particular:

- set up their own ORCID profile for all teaching staff, researchers and doctoral students, which is available at: <https://orcid.org/>,
- update profile information at least quarterly,
- state personal identifiers on behalf of the teaching staff, researcher and doctoral student on the University's website in the relevant section of the department, or in other relevant parts of the site.

### **Article 3 Affiliation of authors**

1. The uniform and correct mention of the authors' affiliation in the articles ensures not only a legitimate link between the results and the institution, but also a correct and consistent identification of the authors and the institution. This will achieve their better visibility, as well as reliable data for scientometry, research evaluation and transfer to electronic databases (Web of Science, SCOPUS, ERIH Plus).
2. The affiliation must reflect the actual contribution of the institutions (this also applies to the authors' shared affiliation). In order to determine the contribution of each institution, Article 2 of these principles.
3. Every author who conducts research at the University and publishes its results must mention the Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice as a tribal research institution in the affiliation. This obligation also applies to short-term employment and traineeship agreements. In the case of a shared affiliate, all affiliates must be listed as separate full addresses, including the name of the institution, street, and city. Merging them under one address may make it impossible to correctly identify one or both institutions. Authors must insist on listing these affiliates separately before or after the publication of the article.

#### ***The correct form should look like this:***

*John Researcher<sup>1,2</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup>Institution 1*

*<sup>2</sup>Institution 2*

4. The form of the affiliation is usually part of the instructions of the publishing platform publisher. However, if the publisher does not edit it, it is recommended to write it in order from the lowest organizational unit to the highest.

#### ***Examples of proper full affiliation:***

*Department of xxxxx, Institute of xxxx, Faculty of xxxx, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Street and number, Postcode Košice, Slovak Republic*

5. It is always necessary to state the affiliation in its complete form (department, institute, institution, address). If the publisher does not explicitly allow this (eg when limiting the number of characters), the absolute name is given by the name of the institution, t. j. Universities:

**Examples of the correct abbreviated form of affiliation:**

*Faculty of xxxx, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Street and number, Postcode Košice, Slovak Republic*

6. The authors are obliged to state the affiliation of the institution in accordance with Art. 1 par. 2 of the Statute of Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice:

The name of the university is "Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice" (hereinafter referred to as "university") or

english: Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice

german: Pavol Jozef Šafárik – Universität in Košice

latin: Universitas Šafarikiana Cassoviensis

russian: Университет им. Павла Йозефа Шафарика,  
Кошице

french: Université Pavol Jozef Šafárik à Košice

spanish: Universidad de Pavol Jozef Šafárik de Košice.

7. **It is inadmissible in the affiliation to shorten the name of the institution at Safarik University, UPJS, UPJŠ or other versions modifying the official version of the name,** because in this form the publication will not be correctly assigned to the institution, which will be damaged in identification in electronic databases in scientometric indicators and evaluation of scientific outputs.

**Examples of incorrect abbreviated affiliation:**

*Faculty of xxxx, Safarik University, .....*

*Faculty of xxxx, UPJS, Kosice .....*

*Faculty of xxxx, University of P.J. Safarik .....*

*Institute of xxxx, PF UPJŠ .....*

*Univerzita P. J. Šafárika v Košiciach*

*Univerzita P. J. Šafárika*

*Univerzita Pavla Jozefa Šafárika*

*UPJŠ v Košiciach UPJŠ and*

*other...*

8. Authors who have graduated from the University should, in accordance with good practice, list the affiliation of the Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice in publications whose results were obtained during their research and pedagogical activities at the University.

#### **Article 4 Mention of thanks to grant providers**

1. All sources of external financial support for the research whose results are the subject of the publication must be mentioned in the acknowledgment or in the part of the article designated by the publisher in accordance with the requirements of the grant provider. Mandatory data are the project number or grant agreement number, the name of the project or its acronym and the full name of the financial support provider.

**Example of good practice:**

*This work was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the contract No. APVV-18-0125 and the Scientific Grant Agency of the Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic under the contract No. VEGA 1/0022/19.*

2. If the results of the publication were obtained using the unique infrastructure of the specialized laboratories of the University, they must be mentioned in the acknowledgment or in the part of the article specified by the publisher. This information is needed to record the use and needs of the infrastructure.

**Example of good practice:**

*The Analytical Cytometry Facility of the Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice is acknowledged for support in image acquisition and analysis.*

3. It is also necessary to mention financial support from specific doctoral and postdoctoral programs.

**Example of good practice:**

*The work was supported by the PhD Programme of the ..... (X. Y.); and the Interdisciplinary Postdoc Programme under Marie Curie Actions COFUND (X. Z.).*

## Article 5

### Rules for providing information on permits for biomedical research, research using experimental animals, etc.

1. It is recommended to follow the guidelines of ARRIVE (Animals in Research: Reporting In Vivo Experiments; PLoS Biol. 8 (6): e1000412, 2010) when publishing the results of animal studies. The publication must state that all procedures have been carried out in accordance with the relevant standards and regulations and identify the competent authority that approved the project, indicating the project approval number. In Slovakia, the competent authority is the State Veterinary and Food Administration of the Slovak Republic, which approves the use of animals in projects on the basis of legal norms transposing Directive 210/63 EU, t. j. Regulation of the Government of the Slovak Republic no. 377/2012 Coll., Laying down requirements for the protection of animals used for scientific or educational purposes, as amended by Government Regulation no. 199/2019 Coll. and Decree of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Slovak Republic no. 436/2012 Coll., Which lays down details on the requirements for the protection of animals used for scientific or educational purposes.

**Example of good practice:**

*The experiment was approved by the State Veterinary and Food Administration of the Slovak Republic (Accreditation No. Ro-1389/18-221 and Ro-2375/19-221) and was conducted in accordance with the Directive 2010/63/EU on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes.*

2. Within the framework of good publishing practice and in accordance with the requirements for animal welfare, it is necessary to state the total number of animals used, to describe the species, line, sex, age, resp. weight, genetic or other characteristics of the animals that may affect the results. The experimental design and conditions of keeping the animals (food, water, light / dark cycle) and the fate of the animals at the end of the experiment (method of killing, use of anesthesia) should be described in detail. The products used (applied substances or medicines, feed, bedding) should also be described in detail, stating the trade name, name of the supplier, place and country of the seller.
3. In multicentre / consortium works - mostly clinical trials involving hundreds to thousands of centers - there is a need to fundamentally distinguish co-authorship from collaboration. This is about the so-called "Collaborators", ie clinical collaborators who do not meet the criteria of authorship. These are listed at the end of the work. Even the citations that such work will receive, these collaborators cannot include in their individual overview of their own publishing and citation activities for the purpose of evaluating career growth. Participation in such studies is specified separately.

**Article 6 Unethical or undesirable publishing practice**

1. In publishing practice, with regard to the generally accepted rules of good practice, the following practices are considered inadmissible, the use of which the University refuses in the publishing activities of its pedagogical staff, researchers and doctoral students:
  - purely pragmatic publishing strategies, the primary purpose of which is not the dissemination of scientific knowledge but the artificial strengthening of personal credit or other personal interests,
  - purposeful division of one complex topic into several articles (so-called "salami slicing"), which leads to overproduction of texts of smaller scope and lower quality,
  - artificial increase in responses to one's own work, as well as conscious and targeted participation in a closed network of mutually quoting authors or a publishing platform (sometimes unethically required by the publisher of the publishing platform),
  - supporting activities that reduce the credibility of the scientific publishing system, e.g. poor quality review,
  - publishing in the so-called predatory or suspicious magazines and publishers and adapt to their unethical practices,
  - acknowledging authorship of persons who, according to recognized good practice, cannot be considered as authors,
  - omission of authors who have an appropriate share in the work, plagiarism.



2. The practices referred to in point 1 of this article fundamentally damage the quality and reputation of the scientific field in which the work is published, distort scientometric parameters and lead to other negative phenomena damaging the authors and the institution. The university clearly distances itself from them.

#### **Article 7 Procedure in case of detection or suspicion of inadmissible publishing practices**

1. Anyone who encounters a violation of these principles or good publishing practice by the University's teaching staff, researchers, and doctoral students in their area should consider leaving this activity unnoticed to take some of the responsibility for it or for these activities. It will alert the university. The notifier shall not be subject to any sanction unless his information proves to be false, unfounded and / or contrived.
2. The University recommends that such cases of unethical practices be addressed first within the workplace / research group. The head of the department / research group, who is responsible for the publishing activities of the staff and doctoral students of the department / research group, should have the final say. The head of the department / research group informs the Rector of the University about the result of solving the case of unethical practices.
3. If the case cannot be resolved at the level of the given workplace / research group within 30 days from the date of receipt of the notification of the case of unethical practice, the Rector of the University assumes responsibility for resolving the case. Rector of the University will decide on the basis of the opinion of the Ethics Committee of the University of Pavol Jozef Šafárik in Košice. Details of the ethics committee's procedure are regulated by its rules of procedure.
4. The investigation of the case as well as its participants must be kept confidential during the investigation of the case.

#### **Article 8 Reporting the results of research and artistic activities of the University**

1. Records of scientific results and results of artistic activity with the aim of their registration and registration in central registers (Central Register of Records of Publishing Activity, Central Register of Records of Artistic Activity) are made by professional staff of the University Library of UPJŠ in Košice.
2. Pedagogical staff, researchers and doctoral students of the University are obliged to provide the University's professional staff with all the information needed to create a complete record of each work, which is necessary for various evaluations, creating links between different electronic systems and presenting the results of Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice.

### **Article 9 Final provisions**

This decision enters into force on the day they are signed by the Rector of UPJŠ in Košice.

This is the English language translation of the original Slovak language version of internal regulation and is not an authorized translation. In the event of inconsistency or discrepancy between the Slovak language version and the English translation of this internal regulation, the original Slovak language version prevails.

prof. RNDr. Pavol Sovák, CSc.  
Rector

## Annex no. 1 Rector's decision no. 5/2021

### Bibliographic resources

Európska charta pre výskumných pracovníkov a Kódex správania pre nábor výskumných pracovníkov.

[https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/am509774cee\\_en\\_e4.pdf](https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/am509774cee_en_e4.pdf)

All European Academies. **Európsky kódex etiky a integrity výskumu**. Revidované vydanie. 2018.

[https://www.sav.sk/index.php?lang=sk&doc=sas-commission&folder\\_no=424](https://www.sav.sk/index.php?lang=sk&doc=sas-commission&folder_no=424)

Masarykova Univerzita. **Dobrá praxe vědeckého publikování**. 2017.

[https://www.press.muni.cz/media/3159863/zasady\\_vedeckehe\\_publicovani\\_na\\_mu\\_cz.pdf](https://www.press.muni.cz/media/3159863/zasady_vedeckehe_publicovani_na_mu_cz.pdf)

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. **Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Authorship and Contributorship**.

<http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf>

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. **Defining the Role of Authors and Contributors**. <http://icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-roleof-authors-and-contributors.html>

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). **How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers**, 2003.

<http://publicationethics.org/files/2003pdf12.pdf>

EASE - The European Association of Science Editors. **Guidelines for Authors and Translators of Scientific Articles to be Published in English**, 2018.

<https://ease.org.uk/publications/author-guidelines-authors-and-translators/>

European Molecular Biology Laboratory. **Internal Policy No. 63: EMBL Publication Policy**. 2014. [https://www.embl.de/services/library/open-access-](https://www.embl.de/services/library/open-access-information/publisherschemes/bmc-pre-pay-scheme/IP-63---EMBL-Publication-Policy.pdf)

[information/publisherschemes/bmc-pre-pay-scheme/IP-63---EMBL-Publication-Policy.pdf](https://www.embl.de/services/library/open-access-information/publisherschemes/bmc-pre-pay-scheme/IP-63---EMBL-Publication-Policy.pdf)

EMBL rules of good scientific practice. Internal Policy No. 51: **EMBL rules of procedure in cases of suspected scientific misconduct**, 2002.

[http://www.embl-hamburg.de/~wolfram/JGS/ip51\\_misconduct.pdf](http://www.embl-hamburg.de/~wolfram/JGS/ip51_misconduct.pdf)

University of Oxford. **Publication and Authorship**.

<https://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/researchsupport/integrity/publication/>

UK Research Integrity Office. **Code of Practice for Research: promoting good practice and preventing misconduct**, 2009. <http://ukrio.org/publications/code-of-practice-for-research/>

UK Research Integrity Office, 2017. **Good Practice in Research. Authorship**.

<http://ukrio.org/wp-content/uploads/UKRIO-Guidance-Note-Authorship-v1.0.pdf>

ETICKÝ KÓDEX Univerzity Pavla Jozefa Šafárika v Košiciach.

<https://www.upjs.sk/public/media/3165/eticky-kodex-upjs-v-kosiciach.pdf>

Dodatok č. 1 k ETICKÉMU KÓDEXU Univerzity Pavla Jozefa Šafárika v Košiciach.

<https://www.upjs.sk/public/media/3165/dodatok1-k-Etickemu-kodexu-UPJS.pdf>