

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement, *Acta Structilia*

Acta Structilia follows best practices on ethical matters, errors and retractions (see *Acta Structilia* policies and procedures). Any kind of unethical behavior or plagiarism is not acceptable, and authors submitting articles to *Acta Structilia* affirm that manuscript contents are original.

Ethics and malpractice statements of *Acta Structilia* are based on the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors which outline the following duties for editors, authors, and reviewers. Editors, authors, and reviewers will also adhere to the *Acta Structilia* submission instructions as well as the policies and procedures of the journal.

Duties of Editor

1. **Review of manuscripts:** Each editor must ensure that each manuscript is initially evaluated by the Editorial Office staff for originality, making use of Turn-it-In or any applicable software. After pre-review, the manuscript is forwarded blind peer review to suitable reviewers who will make a recommendation to accept, reject, or modify the manuscript.
2. **Publication decisions:** Based on the review report(s) and recommendations of the reviewers, the editor can accept, reject, or request modifications to the manuscript. Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.
3. **Fair review:** The editor must ensure that each manuscript received by *Acta Structilia* is reviewed for its academic/intellectual content and contribution without any consideration given to sex, gender, race, religion, citizenship, etc. of the authors.
4. **Confidentiality:** The editor and any editorial staff must ensure that information regarding manuscripts submitted by the authors is kept confidential.
5. **Disclosure and conflicts of interest:** The editor of *Acta Structilia* will not use unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript for his/her own research without written consent of the author.
6. **Complaints:** Editors should take reasonable measures when responding to ethical complaints that have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper.

Duties of Authors

1. **Originality:** Authors must ensure that they have written entirely original work.
2. **Authorship:** Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the reported study. Others who have made significant contribution must be listed as co-authors. Authors also ensure that all the authors and co-authors have seen and agreed to the submitted version of the manuscript by completing, signing and returning the prescribed Declaration form to the editorial office.

3. **Reporting requirements:** Authors should present an accurate interpretation of their original research as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Manuscripts will follow the submission guidelines of the journal. (See instructions to authors as well as submission policies and procedures)
4. **Referencing and acknowledgement of sources:** Authors should appropriately cited or quoted all sources of data used in the research and cite publications that have been influential in the research work as outlined in the instructions to authors.
5. **Multiple, redundant, or concurrent publications:** Authors must not submit the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently. Authors should not submit manuscripts describing essentially the same research to more than one journal.
6. **Plagiarism:** Submitted manuscripts must not contain evidence of plagiarism.
7. **Fundamental errors in published works:** When an author or reader discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in the published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor and work with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

Duties of Reviewers

1. **Contribution to editorial decisions:** Peer review assists the editors in making editorial decisions.
2. **Promptness:** In the event that a selected reviewer feels unqualified to complete a prompt review of a manuscript within the stipulated time then this information must be communicated to the editor, so that the manuscript could be sent to another reviewer.
3. **Confidentiality:** Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review regarding manuscripts submitted by authors should be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage or be shown to, or discussed with others except as authorized by the editors.
4. **Conflict of interest:** Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscripts.
5. **Standards of objectivity:** Review of submitted manuscripts must be done objectively and the reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments, so that authors can use them for improving the paper.
6. **Acknowledgement of sources:** Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Manuscript reviewers must ensure that authors have acknowledged all sources of data used in the research. Any kind of similarity or overlap between the manuscripts under consideration or with any other published paper of which the reviewer has personal knowledge must be immediately brought to the editor's notice.