

Acta geographica Slovenica¹

publication ethics and publication malpractice statement

(based on Elsevier recommendations and COPE's Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors)

Acta geographica Slovenica/Geografski zbornik editorial board and the publishers **Anton Melik geographical institute ZRC SAZU² & SAZU³** are committed to ensuring ethics in publication and quality of published books.

Duties of authors

Quality standards

Authors should present an objective discussion of the significance of research work as well as sufficient detail and references to permit others to follow their empirical work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

Originality, plagiarism, and acknowledgement of sources

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 acknowledged. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

An author should not publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Authorship of the paper

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors. The corresponding author should ensure that there is a full consensus of all co-authors in approving the final version of the manuscript and its submission for publication.

Fundamental errors in published works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

¹ <http://ags.zrc-sazu.si>

² <http://giam2.zrc-sazu.si/sl#v>

³ <http://www.sazu.si>

Duties of editors

Publication decisions

The editor-in-chief is responsible for deciding which manuscript should be published. These decisions are based on the policies of the serious editorial board, including the editorial review, technical review, and anonymous peer review.

Fair play

The editor evaluates manuscripts exclusively on the basis of their academic merit or their intellectual content without regard to any physical, social or mental characteristics of the author.

Confidentiality

The editor and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, editorial reviewers, reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

The editor and any editorial staff must not make use of unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript without the express written consent of the author.

Duties of publisher

Publisher enables that all parties involved into publishing process are able to perform their rights and fulfill their obligations.

Duties of reviewers

Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Editorial review, technical review and peer review assist 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 selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript 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. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention 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

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. 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 papers.