

Publishing

Ethics:

Ratio Publica

At Ratio Publica, we are committed to the integrity of our academic content and publishing. This is paramount to us. This document describes the standards of practices we follow at our journal. Before submitting an article to our journal, please become familiar with these standards and adhere to them. The editors of Ratio Publica want to encourage and advance high-quality academic and research debate, where this is only possible if we all approach our work responsibly, whether as authors, reviewers, or as members of the editorial board.

1. Ethical Responsibilities of Authors

1.1 Research Integrity

We expect that all researchers (authors) to abide the standards of research integrity. Those standards include in particular:

a) Honesty in all aspects of research.

We expect the authors to be honest in presenting their research goals, intentions and research methods.

We expect the authors to work appropriately and carefully with the work (articles, papers, contributions, etc.) of other researchers and authors and that they honestly reference this work of other researchers and authors.

b) Great diligence and thoroughness that contribute to the excellence of the research. We expect authors to work with other authors' texts with great diligence and not to deliberately engage in misrepresentation of other authors' work (articles, papers, contributions, etc.)

We expect authors to choose with great care and diligence the appropriate methods for answering the questions they pose.

We expect authors to take a diligent approach to drawing their conclusions, which should be well argued.

c) Transparency and communication.

We expect authors to be transparent in declaring conflicts of interests. This is to ensure objectivity and transparency in research.

Authors should include information regarding sources of funding, (potential) conflicts of interest, be them financial or non-financial. If applicable, authors should include disclosure of potential conflicts of interests.

Authors are requested to disclose interests that are directly or indirectly related to the work submitted for publication. This disclosure of interests provides a complete and transparent process and helps readers to form their own judgments of potential bias concerning the research. Interests that should be considered and disclosed might be in particular (but not limited to the following): funding, employment, financial interests, non-financial interests.

We expect open communication in presenting the work to other researchers and even to the general public.

In the case of human subject research, i.e. empirical research with participant, we further expect:

a) Honesty in research.

We expect the authors (researchers) to be honest in presenting their research goals, intentions and research methods and procedures.

We expect authors (researchers) to be honest in gathering the data and conveying valid interpretations of this data.

We expect authors (researchers) to make justifiable claims which are based on the research findings.

We expect the authors (researchers) to work appropriately and carefully with the work (articles, papers, contributions, etc.) of other researchers and authors and that they honestly reference this work of other researchers and authors.

b) Scrupulous care and thoroughness in research.

We expect authors (researchers) to take scrupulous care and thoroughness when performing the research.

We expect authors (researchers) to use appropriate research methods.

c) Care and respect for all participant.

To ensure objectivity and transparency in research the authors (researchers) should include informed consent.

1.2 Authorship

We assume that all authors agreed with the content of the work submitted to our journal and that all authors gave explicit consent to submit the work (text, article, review) to our journal.

We also assume that the consent from responsible authorities at the institution or organization where the work has been carried out was obtained before the work was submitted to our journal.

We expect that there appear names of all authors on the submission who:

- a) made substantial contributions to the conception of the work,
- b) made substantial contributions to the design of the work,
- c) made substantial contribution to the acquisition of the data,
- d) made substantial contribution to the analysis of the data,
- e) made substantial contribution to the interpretation of the data,
- f) create the new software which was used in the research or the work,
- g) drafted the work,
- h) revised it critically for important intellectual content,
- i) approved the previous versions of the text to be published.

We assume that those authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Those authors are responsible for the accuracy and integrity of any part of the work.

One author should be assigned as ***Corresponding Author***. The Corresponding Author acts on behalf of all co-authors. The Corresponding Author is responsible for managing all the communication between our journal and all co-authors (before and even after publication). The Corresponding Author is also responsible for making sure disclosures and declarations from all authors are included in the manuscript. Corresponding Author is also responsible for manuscript corrections and proofreading.

We strongly advise the authors to ensure the correct author group and the order of authors at submission because changes to authorship (even by deleting authors, or changes in Corresponding Author, or changes in the sequence of authors or other possible changes) after acceptance of a manuscript are not accepted.

We expect that all the names of all the authors are correctly spelled and that affiliations are current.

All authors are also recommended to use their ORCID ID.

Authors should treat all the communication with our journal as confidential. They can not handle editors and/or reviewers' reports unless explicit consent has been received.

1.3 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is understood as using the ideas, data, words and other materials produced by someone else without acknowledgement.

Plagiarism is strictly forbidden as it contradicts publishing ethics and interferes with the copyrights of other parties. We do not tolerate any form of plagiarism, be it the case of text, illustration, material downloaded from websites or other media, published or unpublished material.

In the case of suspected plagiarism, the editor has the right to ask the author or the Corresponding Author for an explanation and to terminate the review process. If the author(s) is found to have committed plagiarism before the submission is accepted for publication, the submission (work, article) will be rejected and will not be published.

If plagiarism is discovered after publication, we reserve the right to retract the article. In that case we reserve the right to remove an article or other work from online publication and we will contact the author and other interested parties (such as the authors employer, the funder, etc.).

1.4 Self-plagiarism, Duplicate and Redundant Publications

We expect that all the texts submitted to our article are original work, so we do not tolerate even self-plagiarism, duplicate and redundant work. Those phenomena occurs when an author uses his work, or substantial parts of a work, repeatedly without cross referencing or without justification for the overlap in the same language.

Sometimes it is justifiable when the new work is for example the extension of the previous work/ text written by the author. In some exceptional cases, we accept translations of the original works written in different language if justifiable. The justifiable exemptions might be for example when the editor feels that this will strengthen the academic discourse. In that case we include citation of the original source where the text was published.

We expect that authors who submit the work/ text to our journal, did not submit it to any other journal before. This means that we expect that the work submitted to our journal is not under consideration, or accepted for publication or even in press within a different journal, or edited book, book, etc.

1.5 Other Ethical and Publication Malpractice

We expect that authors abide to other rules of good scientific practice, including:

- a) not splitting up single study into several parts and then submitting them to various journals or to one journal over time with the intention to increase the quantity of submissions. This method is also known as salami-slicing.
- b) presenting results clearly and honestly. Do not fabricate or falsificate the data.

2. Ethical Responsibilities of Reviewers

All articles submitted to our journal will undergo double-blinded peer review process. As peer reviewers play an important role in ensuring the integrity of the scholarly work submitted to our journal, peer reviewers have also their responsibilities, they have to behave responsibly and ethically.

We expect that peer reviewers who becomes aware of a potential conflict of interests, will immediately inform the editor about this fact. In that case the editor will ensure that another person of appropriate knowledge and academic quality will review the manuscript.

We expect that peer reviewers will ensure that information concerning the manuscript and its content remains confidential. Peer reviewers cannot further disseminate the manuscript or any other information regarding the manuscript. They have to be aware about the fact that the manuscript is the work written by the authors and the peer reviewers has not the right to distribute the manuscript or its parts to someone else.

We expect that peer reviewers will maintain the anonymity of the peer review process. They do not have to seek for the information about who the author(s) is (are).

We expect that whenever the peer reviewer becomes aware of any information concerning the manuscript that could lead to its rejection, the peer reviewer will immediately contact the editor and share with the editor relevant facts.

We expect that whenever the peer reviewer suspects that a manuscript is a plagiarised, the peer reviewer will immediately contact the editor as soon as possible.

We expect that the peer reviewers will meet the deadlines set by the editor. If the peer reviewer suspects that he or she will not meet the deadline, the peer reviewer will immediately contact the editor who will decide on the next procedure.

We expect that all peer reviewers will evaluate the manuscript impartially and make a constructive assessment of the manuscript. The peer reviewers' comments may contribute to the improvement or refinement of the manuscript. The peer reviewers have to provide an objective and quality feedback to the author.

We expect that the peer reviewers will provide a fair, honest, and unbiased assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript.

3. Ethical Responsibilities of Editor

The Editor is responsible for the content and overall quality of the Journal *Ratio Publica*.

The Editor ensures that contributions (texts) published in *Ratio Publica* are original, high quality and that they meet the aims and scope of the Journal.

The Editor guarantees that all published contributions have undergone a proper and thorough peer review process (for more details about peer review process see Section 4).

The Editor is obliged to ensure that all information relating to the submitted manuscript remains confidential.

The Editor takes care to ensure that the peer review process is carried out by a person who is professionally qualified to carry out such a review because the peer review is supposed to provide a good quality feedback to the author.

The editor also takes care that the peer reviewer is a person who is not expected to have a potential conflict of interests between him/her and the author.

The Editor decides whether or not to accept the manuscript for publication. This decision is supposed to be based among other things on the peer reviewer's opinion and evaluation of the manuscript where the most important criteria is academic quality.

If the Editor suspects that the manuscript submitted to the Journal is not original or that the Author has violated any of the basic ethical principles listed above (for example, that he or she has committed plagiarism), then the Editor will not accept such manuscript for publication in the Journal.

The Editor is obliged to admit objections not only to factual errors in published texts, but also to unethical behaviour of the Authors (e.g. obvious absence of essential citations or so-called gift authorship).

The Editor is obliged to investigate the objections and, if necessary, to arrange for a remedy. Ideally in cooperation with the Author in the form of a short text, which will be published in the Journal without delay.

4. Aims and Scopes of the Journal

Ratio Publica accepts theoretically oriented papers in the following areas:

- (a) legal philosophy;
- (b) political philosophy;
- (c) legal ethics;
- (d) legal theory;
- (e) constitutional law.

Ratio Publica accepts theoretically oriented articles for the following sections:

- (a) essays (recommended length: 45,000 to 70,000 characters including spaces);
- (b) discussion papers (recommended length: 30,000 to 70,000 characters including spaces);
- (c) review essays (recommended length: 30,000 to 70,000 characters including spaces).

Ratio Publica does not publish texts that are mere analyses of legal regulations, commentaries on case law, news from legal practice. Nor does it publish reviews that are of a mere summary of the publication under review and do not contain a critical evaluation of it.

5. Peer Review Process

Manuscripts are submitted electronically to the e-mail address *redakce@ratiopublica.cz*.

Manuscripts can be submitted in Czech, Slovak and English.

The author submits both the full and anonymised versions of the manuscript to the Editor(s).

The Editor(s) will determine which section the manuscript is suitable for, taking into account the designation of the author of the manuscript. He or she will also assess whether the manuscript should be submitted for peer review or rejected.

In particular, the following are grounds for rejecting a manuscript without a peer review process:

- (a) violation of the principles of publication ethics;
- (b) non-compliance with the journal's Aims and Scopes (see Section 4. above),
- (c) ignoring foreign language literature;
- (d) in the case of a review essay, the fact that the text merely summarizes the content of the publication without polemicising with any of their research questions.

The review process is anonymous (double blind review). The reviewer will not be given any information about the author and *vice versa*.

The Chair of the Editorial Board will appoint at least two reviewers of the manuscript and supply them with the manuscript. In consultation with them, he or she will set a time horizon for the reviews.

After reading the text, the reviewer completes the review form and sends it to the Chair of the Editorial Board.

The Chair of the Editorial Board shall assign a third review if the reviews of the first two reviewers differ substantially in their evaluation.

The Chair of the Editorial Board, based on the recommendations of the reviewers and the Editorial Board, shall decide on publication of the text and/or its possible revision.

In the case of acceptance of a text for publication, the Chair of the Editorial Board shall decide on the publication of such text in a specific issue of the Journal.

Once the typesetting of the text has been completed, the typesetting is sent to the authors for proofreading.

The Chair of the Editorial Board or a member of the Editorial Board authorised by him shall set a reasonable time limit for the authors to carry out this proofreading.

The text is published in the print issue of the journal and in the electronic issue in open access mode at its website.

6. Useful Contacts

E-mail: redakce@ratiopublica.cz