

Ethics and malpractice statement

Czech Mycology journal respects the rules of Committee for Publication Ethics (COPE). To comply with the ethical standards in the publication process, all authors interested in publishing research papers in this journal are recommended to follow the COPE Guidelines to prevent misconduct, dubious or fraudulent behaviour.

Authors of papers submitted for publication in Czech Mycology are obliged to refrain from the following actions which could jeopardize the reputation of the journal and the credibility of its authors:

- submitting a manuscript whose content was entirely or partly published by other authors, regardless of its character – results of field research, theoretical findings or practical outcomes (plagiarism);
- submitting a manuscript containing information which was previously published by the same authors (self-plagiarism, text-recycling);
- submitting a manuscript which is simultaneously submitted to another journal;
- including false, purposefully biased or fraudulently obtained data in a study;
- purposefully using selected procedures in data processing to obtain the desired results;
- intentionally dividing a study into several short papers to increase the number of publications (salami-publishing).

Authors are fully responsible for ensuring that their work is in accordance with the ethical standards. By submitting a manuscript, authors express that the study contains results of their own work for which they take personal responsibility. They are equally responsible for the verity of any of their statements. Authors must be able to demonstrate compliance with the ethical standards and the verity of their statements (to dispel any potential suspicion) upon request at any time during the publication process. Violation of the ethical standards is a reason for immediate rejection of the manuscript.

Publication process in detail

Each manuscript submitted for publication in Czech Mycology must contain original scientific data or related data taken from other sources, which must always be properly cited. The authors must have permission to reproduce any results or materials (photographs, tables etc.) from other work which may be protected by copyright, if they use these in the manuscript. The submitted manuscript must be prepared in accordance with the Instructions to Authors and must not either previously or simultaneously be published in another source, or be in the publication process of another journal.

The corresponding author (or the first author, if no corresponding author is appointed) is responsible for ensuring that all authors (listed in the article) have participated in the research and/or manuscript preparation and accept the authorship of the article and responsibility for its contents. In case any author later requests modifications (adding or removing any authors, changing the order of authors), the corresponding author (or the first author) must send the editor written consent of all concerned authors to performing this modification.

If the research involves human or animal subjects, authors attach to the manuscript a declaration of informed consent of human subjects, or a statement on the welfare of utilised animals. Confirmation that the presented work was approved by the ethics commission of the researchers' institution may be an acceptable alternative.

Authors declare all above-mentioned facts in a cover letter or e-mail message attached to the submitted manuscript. If the manuscript directly follows another study by the same authors concerning the same topic, or expands the previous work, all information must be properly cited, and previously published content (or parts of the content) must not be repeated verbatim. If the editor discloses that the manuscript is simultaneously published or submitted elsewhere, contains plagiarism or self-plagiarism, or is not prepared in accordance with the Instructions to Authors, he/she is authorised to reject the manuscript or to return it for amendment.

Financial sources of the presented research should be mentioned in the Acknowledgements.

All materials provided to the publisher are determined for assessment by the editor, the Editorial Board and the reviewers or selected specialists (if necessary). These materials are considered confidential until the article is published, if accepted for publication. If the manuscript is rejected, Editorial Board members are not authorised to make use of the provided materials or any part of these materials in any way after the moment of rejection. Special regard is paid to observing the confidentiality of any data (both text and images) concerning human subjects.

The Editorial Board assesses all manuscripts objectively, regardless of their topic and authors. The editor has the right to reject a manuscript immediately if its quality is distinctly low or its topic is outside the scope of the Czech Mycology journal (according to the editor's or Editorial Board's assessment). If the manuscript is assessed as suitable for publication in this journal, it is proceeded to the review process.

Reviewers are selected by the editor or recommended by the Editorial Board members depending on the manuscript topic for each manuscript. Authors may propose reviewers for their manuscript or, on the contrary, propose to exclude reviewers (e.g. for potential conflict of interests), but the right of final selection belongs to the Editorial Board.

When requesting a selected specialist for a scientific review, the editor sends him/her the manuscript title, authors' names, abstract and key words. If a specialist refuses the offer, he/she should regard the received information as confidential. In case of an impending conflict of interests (e.g. the selected specialist collaborates on the topic with the authors or, on the contrary, they independently do research on the same topic, posing the risk of a "race for publication"), the specialist should inform the editor; in this case the editor selects another reviewer.

If a specialist accepts the review, the manuscript is provided to him/her in printed or electronic form (according to his/her preference) including supplementary files (tables, images reduced in size) for the sole purpose of review. He/She is not allowed to spread any information from the manuscript to a third party otherwise prior to publication of the article. If the assessment is negative and the manuscript is rejected, the reviewer regards its content as confidential and refrains from any further use.

Standardly, a review is anonymous, i.e. manuscript authors are not entitled to know the reviewers' identity. If a reviewer wants to give up anonymity (e.g. in order to directly consult specific issues with the authors), he/she may do this on a voluntary basis.

Reviewers evaluate the manuscript objectively, to the best of their knowledge. The evaluation is based solely on objective criteria, such as originality of the selected topic, methodical correctness, quality of elaboration, and credibility of the results. Reviewers may propose any changes, corrections or additions which they consider appropriate to improve the quality of the manuscript. The review signalises errors and deficiencies, as well as any results identical (or substantially similar) to previously published results or information submitted for publication in other sources. Reviewers may also recommend the authors to study further relevant literature or other information sources, if their omission causes bias in the results of the study.

The principal outcome of the review is a recommendation to the Editorial Board to accept the manuscript / accept it after revision / return it for thorough revision / reject the manuscript.

Authors are obliged to take into account proposals, suggestions and comments of the editor and reviewers, but are authorised to express disagreement with the reviewers' opinion or to respond to particular comments if they disagree with them or assume that the content of the manuscript has been misunderstood. In this case the editor will deal with the particular questions to reach a solution in cooperation with the authors, for which he may have additional consultations with reviewers. The editor is entitled to make a final decision on acceptance of the manuscript for publication and is responsible for its acceptance or rejection. If the editor might be in conflict of interest (for the same reasons as those mentioned for reviewers), acceptance of the manuscript is decided on by the Editorial Board.

If a manuscript is accepted, the authors are informed about this decision by the editor. The decision can only be revoked in case of additional detection of substantial facts which may impeach the credibility of the article and consequently jeopardize the reputation of the authors and the journal.

For final processing, authors provide the editor with all source files (including images in full resolution) in accordance with the Instructions to Authors. After DTP processing, the authors receive galley proofs of the prepared article (in PDF format) for proof reading, when small changes or corrections can be made. However no major changes in the content or the extent of the article scope are accepted. If the authors detect any substantial facts requiring major changes, they are authorised to withdraw the article before publication, which may lead to a significant prolongation of the publication process, since the revised article will not be published until the next issue of the journal.

After proof reading, the article is finally processed and published (online version published continuously, printed version twice a year). Its authors receive the published article (in PDF format) for their personal use. If subsequently any serious error (inaccuracy, biased or misleading statement) is detected in the published article, the authors immediately inform the editor about this fact. Also readers of the journal may report an error. The editor then ensures that errata (addenda, corrigenda) are published in the next issue of the journal.

Both positive and negative results may be represented in published articles. If a new study impeaches the results of previously published articles, the editor must accept it in the same way as the previous ones and publish such a study, unless serious reasons (e.g. low quality of the new study, violation of ethical standards, etc.) preclude its publication. If a new study contains serious criticism of a previous article, the authors of that article will be given the opportunity to respond to the newly discovered facts.

The publisher is prepared to publish apologies, corrections or retractions of previous statements or previously published content if required.

Unethical behaviour

During the publication process, any interested person (author, reviewer, Editorial Board member) may draw attention to misconduct or unethical behaviour of other individuals. Likewise, anyone may draw attention to misconduct or unethical behaviour in the case of an already published article. Notifications are to be addressed to the editor and should contain sufficient and verifiable information about such behaviour. Based on this submission, the publisher investigates the justification of the suspected misconduct or unethical behaviour. Non-justified suspicion is no reason for rejecting a manuscript or any steps against the alleged individuals.

All concerned persons must be judged by the same standards and have the right to express and vindicate their opinion to any allegations. If needed, the editor may ask other persons or institutions for consultation. Investigation of a particular problem should be concluded within an adequate timeframe depending on the severity or complexity of the case, number of necessary negotiations with various parties, and willingness of involved persons or institutions to cooperate. The editor then informs all involved persons about the outcome of the investigation, i.e. whether any suspicions were confirmed or refuted and which consequences result from the case.

Minor misconduct (which may also result from misunderstanding or misapplication of the journal's standards) may be resolved by direct negotiation. The person concerned is warned that his/her conduct is unacceptable and is given the opportunity to correct it. If he/she corrects his/her misconduct upon editorial request or argues that his/her conduct was not unethical, the case can be regarded as resolved.

In case of a serious violation of scientific ethics, the publisher is authorised to cease cooperation with the concerned persons immediately. If unethical behaviour of any authors is disclosed during the publication process, the article will be immediately rejected (regardless of manuscript quality) and the publisher is authorised to refuse any further manuscripts from these authors in the future. If disclosed serious unethical behaviour concerns an already published article, the publisher is authorised to withdraw the online version of the article (and state the reason for removing the article from the journal's website), to state this fact in the printed version of the next issue of the journal, and to request for removing the article from international databases in which the journal is indexed. If unethical behaviour is disclosed after early online publication, but before publishing the printed version, the publisher is authorised to exclude the article from the printed issue of the journal (and state the reason for exclusion). Furthermore, the publisher may draw the attention of other parties (scientific societies, employers, grant agencies, etc.) to unethical behaviour of a person who is their member, employee, or recipient of financial support. If necessary, other appropriate actions may be taken, even if not explicitly stated in this paragraph.