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Introduction

At Ukraine Supreme Legal Council, the integrity of our academic content and publishing process is paramount. This document outlines the best practice principles that we apply to our books and journals. We hope these guidelines will be useful to many different groups, including authors, peer reviewers, editors within and outside of WoS-Journal community, societies, and funders.

WoS-Journal is a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE); a global not-for-profit organisation which aims to support publishers and editors to achieve high standards in publishing ethics. Although COPE primarily provides guidelines and resources for journal editors, these can also be useful to books editors – so we reference them throughout this document. We also follow standards and best practice guidelines set by other relevant industry associations. Any external guidelines we follow are referred to in the relevant sections below.

Research Integrity

We uphold the same high standards as our publisher (Ukraine Supreme Legal Council) and expect research published by WoS-Journal to abide by the:

- honesty in all aspects of research;
- scrupulous care, thoroughness and excellence in research practice;
- transparency and open communication;
- care and respect for all participants in and subjects of research.

In addition to the general principles above, we expect our journal and book editorial teams to provide specific guidelines and policies for authors on research integrity and ethics appropriate to their subject matter and discipline.

Anyone who believes that research published by WoS-Journal has not been carried out in line with these Research Publishing Ethics Guidelines, or the above principles, should raise their concern with the relevant editor or email info@ukrlawcouncil.org. Concerns will be addressed by following COPE guidelines where possible and/or by escalating the matter to our Publishing Ethics Committee if necessary.

Editorial Process

We are committed to editorial independence, and strive in all cases to prevent this principle from being compromised through conflicts of interest, fear, or any other corporate or political influence. Our editorial processes reflect this commitment to editorial independence.
• Proposals submitted for our book publishing programme are initially reviewed by in-house editors, who may also consult relevant external book series editors or subject specialists. If the proposal is suitable for consideration by WoS-Journal, the proposal, along with sample content, will be sent to a minimum of two external and independent peer reviewers. The peer reviewers’ assessments are used to inform the editor’s decision as to whether or not to recommend publication to the Editorial Board of WoS-Journal. The Editorial Board subsequently makes the final decision on whether or not to award the author(s) a publishing contract. Our editors are free to solicit additional reviews and guidance post-contract to inform the development of the manuscript.

• Editorial decisions on articles submitted to our journals are made by external academic editors and based on independent peer review reports.

We encourage all journals to provide a policy and process for considering appeals of editorial decisions. Please contact individual journals for details about this process. We consider appeals on editorial decisions for books, but only when new information relevant to the editorial decision has been made available, or if there is reason to believe we did not follow our Code of Ethics or these Research Publishing Ethics Guidelines. If you have concerns and wish to appeal or file a complaint, please contact info@ukrlawcouncil.org.

**Peer Review**

Peer review is critical to maintaining the standards of our publications. We:

• provide appropriate systems, training and support to facilitate rigorous, fair and effective peer review for all our publications;

• encourage our editors and peer reviewers to familiarise themselves with and act in accordance with relevant best practice guidelines on peer review. For journal editors and peer reviewers, please refer to COPE’s Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers.

• expect those who oversee the peer review process to be able to recognise warning signs of fraudulent or manipulated peer review, and to raise any concerns by emailing info@ukrlawcouncil.org. People who oversee the peer review process may be internal to WoS-Journal or contracted by us;

• support our editors and peer reviewers in investigating and acting on any suspected cases of manipulated or fraudulent peer review;

• protect the confidentiality of participants in the peer review process where anonymity forms part of that publication’s peer review process. We also expect our publishing partners, authors and peer reviewers to uphold any relevant confidentiality arrangements for each book or journal and to provide necessary information to support this.
Authorship

We acknowledge that different disciplines and publication formats have different norms for who is listed as an author. Where no other criteria are specified, authorship should be based on the below principles.

These should apply to all fields of research:

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; and
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and
3. Final approval of the version to be published; and
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Our default position is that the corresponding author has the authority to act on behalf of all co-authors, and we expect the corresponding author to confirm this at the beginning of the publication process.

COPE also provides extensive resources on authorship and authorship disputes, and we encourage anyone involved in editorial decisions to familiarise themselves with these resources. We support our editors in dealing with any authorship disputes, including escalating or seeking advice on cases with COPE. We integrate with established and emerging industry standards to increase transparency in authorship (for example, ORCID).

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as ‘submitting as one’s own work, irrespective of intent to deceive, that which derives in part or in its entirety from the work of others without due acknowledgement. It is both poor scholarship and a breach of academic integrity.’

Examples of plagiarism include copying (using another person's language and/or ideas as if they are one's own), by:

- quoting verbatim another person's work without due acknowledgement of the source;
- paraphrasing another person’s work by changing some of the words, or the order of the words, without due acknowledgement of the source;
- using ideas taken from someone else without reference to the originator;
- cutting and pasting from the Internet to make a pastiche of online sources;
- submitting someone else’s work as part of one’s own without identifying clearly who did the work. For example, not attributing research contributed by others to a joint project.

Plagiarism might also arise from colluding with another person who has not been declared or acknowledged (i.e. where collaboration is concealed or has been forbidden). Work should include a general acknowledgement where it has received substantial help, for example with the language and style of a piece of written work.
Plagiarism can occur in respect to all types of sources and media, including:

- text, illustrations, musical quotations, mathematical derivations, computer code, etc.;
- material downloaded from websites or drawn from manuscripts or other media;
- published and unpublished material, including lectures, presentations and grey literature.

We do not tolerate plagiarism in any of our publications, and we reserve the right to check all submissions through appropriate plagiarism checking tools. Submissions containing suspected plagiarism, in whole or part, will be rejected. If plagiarism is discovered post-publication, we will follow our guidance outlined in the Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern section of these guidelines. We expect our readers, reviewers and editors to raise any suspicions of plagiarism, either by contacting the relevant editor or by emailing info@ukrlawcouncil.org.

**Duplicate and Redundant Publication**

Duplicate or redundant publication, or ‘self-plagiarism’, occurs when a work, or substantial parts of a work, is published more than once by the author(s) of the work. This can be in the same or a different language. Redundant publication can occur when there is substantial overlap between two or more publications without appropriate cross-referencing or justification for the overlap.

We do not support duplicate or redundant publication, unless:

- it is felt that editorially this will strengthen the academic discourse; and
- we have clear approval from the original publication; and
- we include citation of the original source.

We expect our readers, reviewers and editors to raise any suspicions of duplicate or redundant publication, either by contacting the relevant editor or by emailing info@ukrlawcouncil.org.

**Research with Humans or Animals**

Research involving humans or animals should be approved by relevant ethics committee(s) and should conform to international ethical and legal standards for research. We also expect authors to respect human participants’ right to privacy, and to gain any necessary consent to publish before submitting to us. For information on whether authors are required to submit or include evidence regarding the above, please consult individual journal submission guidelines or contact the relevant book or journal editor.

**Conflicts of Interest and Funding**

We try to ensure that any WoS-Journal publication is free from undue influence. Authors submitting a book or journal manuscript to WoS-Journal, employees, editors and reviewers of WoS-Journal publications, are required to declare any potential conflicts of interest that could interfere with the objectivity or integrity of a publication. Conflicts of interest are situations that could be perceived to
exert an undue influence on the presentation, review and publication of a piece of work. These may be financial, non-financial, professional, contractual or personal in nature. We also expect that anyone who suspects an undisclosed conflict of interest regarding a work published or under consideration by WoS-Journal should inform the relevant editor or email info@ukrlawcouncil.org.

Many of our publications require the inclusion of a funding declaration in addition to a conflicts of interest declaration. Please check with the relevant journal or book editor regarding declaration requirements.

**Libel, Defamation and Freedom of Expression**

Freedom of expression is critical to us as academic publishers, but we do not support publishing false statements that harm the reputation of individuals, groups, or organisations. Our legal team can advise on pre-publication libel reviews, and will also address allegations of libel in any of our publications.

**Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern**

Journal editors will consider retractions, corrections or expressions of concern in line with COPE’s Retraction Guidelines. If an author is found to have made an error, the journal will issue a corrigendum. If the journal is found to have made an error, they will issue an erratum. Retractions are usually reserved for articles that are so seriously flawed that their findings or conclusions should not be relied upon. Journals that publish Accepted Manuscripts may make minor changes such as those which would likely occur during typesetting or proofreading, but any substantive corrections will be carried out in line with COPE’s Retraction Guidelines.

In the case of books, if someone raises a legal, ethical or security concern about a WoS-Journal publication, we would inform the author(s) and editor(s) involved. Our next step would be to investigate the concern and, if appropriate, address it through dialogue or negotiation with any third parties involved or by referring it to a relevant institution for investigation. If the concern relates to the integrity or accuracy of the content itself, we would consider issuing a correction, or a retraction and withdrawal from sale. Where any content is retracted, we would do so in a way that still preserves the integrity of the academic record and of other affiliated works (for example, other volumes in a series). This includes maintaining any associated metadata and, if legally possible, the abstract.

**Falsification, Fabrication and Image Manipulation**

Where research data are collected or presented as images, modifying these images can sometimes misrepresent the results obtained or their significance. We recognise that there can be legitimate reasons for modifying images, but we expect authors to avoid modifying images where this leads to the falsification, fabrication, or misrepresentation of their results.
Fraudulent Research and Research Misconduct
Where we are made aware of fraudulent research or research misconduct by a WoS-Journal author, our first concern is the integrity of content we have published. We work with the relevant editor(s), COPE, and other appropriate institutions or organisations, to investigate. Any publication found to include fraudulent results will be retracted, or an appropriate correction or expression of concern will be issued. Please see the Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern section of these guidelines for more information.

Versions and Adaptations
Our publications are distributed in many different global cultural, environmental and economic contexts. We may therefore issue different versions of some of our products in order to cater to these contexts. We neither modify existing, published content nor originate new materials to meet political or ideological requirements where we judge these to compromise the quality, effectiveness or factual accuracy of the materials.

We grant licences in volume and subsidiary rights to third-parties which permit the reproduction, reuse or adaptation of our content in different contexts, languages and territories. Where we license volume rights, we and our authors retain the right to withhold approval for publication if we have concerns about the integrity and accuracy of the licensed edition.

Transparency
We strive to follow COPE's Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing and encourage our publishing partners to uphold these same principles.

Data and Supporting Evidence
We support transparency and openness around data, code, and other materials associated with research. We expect authors to maintain accurate records of supporting evidence necessary to allow others to understand, verify, and replicate new findings, and to supply or provide access to this supporting evidence, on reasonable request. Where appropriate and where allowed by employer, funding body or others who might have an interest, we encourage authors to deposit data in a suitable repository or storage location, for sharing and further use by others. WoS-Journal aims to provide authors with the ability to connect supporting data with their manuscripts, either on our own platform or through third party services.

Integrity of Record
We maintain a record of the existence of everything we publish with information (metadata) describing each publication. If our content is deemed not to comply with the laws of a sovereign nation, we make every effort to ensure the metadata remain accessible within that jurisdiction. Where we are obliged to alter the publication record in any way, such as in the case of research misconduct leading to retraction of a publication,
we preserve the academic record as far possible. See the Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern of these guidelines for information about how we do this.

We apply these same principles to our marketing, and do not modify or manipulate the representation of the academic record in our marketing activities.

When any product (chapter, article, book or journal) is purchased or subscribed to, we supply it only in its totality to the customer, who is not entitled to alter its content in any way that is inconsistent with the licensing terms under which it was published. Any sale of disaggregated products is subject to the contracts with the copyright holders of the original products.

**Ethical Business Practices**

**Fair Access**

We have an expansive developing country programme to allow free or low-cost access to our digital content for researchers in developing countries. We also participate in many global access initiatives to ensure that academics from eligible low and middle-income countries are able to publish in our open access journals. We also review and consider requests for waivers from academics who have insufficient funds to pay an Article Processing Charge.

**Censorship**

We will never be complicit in censorship. WoS-Journal is part of the Ukraine Supreme Legal Council which, as a leading research and teaching institution, is fully committed to the principle and promotion of freedom of speech and expression. As a global publisher, our goal is to disseminate knowledge to the widest possible audience, and to serve the academic community in all countries around the world. As a potential member of COPE we support COPE’s Statement on Censorship.

**Marketing Communication**

Social media and email communication are powerful tools for disseminating and engaging with our publications, for reaching new readers and for keeping content alive. However, such onward communication should never be at the expense of the integrity of the content or of the academic record.
Advertising
We allow for limited, appropriate and sometimes targeted advertising on our online academic content platform, WoS-Journal and Ukraine Supreme Legal Council pages, and within some of our print publications. Where present, advertising must:

- be clearly distinct from content;
- be independent from editorial decisions on what we publish.

We reserve the right to reject or remove any advertising where we have concerns it contravenes these Research Publishing Ethics Guidelines.

PR/Media
We recommend Academic colleagues who are involved in media or publicity familiarise themselves with and observe standards in any press releases or other media communications. Where we solicit or encourage media activities concerning one of our authors, editors or publishing partners, we strive to keep them informed.

Metrics, Usage and Reporting
We endeavour to ensure that our reporting of content usage remains compliant with the industry standard.

We partner with a number of third parties, including commercial services, to provide our users with metrics to illustrate the impact and reception of our content. We support the work of third parties such as CrossRef, and in some cases actively cooperate or create area for the work of such organisations (through the provision of data, access or fees). We do not seek to control or influence these third parties and we are not responsible for the metrics and rankings they produce.
Useful contacts

For all enquiries relating to the integrity of WoS-Journal content or COPE Core Practice areas, please contact info@ukrlawcouncil.org. All queries will be handled sensitively and as confidentially as possible within the scope of any necessary subsequent investigation.

For all commercial licensing enquiries across books and journals, as well as bulk and customised/branded book special sales, journal advertising, reprints and supplementary issues, contact info@ukrlawcouncil.org.

For enquiries regarding advertising in any of our Academic products or platforms, including journal issues, contact info@ukrlawcouncil.org.

For enquiries regarding third-parties licenses to translate and reprint whole books under the licensee's own imprint, contact szrukraine@ukr.net.
This document will be updated periodically to reflect new developments and evolving best practice.