

# ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE STATEMENT FOR *JURIDICAL TRIBUNE - REVIEW OF COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL LAW*

**Rights and responsibilities of authors, reviewers and editors of the *Juridical Tribune - Review of Comparative and International Law* are presented below.**


## **RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF AUTHORS**

**Originality article. Citing sources. Responsibility for plagiarism.** By submitting an article to the journal for publication, the author(s) warrant that the manuscript is their own, original work and that it has neither been published previously nor is currently being considered for publication elsewhere. They also warrant that the sources of any ideas and/or words in the manuscript that are not their own have been properly attributed through appropriate bibliographical references and using quotes. In case of breach of copyright law/ in case of plagiarism, the entire responsibility rests with the author of the article. The editorial board of this journal does not assume any liability for infringement by the authors of the regulations included in copyright legislation and the achievement of plagiarism. If discovered a case of violation of copyright law/plagiarism, the manuscript will be rejected or a published article will be retracted. The editorial board of this journal is exempted from any liability regarding the author's points of view included in the published articles.

**Elaboration of the manuscript shall meet the requirements for editing.** The manuscript submitted must comply with the requirements for writing under [the Author Guidelines](#).

**Not accepting redundant publication.** This Journal does not accept works in the same language that have already been submitted in part or in full in an article published or which are described in another article sent or accepted by other electronic or printed publications. In case of a redundant publication, the manuscript will be rejected or a published article will be retracted.

**Accurate presentation of the primary data.** Underlying data (statistical indicators, legal regulations, jurisprudential solutions, doctrinal opinions, polls and so on) should be represented accurately in the manuscript. Knowingly presenting false or falsified data may be grounds for rejection or withdrawal of the manuscript of the article published. The fabrication of results and the making of fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements may be cause for rejection or retraction of a manuscript or published article.


**Authorizations for reproduction and copyright.** Authors are responsible for obtaining written permission to include any images/artwork or documents/texts for which they do not hold copyright in their articles, or to adapt any such images/artwork or documents/texts for inclusion in their articles. The copyright holder must be made explicitly aware that the images/artwork or documents/texts will be made freely available online as part of the article under [the Creative Commons Attribution – NonCommercial – NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License](#) 

**Giving the names of those who have contributed to this article.** An article can have a maximum of 5 authors. The article will mention the contribution of each author to its realization. The authors'

names should be listed on the article in order of their contribution to the article. All authors take responsibility for their own contributions. Only those individuals who have made a substantive contribution should be listed as authors; those whose contributions are indirect or marginal (e.g., those who provided proofreading or translation of materials, the doctorate coordinators/heads of research centers, which have guided/allowed the realization of manuscript by the authors, people who have financed the research narrated in manuscript) should be named in an “Acknowledgments” section at the end of the article, immediately preceding the Bibliography. The corresponding author must ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the article, and that all listed co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the article and agreed to its publication.

**Mention sources of financial support.** Sources of financial support of the research materialized in manuscript (grants, scholarships etc.) should be mentioned in the paper in a footnote attached to the title of the article.

**Prohibition to give the manuscript to other publications.** Manuscripts submitted for publication purposes may not be offer to other publications, then after receiving the response in the sense that the material can not be published in the *Juridical Tribune - Review of Comparative and International Law* or after 6 months when it was registered the material at journal editorial office and it was not received a refuse of publication.

**Copyright protections of the articles published in journal.** The author(s) of a manuscript agree that if the manuscript is accepted for publication in this journal, the published article will be copyrighted using [the Creative Commons Attribution – NonCommercial – NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/) . This means that all content of the journal in the online version on the site [www.tribunajuridica.eu](http://www.tribunajuridica.eu) is freely available without charge to the user or his/her institution. Users are allowed to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of the articles in this journal without asking prior permission from the publisher or the author, but subject to the following conditions:

- is mentioned the name(s) of the author(s), article title, that article is published in *Juridical Tribune - Review of Comparative and International Law* and indicate page/pages cited of the journal;
- exactly reproduction of the material when it is quoted, used, discussed or multiplied;
- the copyright of the author(s) may not be infringed in any way.

**Manuscript submission exclusively by completing the electronic form.** The manuscript will be submitted exclusively via the electronic form made available to authors on the journal's website.

**Assumption of Liability Declaration.** Authors will submit the article accompanied by an [Assumption of Liability Declaration](#) stating that the manuscript belongs to them, that the sources have been correctly cited, that they have not reproduced material from unauthorized sources, and that the manuscript has not already been published elsewhere.

**Discovery of significant errors or inaccuracies in articles published.** Where an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in an article of his/hers that has been published in this journal, he/she has an obligation to promptly notify the editors and cooperate with them to correct the article or retract it as appropriate.

**Sanctions.** Failure to comply with the above obligations may result in the author being banned from publishing in the journal for up to 3 years.

## **RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF REVIEWERS**

**Evaluation system.** The manuscripts received for publication in this journal will be revised using the „*double blind*“ *peer review* system, respecting international standards of scientific journals. Thus, any article submitted for publication will be reviewed by three specialists with a national and international reputation in legal sciences. Review will be done on an anonymous basis (author's name is not communicated to the reviewers; reviewers name is not communicated to the author). If necessary, the authors will receive recommendations and observations to improve the quality of their paper's content. It is possible to refuse publication of the article to the proposal made by reviewers.

**Status of reviewers.** Scientific reviewers of this journal operates on a voluntary basis, part-time. Scientific reviewers will complete at beginning of the activity a form with their areas of competence. The editor in chief will send the manuscript for evaluation to at least 2 reviewers with scientific competence in the subject of research, together with an evaluation form. The reviewers who have accepted manuscript assessment tasks must submit completed evaluation form later than **three weeks** of receiving it. Reviewers are free to decline invitations to review particular manuscripts if their current employment workload and/or other commitments make it prohibitive for them to complete a review in a timely fashion and to do justice to the task in the available timeframe. The reviewers are obliged to refuse an invitation to evaluate a manuscript if the manuscript content does not match their area of expertise or in the event of a conflict of interest (e.g., one resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with institutions, or companies associated with the manuscript).

**Confidentiality of information and ideas obtained through the peer review process.** Privileged information or ideas obtained by reviewers through the peer review process must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents, and must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the Editor in chief of this journal.

**Objectivity of the evaluation.** When conducting their reviews, reviewers are asked to do so as objectively as possible, refraining from engaging in personal criticism of the author(s). They are encouraged to express their views clearly, explaining and justifying all recommendations made. They should always attempt to provide detailed and constructive feedback to assist the author(s) in improving their work.

**Content of evaluation.** Reviewers will complete the **Evaluation Form** sent of the Editor in chief. In the **Evaluation Form**, reviewers should include the appreciations regarding the framing of the subject in journal theme, the topic relevance and degree of scientific novelty, knowledge of relevant literature in the field, consistency and quality of writing style, research methods used by the author(s), the logic of scientific arguments, the correct use of bibliographic sources. Reviewers should call to the Editor in chief attention any major resemblances between a manuscript under consideration and other published articles or papers of which they are aware, as well as any concerns they might have in relation to the ethical acceptability of the research reported in the manuscript. In conducting the evaluation, reviewers will take into account the provisions of [COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](#) published by *Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)*. Following the evaluation, reviewers can recommend: publication of the article, publication of the article only if it will be amended in accordance with the observations made in the Evaluation Form; not publishing the article.

**Sanctions.** Failure to comply with the above-mentioned obligations may result in reviewers being banned from further evaluating articles for the journal for up to 3 years.

## **RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EDITORS**

**The final decision of publishing.** The Editor in chief has ultimate responsibility for deciding if a manuscript submitted to this journal should be published, and in doing so is guided by the evaluations carried out by scientific reviewers, by the provisions of this *Ethics and Malpractice Statement* and by the copyright law. The Editor in chief may consult with other members of the Editorial Board team, as well as with reviewers, in making publication decisions.

**Objectivity of the evaluation. Prohibition of discrimination on grounds related to the person of the author.** The editors will evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to the race, gender, religious beliefs, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s).

**Confidentiality of the information and ideas contained in the manuscript.** The editors will not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than the author(s) and reviewers.

**Ensuring the integrity of the evaluation process.** The editors will make every effort to ensure the integrity of the „double blind” peer review process by not revealing the identity of the author(s) of a manuscript to the reviewers of that manuscript, and vice versa.

**Evaluation harmful effects in ethics of scientific research.** When evaluating a manuscript for publication, the editors will seek evidence that ethical harms have been minimized in the conduct of the reported research. They will question whether the benefits outweigh the harms in the particular study’s case.

**Request for information on compliance of scientific research ethics.** The journal welcomes the submission of manuscripts from any country. This journal recognizes that laws and regulations regarding research ethics and ethical approval vary worldwide. As such, the editors may need to seek clarification in this regard with the author(s) and to send notifications to institutions responsible for research ethics in the country of the author and / or international organizations active in this field.

**Guidelines used by editors.** In analyzing of the manuscript, editors will consider compliance the publication requirements set out under the [Author Guidelines](#) and recommendations of the [Guidance for Editors: Research, Audit and Service Evaluations](#), [Guidelines on Good Publication Practice](#) published by *Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)* and [Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing](#) published by *Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)*, *Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)*, *Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA)* și *World Association of Medical Editors (WAME)*. The editors will be guided by [Guidelines for Retracting Articles](#) published by *Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)* when considering retracting an article published in journal. Relations of cooperation between editors and research organizations / institutions that support the journal will be made in accordance with [Cooperation between research institutions and journals on research integrity cases: guidance from the Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#) published by *Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)*.

## **ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING THE CONFLICT OF INTERESTS**

**The notion of conflict of interests in the publishing activity.** The **Guidelines on Good Publication Practice (COPE)** show that the conflicts of interest arise when authors, reviewers, or editors have interests that are not fully apparent and that may influence their judgments on what is published. They have been described as those which, when revealed later, would make a reasonable reader feel misled or deceived.

**Conflict of interest regarding the authors.** The author's research must be objective, unbiased, uninfluenced by external factors. Authors must declare that the research directions and conclusions of their articles are not influenced by:

- the author's employer;
- the financier of scientific research;
- clients of the author (as a practitioner of some legal professions) or cases in which he was directly involved;
- contractual relationships with various entities that can influence the objectivity of the research;
- affiliation in any form to economic, political, ideas groups that have an interest in the publication of the article.

The detection of conflicts of interest not declared by the authors can be sanctioned with the refusal to publish or the withdrawal of the article, as well as the prohibition to publish in the journal for 2 years.

**Conflict of interests regarding editors and reviewers.** Editors and reviewers must declare if there are situations that affect editorial or review independence (such as financial relationships with companies or institutions that have an interest in the content of the journal and thus affect the credibility of the journal; ideological affiliations that affect impartiality in the analysis of articles). They will provide at the beginning of the collaboration a list of the entities with which they collaborate and in which they have interests. Detecting conflicts of interest in the case of editors and reviewers can be sanctioned with the obligation to publicly disclose the interests and/or the ban from participating in the journal's editing/reviewing activity for 2 years.

**Guidelines used for conflict of interest.** These provisions are supplemented by the [Guidelines on the conflict of interests](#) developed by the *Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)*.

**Editor in chief**

Associate professor PhD. Habil. **Cătălin-Silviu SĂRARU**  
[catalin.sararu@tribunajuridica.eu](mailto:catalin.sararu@tribunajuridica.eu)