**Publication ethics and publication malpractice statement**

Praktický lékař (PL) is a peer-reviewed scholarly journal published by the Czech Medical Society, Prague. With regard to the highest standards of quality, the Editorial Board follows these publication ethics and malpractice prevention principles and upholds the standards of ethical behaviour and best practices with reference to core practices developed by Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

**Duties of the Publisher**

It is duty of the publisher to support huge efforts of Editors and reviewers to maintain the integrity of the scholarly record. Publisher has a supporting and investigating role in submission, communication, publication process, and guardianship of scholarly record. Publication ethics and publication malpractice statement of Praktický lékař is completely based on the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) code of conduct and best-practice guidelines for journal Editors [1], ethical guidelines for peer Reviewers and Authors [2,3].

**Duties of Editors**

* The editor is independently responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The editor may discuss with other editors (associate editors and editorial board members) or reviewers in making these decisions.
* The editor shall ensure that the peer review process is fair, unbiased, and timely.
* Articles must be reviewed by at least two external and independent reviewers that have expertise in the relevant field. The editor shall follow best practice in avoiding the selection of fraudulent peer reviewers and potential conflicts of interest.
* The editor should evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.
* The editorial policies of the journal should encourage transparency and complete, honest reporting, and the editor should ensure that peer reviewers and authors have a clear understanding of what is expected of them.
* The editor shall establish, along with the publisher, a transparent mechanism for appeal against editorial decisions.
* The editor must protect the confidentiality of all material submitted to the journal and all communications with reviewers, unless otherwise agreed with the relevant authors and reviewers.
* Any potential editorial conflicts of interest should be declared to the publisher in writing prior to the appointment of the editor. Journal should have a declared process for handling submissions from the editors, employees or members of the editorial board to ensure unbiased review.
* The editor must not be involved in decisions about papers which s/he has written him/herself. Further, any such submission must be subject to all of the journal’s usual procedures, peer review must be handled independently of the relevant author/editor, and there must be a clear statement to this effect on any such paper that is published.

**Duties of Reviewers**

* Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author.
* 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 decline to participate in the review process.
* Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. Reviewers must not share the review or information about the paper with anyone or contact the authors directly without permission from the editor.
* Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer’s own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.
* A reviewer should be alert to potential ethical issues in the paper and should bring these to the attention of the editor, including any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which the reviewer has personal knowledge. Any statement that had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation.
* Reviewers should point out relevant published work which is not yet cited.
* Reviewers should be aware of any personal bias they may have and take this into account when reviewing a paper. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should consult the Editor before agreeing to review a paper where they have potential conflicts of interest.
* If a reviewer suggests that an author includes citations to the reviewer’s work, this must be for genuine scientific reasons and not with the intention of increasing the reviewer’s citation count or enhancing the visibility of their work.

**Duties of Authors**

* Authors of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance.
* A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work.
* Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.
* The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works. If the authors have used the work of others, it should be appropriately cited or quoted and permission should be obtained where necessary.
* Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have influenced the reported work and that give the work appropriate context within the larger scholarly record.
* Plagiarism constitutes unethical behaviour and is unacceptable. To verify originality, the submitted article will be checked by the text-similarity detection service Turnitin.
* An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal of primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical behaviour and is unacceptable.
* In general, an author should not submit for consideration in another journal a paper that has been published previously, except in the form of an abstract. The authors and editors of the journals concerned must agree to the secondary publication. The primary reference must be cited in the secondary publication.
* 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 substantial contributions should be listed as co-authors.
* The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.
* Authors take collective responsibility for the work. Each individual author is accountable for ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.
* All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations that could be viewed as inappropriately influencing (bias) their work.
* All sources of financial support for the conduct of the research and/or preparation of the article should be disclosed.
* When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, it is the author’s obligation to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher. If the editor or the publisher learn from a third party that a published work contains an error, it is the obligation of the author to cooperate with the editor, including providing evidence to the editor where requested.
* It is not acceptable to remove or introduce a specific feature within an image.
* Authors are obliged to participate in peer review process.
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