Central European Economic Journal

Editorial Policy: Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

For all parties involved in the act of publishing (the author, the journal editor(s), the peer reviewer and the publisher) it is necessary to agree upon standards of expected ethical behaviour. The ethics statements for the Central European Economic Journal are based on guidance published by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), in particular the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers and COPE flowcharts, as well as on the Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing (COPE, DOAJ, OASPA and WAME).

Editor Responsibilities

Accountability

The editor of a peer-reviewed journal is responsible for deciding which articles submitted to the journal should be published, and, moreover, is accountable for everything published in the journal. In making these decisions, the editor may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board as well as by legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editor may confer with other editors or reviewers when making publication decisions. The editor should maintain the integrity of the academic record, preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards, and always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

Fairness

The editor should evaluate manuscripts for intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s). The editor will not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than the author(s), reviewers and potential reviewers, and in some instances the editorial board members, as appropriate.

Confidentiality

The editor and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

Disclosure, conflicts of interest, and other issues

The editor will be guided by COPE's Retraction Guidelines when considering retracting, issuing expressions of concern about, and issuing corrections pertaining to articles that have been published in the Central European Economic Journal.

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author.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.

The editor is committed to ensuring that advertising, reprint or other commercial revenue has no impact or influence on editorial decisions.

The editor should seek to ensure a fair and appropriate peer review process. Editors should recuse themselves (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers. Editors should require all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication. If needed, other appropriate action should be taken, such as the publication of a retraction or expression of concern.

Manuscripts submitted by the Editor-in-Chief, the Managing Editor or members of the Editorial Board are handled through the same peer review process as all other submissions. The editor concerned is excluded from all stages of handling the manuscript and has no access to information about its review. If an editor provides a review of a manuscript they are handling, this is done openly and not as an anonymous additional reviewer.

Involvement and cooperation in investigations

Editors should guard the integrity of the published record by issuing corrections and retractions when needed and pursuing suspected or alleged research and publication misconduct. Editors should pursue reviewer and editorial misconduct. An editor should take reasonably responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper.

CEEJ takes any and all allegations of research misconduct seriously. This includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism, citation manipulation, and data falsification/fabrication. Upon receiving an allegation, the journal is guided by COPE guidance to investigate and resolve the issue. The journal is committed to taking reasonable steps to prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred. In cases where misconduct is confirmed, the journal will take appropriate actions, which may include retraction of the article, correction notices, or other measures as deemed necessary. The procedure is described in detail in the section “Allegations of research misconduct” below.

Reviewer Responsibilities

Contribution to editorial decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and, through the editorial communication with the author, may also assist the author in improving the manuscript.

Promptness

Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its timely review will be impossible should immediately notify the editor so that alternative reviewers can be contacted. Reviewers should agree to review only if they can return the report within the agreed time frame. If their circumstances change, or they need an extension, they should inform the journal promptly. Reviewers must not intentionally delay the review process. When declining an invitation, reviewers may suggest alternative reviewers based solely on their expertise.

Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the editor. Reviewers must not involve

anyone else, including students or junior colleagues, in the review without the editor's prior permission; anyone who helped should be named to the editor. Reviewers must not contact the authors directly. Confidentiality continues after the review process ends. Reviewers must not upload the manuscript or any part of it to generative AI tools or other external services.

Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable. Referees should express their views clearly with appropriate supporting arguments. Reviewers should not be influenced by the authors' nationality, gender, religious or political beliefs, institutional affiliation or other personal characteristics. Comments should be specific and constructive, and the recommendation to the editor should be consistent with the comments sent to the authors. Confidential comments to the editor must not be used to make unfounded accusations. If reviewers have assessed only part of the manuscript, they should say which part. Reviewers should be mindful that many authors do not write in their first language and should suggest improvements in clarity rather than rewrite the text in their own style. They should distinguish between additional analyses that are essential to support the conclusions and those that are optional.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published data of which they have personal knowledge. Reviewers must not ask authors to cite the reviewer's own work, or the work of their colleagues, unless there is a clear scholarly reason to do so.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the submission. Competing interests may be personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious. In particular, reviewers should decline if they work at the same institution as any of the authors, or if in the past three years they have co-authored with, held a joint grant with, or acted as supervisor or mentor to any of the authors. Reviewers should also decline to review a manuscript very similar to their own work in preparation, and must not accept an invitation only to gain access to the manuscript. In double-blind review, if a reviewer suspects who the authors are and this may create a conflict of interest, they should inform the editor.

Suspected ethical violations

If reviewers suspect research or publication misconduct, such as data fabrication or manipulation, plagiarism or duplicate submission, they should inform the editor confidentially and should not investigate the matter themselves.

After the review

Reviewers are encouraged to assess revised versions of manuscripts they have reviewed. If, after submitting their report, they become aware of information that could change their assessment, they should inform the journal. These responsibilities are based on the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers.

Author Responsibilities

Reporting standards

Authors reporting results of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the manuscript. 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.

Originality and Plagiarism

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Parallel submission of the same manuscript to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

Acknowledgement of sources

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.

Authorship of a manuscript

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 significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be named in an Acknowledgement section.

The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors (according to the above definition) and no inappropriate co-authors are included in the author list of the manuscript, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

Unaccepted authorship types

Three types of authorship are considered unacceptable: a) Ghost authors, who contribute substantially but are not acknowledged; b) Guest authors, who make no discernible contributions; c) Gift authors, whose contribution is based solely on a tenuous affiliation with a study. Journal follows the definitions of inappropriate types of authorship of the Council of Science Editors available at https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/2-2-authorship-and-authorship-responsibilities.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or their interpretation in the manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

From November 2026, authors include statements on conflicts of interest and on the use of generative AI at the end of the manuscript; information on funding and, where applicable, on ethics and data is provided on the title page to keep the review anonymous. All these statements are published with the article. Before that date, authors made some of these declarations only when submitting the manuscript in the ScholarOne system, and they were not included in the published article. Details are given in the Submission Guidelines.

Fundamental errors in published works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal's editor or publisher and cooperate with them to either retract the paper or to publish an appropriate erratum.

Journal Policies

The following policies describe how the Central European Economic Journal handles specific ethical issues. They are guided by COPE guidance, and each section links to the relevant COPE document.

Peer review

CEEJ uses double-blind peer review: reviewers do not know the identity of the authors, and authors do not know the identity of the reviewers. Each manuscript that passes initial editorial screening is assessed by at least two independent reviewers. We choose reviewers with expertise in the subject of the manuscript and a relevant publication record. Reviewers should have no conflict of interest with the authors – for example, they should not work at the same institution, have co-authored with them recently, or have supervised them. Most of our reviewers come from outside the University of Warsaw, and the majority are based at institutions outside Poland. We check each reviewer's identity and affiliation before sending an invitation. Reviewers suggested by authors are used only occasionally, once we have made sure there is no conflict of interest, and never as the only reviewers of a manuscript. Reviews are not published and are not passed on to other journals without the reviewers' permission. The full procedure is described in the Peer review section.

COPE guidance: Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers; Who 'owns' peer reviews?.

Authorship and contributorship

Authorship should be limited to those who meet the criteria set out under Author Responsibilities. Requests to add, remove or reorder authors after submission must be explained and signed by all authors, including those being added or removed; after publication they are handled as a correction. AI tools cannot be listed as authors. Authors must disclose any use of generative AI in the manuscript and remain fully responsible for its content.

COPE guidance: Authorship; Authorship and AI tools.

Complaints and appeals

Authors may appeal an editorial decision by writing to the Editorial Office at ceej@uw.edu.pl within 30 days of the decision, explaining the grounds for the appeal. Appeals are considered by the Editor-in-Chief, who may consult an Associate Editor or an additional reviewer not involved in the original decision; if the Editor-in-Chief was involved in the decision, the appeal is handled by another member of the Editorial Board. The outcome of an appeal is final. Complaints about the journal's policies, procedures, or the conduct of editors, reviewers or staff can be sent to the same address. Each complaint is acknowledged, investigated and answered in writing.

COPE guidance: Complaints and appeals; Responding to concerns from complainants who submit multiple issues.

Allegations of research misconduct

Allegations of misconduct – including fabrication or falsification of data, plagiarism, duplicate publication, citation manipulation, authorship disputes and manipulation of peer review – may be raised by anyone and should be sent to the Editorial Office. The journal is guided by the relevant COPE flowcharts: authors are given the opportunity to respond, and where necessary the journal contacts the authors' institution. Depending on the outcome, the journal may reject the manuscript, publish a correction, or retract the article.

COPE guidance: Allegations of misconduct; Fabricated data in a submitted manuscript; Plagiarism in a submitted manuscript; Handling citation manipulation; Cooperation between universities and journals: research integrity.

Conflicts of interest

Authors must disclose any financial or non-financial interests that could be seen as influencing their work, as well as all sources of funding. Reviewers must declare any conflict of interest when accepting an invitation and in the review form, and decline to review if a conflict exists. Editors with a conflict of interest are excluded from handling the manuscript; submissions by the Editor-in-Chief are handled by the Managing Editor. Undisclosed conflicts identified after publication are handled through a correction or, where needed, a retraction.

COPE guidance: Conflicts of interest; Handling conflicts of interest; Undisclosed conflict of interest in a submitted manuscript; Editorial board participation.

Data sharing and reproducibility

CEEJ encourages authors to make the data and code underlying their findings available, for example in a public repository, unless legal, ethical or contractual restrictions apply. Authors should describe their data sources and methods in enough detail to allow others to understand and replicate the results. If data are publicly available, authors are encouraged to indicate where they can be accessed. During the review process, editors and reviewers may ask authors to provide additional information about the data.

COPE guidance: Data and reproducibility; Scientific rigour of unpublished data: dealing with concerns.

Ethical oversight

Research involving human participants, such as surveys, interviews or experiments, should be conducted in line with recognised ethical standards and applicable law. Where relevant, authors should state in the manuscript how informed consent was obtained and whether the study was approved by an ethics committee, if such approval is required by their institution or national regulations. Personal data should be anonymised and handled in accordance with applicable data protection rules, such as the GDPR. If the editors have questions about the ethical aspects of a study, they may ask the authors for further information or documentation, guided by COPE guidance on handling such cases.

COPE guidance: Ethical oversight; Suspected ethical problem in a submitted manuscript.

Intellectual property, open access and licensing

CEEJ is an open access journal. All articles are published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which allows anyone to share and adapt the article for any purpose, including commercial use, provided that appropriate credit is given. Authors retain copyright and all publishing rights and grant the publisher a non-exclusive licence to publish the article. Authors may deposit any version of their article in repositories without embargo. The journal does not charge any article processing or submission fees. Authors must obtain permission to reproduce third-party material, such as figures. Details are given in the Open access, licence and copyright policy.

COPE guidance: Intellectual property; Legal and regulatory restrictions of unpublished data: dealing with concerns.

Plagiarism screening

All submitted manuscripts are checked with Crossref Similarity Check to ensure that the content published is original. Manuscripts with substantial unattributed overlap with other publications are rejected or handled under the misconduct procedure.

Archiving

The journal's content is preserved in Portico and by the Library of Congress, as recorded in the Keepers Registry. All articles published in CEEJ since 2017 have DOIs.

Post-publication discussions

Readers who have comments or concerns about a published article may contact the Editorial Office at ceej@uw.edu.pl. The editors review each message and, where appropriate, forward it to the authors. CEEJ does not publish comments or letters on published articles. Concerns about errors or misconduct are handled under the policies on corrections and retractions and on research misconduct.

COPE guidance: Post-publication discussions and corrections; Handling of post-publication critiques.

Corrections and retractions

Published articles are not changed or removed without notice. If a significant error is found in a published article, the journal will publish a correction. If the findings are shown to be unreliable, for example as a result of misconduct, the article may be retracted. Any correction or retraction notice is published openly and linked to the original article, and a retracted article remains available, clearly marked as retracted. In such cases, the journal is guided by COPE guidance.

COPE guidance: Retraction guidelines; Visibility of corrections and retractions.

Publisher's Confirmation

In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism the publisher, in close collaboration with the editors, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum or, in the most severe cases, the complete retraction of the affected work.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us at ceej@uw.edu.pl