

Editorial process and publication ethics

The Editorial Board of UMedical Reports declares that the presented responsibilities, obligations, and rights of editors, reviewers, authors, and publishers adhere to ethical principles and standards consistent with the guidelines of the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#).

Submitting the manuscript for publication

All submitted manuscripts should comply with the editorial requirements of the Publishing House ([link](#)).

The corresponding author is obliged to submit an article for publication with an appropriate statement in which they confirm that:

1. A submitted manuscript is original and does not infringe the copyrights of any third parties; it has not been previously published nor is under consideration for publication elsewhere.
2. All and only those who are the authors of the submitted article have been listed.
3. A manuscript has disclosed all sources of funding for the research presented in the article or for its creation (if any).
4. There has been no conflict of interest between the author or authors and the proposed peer reviewers, i.e. no direct personal relationships between the peer reviewer and the author, professional subordination, or direct scientific cooperation for the last five years prior to the year of submission of the manuscript for publication.

Those who have participated in certain aspects of the research project and manuscript preparation but whose contribution is not significant enough to justify co-authorship of the work should be listed in the acknowledgments.

If fundamental errors are detected in the text, the author should cooperate with the Editorial Board to correct them or withdraw the article.

Initial evaluation of the manuscript by the Editorial Board

1. All submissions are initially evaluated by the Editorial Board to determine whether they are suitable for the profile and thematic scope of the journal; the level of language and compliance with editorial standards are also checked. The Editors may at this stage decide to reject an article or return it to the authors for revision and resubmission. However, this does not preclude the evaluation of these criteria again in the review process.
2. All texts submitted to UMedical Reports are subject to anti-plagiarism control. Manuscripts that display plagiarism will be excluded from publication.

3. After the initial formal evaluation according to points 1 and 2, the manuscript is sent to the Scientific Editor responsible for further stages of the editorial process until acceptance or rejection of the paper.
4. Once a conflict of interest is disclosed, the Scientific Editor is obliged to withdraw from the editorial process and submit a manuscript to another editor for processing.
5. Manuscripts are directed to external peer reviewers. The decision on publication of the article depends on the result of the peer review process.

Peer review process

Manuscripts submitted to UMedical Reports are subject to at least two anonymous peer reviews (*single-blind review*), prepared by eminent representatives of the relevant field of study and scientific specialty according to the following rules:

1. The Editorial Board requests experts to undertake a written review of the assessed article. Expert reviewers should be specialists with outstanding achievements in the relevant field of study. In the event that the text, however, goes beyond their scope of competence, the reviewers shall immediately inform the Editorial Board about it.
2. Peer reviewers come from outside the institutions to which the authors of the manuscript are related and cannot have any conflict of interest. When a conflict of interest is disclosed, the reviewers are obliged to immediately notify the Editors.
3. Peer reviewers should respect the confidentiality of manuscripts supplied to them and cannot share the text or information about it. Moreover, they cannot use the text for their own purpose and benefits until a final decision is made about its publication, providing they have obtained prior consent from the authors. These rules also apply to the reviewers who have declined the invitation to perform the review.
4. Peer review reports should be conducted objectively and peer reviewers should assess only the substantive value of a presented manuscript, research results, and the text, which meet the criteria for a scientific monograph. Assessments concerning the degree of relevance of the manuscript under review, its consistency with the profile and thematic scope of the journal, the language level, and compliance with editorial standards are also acceptable. The reviewers have to inform the Editorial Board of any suspected plagiarism or other violation of the principles of scientific ethics.
5. Peer reviewers are requested to undertake a review within 14-21 days, depending on the type of manuscript. Upon the reviewer's request, a different date for conducting the review report may be fixed.
6. Peer reviewers are obliged to complete review reports within the proposed time frame. If the reviewer fails to meet the deadline for the report, the Editorial Board may withdraw them and invite another reviewer.

7. Peer reviews are completed using a reporting template (link). The review should not be perfunctory and should include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the text, supporting the review conclusion. Four types of conclusions are possible:
 - › a positive review (1): a manuscript is qualified for publication without any changes;
 - › a positive review (2): a manuscript is eligible for publication provided that slight amendments specified by the reviewer are made;
 - › a negative review (3): a manuscript should be substantially revised and reanalyzed before the decision to be printed;
 - › a negative review (4): a manuscript is not qualified for publication and is rejected.
8. The manuscript is published after having obtained at least two positive peer reviews. In the case of a positive review no. 2, the Editorial Board makes sure that the author has introduced changes specified in the review. In the case of review no. 3, the Editorial Board sends the text for reevaluation by at least one of the peer reviewers who has requested a substantial revision of the text or to the third reviewer if the reviewer who has conducted a negative review refuses to repeat the verification of the manuscript. When one peer review is positive and the other negative no. 4, the Editorial Board sends the article for the third review. If the manuscript receives two negative reviews no. 4, it is rejected for publication.

Publication ethics

The Editorial Board has adopted and fully abides by the principles of publication ethics according to the [guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#).

The Editorial Board of UMedical Reports is determined to implement the highest publishing standards in compliance with the ethical requirements. Each case of scientific misconduct is documented and information is transferred to the relevant entities.

The Editorial Board treats all authors equally, regardless of their degree or academic title, age, gender, affiliation, and any other characteristics, including race, nationality or citizenship, ethnic origin, worldview, or disability. The content of the manuscript, its association with the profile of the journal as well as the result of the peer review process carried out in accordance with the above standards determine publication.

Editorial Board members do not use the submitted materials in any way without the author's permission.

Once the manuscript is submitted to UMedical Reports by its Editorial Board members or by a person being with them in such a relationship that would cause a conflict of interest, e.g. a family member, another close person, or a person with whom they have cooperated on

a research project for the last five years prior to the year of submission of the manuscript for publication, another Editorial Board member without any conflict of interest participates in preparing and conducting the peer review process. The peer reviewers' data is not disclosed to the Editorial Board member who has been excluded from the peer review process.

In order to ensure the highest substantive level of the journal and the implementation of ethical principles, disclosure of the contribution of all authors and their supporting institutions to the creation of a manuscript is required. It is unacceptable to ignore the authorship of those who have contributed to its creation and to assign authorship to people who do not have any contribution.

The above activities are aimed at preventing, in particular, the following irregularities:

1. *Ghost authorship* which occurs when an individual has made substantial contributions to writing a manuscript but this role is not mentioned.
2. *Guest authorship*, where the contribution of the mentioned author to the study is so small that it does not affect the manuscript.

In all other aspects, the Editorial Board follows [the COPE standards](#).