

## **ETHIC RULES Proceedings *Technology and Law***

### **I. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF AUTHORS**

**Originality. Citing. Responsibility for plagiarism.** By submitting a paper 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 (on the language version common with the submitted paper). 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.

If discovered a case of violation of copyright law/plagiarism, the manuscript will be rejected or a published will be retracted, if it is technically possible. The editorial team of this proceedings is exempted from any liability regarding the author's points of view included in the published paper.

**The manuscript must comply with the requirements under the Author Guidelines.**

**Accuracy and objectivity.** Underlying data (statistical indicators, legal regulations, jurisprudential solutions, doctrinal opinions, polls and so on) should be represented accurately in the manuscript. Presenting falsified data may be ground for rejection or withdrawal of the manuscript of the publication. 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 paper. The editorial committee will not publish works that deviate from the basic values of the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria.

**Giving the names of those who have contributed to this.** A paper can have a maximum of 3 authors. The paper will mention the contribution of each author to its realization. The authors' names should be listed on the paper in order of their contribution to the paper. 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 tutors/heads of research teams, which have guided/allowed the realization of manuscript by the authors, people who have financed the research narrated in manuscript) could be named in an "Acknowledgments" section at footnotes. The corresponding author must ensure that all co-authors are included on the paper, and that they all have approved the final version and agreed to publication.

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

**Reproduction and copyright.** Copyright for studies published in these *Proceedings* is retained by the authors. Authors grant to the *Proceedings* (the University of Plovdiv - Faculty of Law and Plovdiv University Press) as a publisher the non-exclusive rights to publish, reproduce and distribute their works, as well as the right to communicate their works to the public, including the making available to the public in an interactive way. *The Proceedings* could be accessible online.

Authors shall in case of republishing and/or new communication to the public of the work, including the making available to the public in an interactive way, acknowledge that it initially has been published in these *Proceedings*.

## II. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF REVIEWERS

**Evaluation system.** Firstly, the originality of manuscripts received for publication must be checked through the specialized software. If the result is negative, secondly the manuscript will be revised using the „*double blind*” *peer review* system. 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 to the proposal made by reviewers.

**Status of reviewers.** Scientific reviewers of this *Proceedings* operate on a voluntary basis. The responsible editor will send the manuscript for evaluation to at least 2 reviewers with scientific competence in the subject of research. The reviewers who have accepted manuscript assessment tasks must submit completed evaluation form later than **four weeks** of receiving it. Reviewers are free to decline invitations to review particular manuscripts if their current commitments make it prohibitive for them to complete a review in a timely fashion. 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.** 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 Responsible Editor.

**Objectivity.** 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 should include the appreciations regarding the framing of the subject in these *Proceedings*' 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 Responsible Editor attention any major resemblances between a manuscript under consideration and other published studies 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 paper, publication of the paper only if it will be amended in accordance with the observations made by the reviewer; the rejection (not publishing) the paper.

### III. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EDITORS

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

**Objectivity of the evaluation.** 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.** The editor committee does not provide third parties with information about rejected works, regardless of the reason. Each author has the right to withdraw the work submitted for publication until the final of edition of these *Proceedings*.

**Ensuring the integrity of the evaluation process.** The editors will make efforts 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.

In analyzing of the manuscript, editors will consider compliance the publication requirements set out under 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 the Author Guidelines and recommendations of the Guidance for Editors: Research, Audit and Service Evaluations, *Guidelines on Good Publication Practice* published by *COPE* and others (<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/guideline/principles-transparency-and-best-practice-scholarly-publishing>).

Relations of cooperation between editors and research organizations / institutions that support the periodical will be made in accordance with Cooperation between research institutions and periodicals on research integrity cases: guidance from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) published by *COPE* (<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/guideline/cooperation-between-universities-and-periodicals-research-integrity>).

### IV. THE 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.

**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 studies are not influenced by, for instance, the author's employer; the

financier of scientific research; clients of the author 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 groups that have an interest in the publication of the paper.

The detection of conflicts of interest not declared by the authors can be sanctioned with the refusal to publish or the withdrawal of the paper.

**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 *Proceedings* and thus affect the credibility of the *Proceedings*; ideological affiliations that affect impartiality in the analysis of studies). 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 editing/ reviewing activity for 3 years.

These provisions are supplemented by the Guidelines on the conflict of interests developed by the *Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)*.

**Plovdiv, April 2024**

**Organizing Committee**