

BIULETYN HISTORII SZTUKI

PUBLICATION ETHICS
AND PUBLICATION MALPRACTICE
STATEMENT

CONTENTS

I. GENERAL INFORMATION.....	3
General Principles of Research and Publication Integrity	3
Contacts for Raising Concerns	3
II. EDITORIAL PROCESS	3
III. REVIEW PROCESS	5
Rules of the Double-Blind Peer Review Process	5
Stages of the Review Process	6
IV. AUTHORSHIP AND PUBLICATION.....	7
Authorship and Contributorship	7
Affiliations	7
Duplicate or Redundant Publication	7
Cases of Research Misconduct.....	8
Disclosure of Competing Interests and Funding	8
Corrections, Apologies, Retractions, and Post-Publication Discussions	9
V. CODE OF ETHICS.....	9
Rules Applying to <i>Biuletyn Historii Sztuki</i> Editorial Team	10
Rules Applying to <i>Biuletyn Historii Sztuki</i> Peer Reviewers	10
Rules Applying to <i>Biuletyn Historii Sztuki</i> Authors	11
Rules Applying to <i>Biuletyn Historii Sztuki</i> Publishers.....	11
VI. DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT.....	12
Suspected Plagiarism.....	12
Suspected Ghost, Guest, or Gift Authorship	12
VII. BUSINESS MODEL AND ETHICAL BUSINESS PRACTICES.....	13
Financial and Organizational Support.....	13
Open Access and Copyright Statement	13
Archiving and Self-archiving	13
Dissemination and Promotion	14
Personal Data Protection	14

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

General Principles of Research and Publication Integrity

Biuletyn Historii Sztuki, committed to the high standards of academic publishing, expects all contributors and collaborators to adhere to the principles set forth in [The European Code of Conduct of Research Integrity](#), with special emphasis on:

- reliability at all stages and in all aspects of the research;
- honesty in developing, reviewing, and communicating the research;
- respect and care for all involved in the research;
- accountability for the research from the idea through the design to publication.

The editors are committed to keeping their knowledge of best practices in editorial, reviewing, publishing ethics up to date while maintaining openness to new ethical perspectives. In our regularly updated “Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement,” we follow the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and refer to [the Committee’s documents](#).^{*} For all matters unspecified in this statement, the COPE guidelines, which are tracked by the editors on an ongoing basis, will be applied.

Contacts for Raising Concerns

Any concerns regarding publication ethics and the publishing integrity of *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* as well as complaints against the journal, its editorial team or publisher will be handled appropriately by the journal team and/or the publisher. Concerns should be addressed either to the editorial team (bhs@ispan.pl) or directly to the publisher, the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences (wydawnictwo@ispan.pl). Depending on the reported problem, the response of the head of the institute, the editor-in-chief of the journal or a representative of the publisher is given in writing as soon as possible, but no later than within two weeks.

II. EDITORIAL PROCESS

In *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, all editorial processes are organized to ensure editorial freedom and full independence of publication decisions. We are constantly improving our editorial practices to effectively serve the principles of diversity, inclusivity, and equity in the academic debate on art. The editors are being advised on matters regarding the mission of the journal by regular contributors and an international Academic Advisory Board.

^{*} All documents we are referring to are available on Creative Commons license and the copyright ownership is described as © 2021-2022 Committee on Publication Ethics ([CC BY-NC-ND 4.0](#)).

We never discriminate against authors, editors, or reviewers based on personal characteristics or identity, such as race and ethnicity, age, gender, sexual identity, sexual orientation, nationality, citizenship, social class, religion, beliefs, or disabilities.

The whole editorial team upholds the journal's mission. Editors are responsible for content development; they review submitted manuscripts to make a preliminary selection, sometimes seeking consultation and advice from the Academic Advisory Board. Editors strive to select content objectively, guided by the rules of linguistic and stylistic correctness, and taking into account the quality of research and methods of presenting it, as well as the likelihood of being of interest to the academic community and the readers of *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, and not with an eye toward promoting specific viewpoints or research interests. All preliminarily selected manuscripts of research/review articles are evaluated through a double-blind peer review process by at least two independent peer reviewers. The [review process](#) is managed by the editors. On request of the editors, a member of the Academic Advisory Board, appointed as an expert, may make further recommendations about manuscripts, independently from peer reviewers. The final publication decision is taken jointly by the editorial team on the basis of the assessment of the merits and linguistic quality of the text, its relevance for the readers of *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, peer-reviewers' comments, and legal requirements. The editors reserve the right to make corrections and/or abbreviations to the manuscript. The editors are responsible for sending feedback (especially editors' and peer reviewers' comments and revision suggestions) to the author, for plagiarism checking (Crossref Similarity Check), as well as for the whole process of preparation of the accepted texts for publication. No one involved in the editorial or review processes may use the submitted manuscript for one's own purposes in an unauthorized way.

Biuletyn Historii Sztuki will never be complicit in censorship and is fully committed to the principle and promotion of freedom of speech and expression. At the same time, our ethical oversight takes into account the fact that the subject of our research may be vulnerable, and the research conduct should respond to that. Mindful of the power of the written word, we strive to ensure that the right to privacy of the people mentioned in the texts we publish is taken into account, as well as their dignity, and that the sensibilities of our readers are respected. The editors are committed to ensuring that no one is exposed to abusive behavior or correspondence during the editorial processes, and reserve the right to take measures to protect all participants from any abuse. This may include, for example, withdrawal of a manuscript from consideration or challenging and/or omitting any clearly abusive peer reviewers' comments.

Should any misconduct be suspected with regard to authorship, reviewing or editing, the publication process to which the allegations or concerns relate will be suspended and the relevant persons will be asked for clarification. Once these are obtained, a decision will be made by the editors. If the allegations or doubts concern a person on the editorial board, she or he will be excluded from the decision-making process. The successive stages of case clarification are carried out in accordance with COPE guidelines. The examples of such situations are discussed later in this document.

III. REVIEW PROCESS

Fair, unbiased, competent, rigorous, and constructive peer review is critical to maintaining the standards of publications on our pages. Peer review is an activity carried out by scholars as a means of contributing to the academic fields we cover. *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* uses double-blind peer review (the authors do not know the identity of the reviewers, and the reviewers do not know the identity of the authors at the time of the review) and requires a minimum of two independent peer reviewers with at least a doctoral degree and representing different academic institutions, to review the manuscript of the research/review article for consideration in the journal. Texts such as editorials, commemorations, news releases, reviews of books and exhibitions, polemics, the annual chronicle of the Association of Art Historians that are only internally assessed, are marked as non-refereed in the online edition.

Rules of the Double-Blind Peer Review Process

1. We invite reviewers on the basis of their competence and professional expertise. The reviewers are asked to provide a fair, honest, and respectful assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript, containing possible suggestions for further work which the editors will forward to the author ensuring that anonymity is maintained.
2. We make every effort to avoid selecting reviewers who may have [competing interests](#) that might prevent them from providing a fair and unbiased opinion. In case of identifying a competing interest, the reviewer is required to notify the editors immediately and refrain from looking at the manuscript and associated material until they agree with editors on how to proceed in this particular case. The reviewers are not members of the editorial team of *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* or its Academic Advisory Board.
3. We respect the confidentiality of the peer review process. The manuscripts are fully anonymized before reviewing; at all stages of the review process the author and reviewers remain anonymous, their identity is strictly confidential to members of the editorial team. Reviewers may not use the manuscript they evaluate in any unauthorized way. Reviewers do not recommend to authors, without specific justification, that their work be cited.
4. We provide reviewers with substantive and ethical reviewing principles (based on COPE recommendations), which they accept by agreeing to perform the review. Reviewers should immediately [report misconduct](#) and any suspected breach of publication ethics by an author or an editor to the editorial team. At the same time the editorial team remains cautious of possible attempts at fraud or manipulation in peer reviews or peer reviewers' unauthorized use of manuscripts for their own purposes; any suspected case will be investigated and acted on according to the [COPE guidelines](#).
5. We publish the names of peer reviewers who have collaborated with the journal during the year at the end of each year on the journal's website. This list is published in print in the first issue of the following year.
6. The editors of *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* who submit their texts to the journal are completely excluded from all stages of the review process.

See: COPE Council. COPE Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers — English.

<https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.9> Version 2: September 2017; COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts and infographics — Peer review manipulation suspected during the peer review process — English.

<https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.20>; COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts and infographics — Peer review manipulation suspected after publication — English. <https://doi.org/10.24318/dvuDitEV>.

Stages of the Review Process

1. Internal reviewing and preliminary selection of submitted manuscripts by the editorial team, within 5 weeks after submission (manuscripts may be desk rejected or qualified for peer review).
2. Inviting qualified peer reviewers in line with editorial policy and ethics of *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*. Reviewers must have at least a doctoral degree.
3. Double-blind peer reviewing process (5 weeks or longer, if required). The reviewers assess the manuscripts (before they are edited) in writing, using a review form available on the journal's OJS platform. They evaluate, in particular, the originality of approach in the light of recent research, the relevance of methodology and its application, the soundness of argumentation and clarity of exposition as well as the linguistic quality of the text. A review must include an overall recommendation to: accept the manuscript for publication, accept with minor or major revisions, or reject it. Optionally, in justified cases and at the explicit suggestion of the reviewers, it is possible to resubmit the article for review after the author's review and corrections, i.e. a so-called second round of review. If reviewers have any objections to articles submitted for review, the editors mediate between them and the authors, respecting the principle of confidentiality, and give the authors the opportunity to respond to the reviewers' comments.
4. If the recommendations of the reviewers diverge, the editors may appoint a third reviewer or consult a member of the Academic Advisory Board.
5. Final decision (publication, revisions, or rejection) made jointly by the editorial board on the basis of:
 - the quality of the manuscript and the research it presents;
 - importance of the work for the research community and the readers of *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*;
 - the peer reviewers' comments;
 - legal requirements that are currently in force regarding libel, copyright infringement, and cases of plagiarism (or self-plagiarism).
6. The editors provide authors with comments and suggestions from reviewers, taking care to maintain the principle of anonymity. The editors also provide authors with their own comments. Revised versions of the authors' texts are placed in the OJS.
7. If a manuscript is rejected following a negative assessment by the editorial board or reviewers, the editors will notify the authors. The decision of the editorial board is final in this regard. Once a submitted text has been rejected, the editors do not accept it for further consideration.

IV. AUTHORSHIP AND PUBLICATION

We welcome proposals from scholars of diverse backgrounds, both experienced and those at the beginning of their academic careers. To ensure greater diversity, inclusivity, and equity in academic debate, no fees are charged for submitting, processing, reviewing, or publishing manuscripts in *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*.

Authorship and Contributorship

Biuletyn Historii Sztuki complies with the [COPE definition of authorship](#). In the process of submitting a manuscript to our journal, a written statement of authorship is required. Corresponding author (i.e., the one submitting the manuscript and responsible for ensuring that contribution descriptions are accurate and agreed on by all authors) is obliged to disclose the names of co-authors and all individuals who have made substantial contribution to the submitted manuscript, that is anyone who has made a significant contribution to: the conception of the text in whole or in parts, the research leading to the text, or the preparation of the text. The declaration of authorship is tantamount to a commitment to taking responsibility for all aspects of the work and ensuring that all stages of the work have been carried out with professional integrity and transparency. All persons who made contributions to the work reported in the manuscript (such as technical help, writing and editing assistance, general support) but who do not meet the criteria for authorship must not be listed as authors. Any concerns/discussions regarding authorship and contributorship will be handled in line with the [“Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct”](#) section in this document and COPE guidelines.

See: COPE Council. COPE Discussion Document: Authorship. September 2019.
<https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.3.3>.

Affiliations

The author affiliation identifies where the author worked or studied when the research was conducted. If an author’s affiliation has changed, the author should notify the change of his or her affiliation in time for corrections to be made before publication of the current material. It is possible to submit a manuscript without the author’s affiliation, as an independent scholar. Knowingly providing false or fraudulent affiliation information is considered a form of misconduct and may lead to manuscript withdrawal or article retraction.

Duplicate or Redundant Publication

Biuletyn Historii Sztuki does not accept articles that have already been published or that have been submitted for publication elsewhere. A written statement from the author(s) to this effect is required as part of the text submission process. If the manuscript or its relevant parts are published at least once by its author(s) without clearly stating the relevant information, a text is

considered a duplicate or redundant publication and as thus rejected. This applies to publications in the same or different languages. If an article has been made available online, it cannot be published in *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, even if it has not been published in any journal and has not been reviewed. Minor overlap of content with author's previous publications must be reported transparently in the article submitted. Both editors and reviewers undertake to report any suspected duplication or redundancy of a publication by contacting the relevant editor or e-mailing bhs@ispan.pl.

See: COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts and infographics — Redundant (duplicate) publication in a submitted manuscript — English. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.12>.

Cases of Research Misconduct

The editorial team shall take [reasonable actions](#) to identify research misconduct and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred, including plagiarism (i.e. presenting someone else's ideas or words as one's own and intentionally omitting the relevant reference), self-plagiarism, and any form of citation manipulation (resulting in a distortion of the meaning), data or image falsification/fabrication, among others. We reserve the right to monitor all submissions for plagiarism via appropriate anti-plagiarism tools. Submissions containing plagiarism (or self-plagiarism), in whole or part, will be thoroughly investigated. See: [“Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct”](#) section in this document. In all cases unspecified in this statement, [COPE guidelines](#) will be followed.

We also expect our readers, reviewers, and editors to raise any suspicions of plagiarism (or self-plagiarism) by contacting the editorial team at bhs@ispan.pl.

Disclosure of Competing Interests and Funding

The editorial team, striving to ensure that any publication is free from undue influence, requires authors, editors, and reviewers to disclose any competing interests and potential conflict of interests. In special cases, the editors may ask for a statement to this effect. Competing interests may be financial, non-financial, professional, contractual, or personal in nature. Conflict of interest occurs when the author, editor, or reviewer might reap personal or professional benefits (or suffer losses) that could interfere with the objectivity or integrity of a publication or its assessment. Conflict of interests may result from competition or collaboration or other relationships between persons or/and institutions connected to the manuscript (e.g., family relationships, supervisor/doctoral candidate relationship, professional dependence and interdependence, close professional collaboration, competition between institutions, among others). Funding received for the research work described in the manuscript must be clearly declared within the publication.

Examples of dealing with competing interests of editors, peer reviewers, and publisher:

- Editors recuse from the evaluation process of texts that they submitted themselves as authors, as well as the manuscripts with which they may have a competing interest (resulting, for example, from close professional collaboration, personal relations, etc.).
- Texts whose authors are affiliated with the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences, the publisher of *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, are evaluated on the same basis as all others, without any preference.
- Researchers who are members of the editorial team of *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* are not appointed as reviewers; persons employed by other departments of the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences may be invited to review in exceptional and merit-based cases.

We also expect that anyone who suspects any undisclosed competing interests regarding a work published or under consideration by *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* should inform the editorial team at bhs@ispan.pl.

See: COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts and infographics — Undisclosed conflict of interest in a submitted manuscript — English. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.6>; COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts and infographics — Undisclosed conflict of interest in a published article — English. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.7>; <https://publicationethics.org/competinginterests>.

Corrections, Apologies, Retractions, and Post-Publication Discussions

In case of minor errors in published articles, *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* will issue a corrigendum (related to author's error) or erratum (related to editor's error). The editors will consider retraction of the published article, if there is clear evidence that findings and conclusions are not to be relied upon (and it is not sufficient to publish corrections or concerns). An article will be retracted from online edition if there is clear evidence that it constitutes plagiarism (or self-plagiarism), contains unauthorized use of materials, infringes copyrights, or in case of other legal issues (i.e. libel, confidentiality laws). The retraction will be properly identified and the notice of retraction – written in an objective and not inflammatory manner – should contain a statement about who and why is retracting an article. We encourage post-publication discussion of articles published in *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*. We provide authors with the opportunity to address polemical voices, and we mark all texts that make up the discussions accordingly.

See: COPE Council. COPE Guidelines: Retraction Guidelines. November 2019. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.4>.

V. CODE OF ETHICS

Biuletyn Historii Sztuki code of ethics refers to editorial and peer review processes, authorship and contributorship. The journal (and/or publisher) will handle complaints and appeals concerning publication ethics appropriately. All concerns should be addressed either to the editorial team: bhs@ispan.pl, or directly to the publisher, Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences: wydawnictwo@ispan.pl. The complaining party should receive written

information on the resolution of the matter submitted within 30 days of the letter. Detailed COPE guidelines in this matter can be found [here](#).

Rules Applying to *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* Editorial Team

1. Editors assess the merits and linguistic correctness of submitted texts, taking care to treat all the authors equally and without any bias.
2. Editors, striving to ensure that any publication decision is free from undue influence, require authors, editors, and peer reviewers to disclose any competing interests and potential conflict of interests.
3. Editors choose peer reviewers in a way that ensures unbiased assessment of submitted articles.
4. Editors make sure that the peer review process is anonymous and that information about submitted texts is disclosed exclusively to their authors, peer reviewers, or appointed experts.
5. Editors are obliged to respect the principle of confidentiality throughout the process of working on the submitted texts, and in particular they must not use the texts for their own purposes in an unauthorized way.
6. Editors are obliged to react appropriately, i.e. in accordance with the guidelines provided by [COPE](#) and the [Committee on Ethics in Science of the Polish Academy of Sciences](#), to any instances of a contributor's, editor's, or reviewer's lack of integrity. The first step is always asking the person in question for an explanation.
7. All submitted articles are screened for plagiarism (Crossref Similarity Check). Editors will inform all relevant authorities and institutions (including the institution with which the contributor is affiliated) about any serious documented instances of the lack of scholarly integrity (such as plagiarism, self-plagiarism, ghostwriting, and guest/gift authorship).
8. Editors are always willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies when needed. If there is a need to retract an article from publication, its electronic version will be marked accordingly (with a comment to that effect).

Rules Applying to *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* Peer Reviewers

1. A reviewer should inform the editorial team as soon as possible about any risk of conflict of interest involving the paper received for review and of any other reason why the reviewer would wish to withdraw from the review process.
2. Throughout the process of manuscript review and evaluation, reviewers are obliged to observe the strictest confidentiality.
3. Reviewers shall evaluate the manuscripts objectively, refraining from any subjective or personal comments. A review, the purpose of which is to support the author in improving their manuscript, should include a clearly stated explanation of the recommendation.
4. Reviewers should point out where the manuscript under review lacks pertinent references or bibliographical information. Whenever possible, reviewers are obliged to inform the editorial team if the manuscript or its part is similar to any other work which has already been published.

5. Reviewers may not use the manuscripts under review for any purpose other than the review itself. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.
6. Reviewers consent to their full names being published once a year on the journal's website.

Rules Applying to *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* Authors

1. By submitting a text, the author vouches that it is an original work that does not infringe on the copyrights of third parties and has not been published or submitted for publication with any other publisher.
2. The author is obliged to inform of everyone involved in the work on the manuscript.
3. The author is obliged to disclose information about funding and other contributions provided by scholarly or research institutions, associations, or other bodies.
4. It will be possible to publish copyrighted material, provided the authors have first obtained permission from the copyright holders. By submitting a text with illustrations, the author declares that reproduction rights have been secured.
5. Submitting the manuscript is tantamount to ensuring that all stages of the research have been carried out with ethical insight, professional integrity, and transparency, in line with [The European Code of Conduct of Research Integrity](#) and [Committee on Ethics in Science of the Polish Academy of Sciences](#) guidelines. Where appropriate, authors should also provide a statement of how the data and information they submit was obtained and how rights have been secured. When sensitive data are included in the text submitted by the author, it is necessary to indicate that no human rights were violated (i.e., that the activities were carried out in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights). The editorial team does not collect research data and the presentation of the research data management plan does not constitute a requirement that must be met in order for a paper to be published.
6. Should the author discover any error or violation of research integrity or code of ethics that involves a manuscript that has already been submitted or the published article, they must notify the editorial team immediately.
7. The author is obliged to collaborate with the editorial team in the process of preparing the manuscript for publication (by responding to the comments and suggestions of peer reviewers and editors and by making corrections).

Rules Applying to *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* Publishers

1. The publisher is obliged to collect and share with journal editors all complaints and appeals against the journal, its staff, editorial board, and the publisher itself.
2. The publisher is obliged to handle appropriately all issues of publishing integrity that have been referred directly to them.

VI. DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

In dealing with any research misconduct allegations made by authors, editors, reviewers, readers, or other whistleblowers, we follow guidelines provided in flowcharts by [COPE](#) as well as the rules of the [Committee on Ethics in Science of the Polish Academy of Sciences](#). In investigating allegations of potential research misconduct, we shall proceed with sensitivity and responsibility to get full documentary evidence before reaching any conclusions. The cases described below and in other sections of this document do not exhaust all possibilities. In other cases, we will apply the COPE rules that we follow on an ongoing basis.

Suspected Plagiarism

1. In case of suspected plagiarism (or self-plagiarism) in a submitted manuscript, we will investigate the degree of unattributed use of another's text (or author's own text, previously published), data, or ideas, before contacting the author(s) to discuss necessary corrections. In case of clear plagiarism and lack of satisfactory explanation, we will reject the manuscript and contact the author's institution.

See: COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts and infographics — Plagiarism in a submitted manuscript — English. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.1>.

2. In case of suspected plagiarism (or self-plagiarism) in a published article, we will investigate the degree of unattributed use of text, data, or ideas, before contacting the author(s). In case of minor unattributed copying, we will discuss corrections. In case of clear plagiarism and lack of satisfactory explanation, we will retract the article and contact the author's institution.

See: COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts and infographics — Plagiarism in a published article — English. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.2>.

Suspected Ghost, Guest, or Gift Authorship

We make author(s) aware of the [authorship and contributorship](#) criteria. In case of suspected ghost authorship (when a person who made a significant contribution to the submitted work is not listed as an author) or guest/gift authorship (when a person who made little or no contribution to the submitted work is listed as an author), the editors will suspend peer review/publication and request information from the author. In case of identifying ghost or guest/gift authorship, the corrections of authors list and/or acknowledgement section and new written statement(s) of authorship are required before peer review/publication can be continued.

See: COPE Council. COPE Flowcharts and infographics — Ghost, guest, or gift authorship in a submitted manuscript — English. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.18>.

VII. BUSINESS MODEL AND ETHICAL BUSINESS PRACTICES

Financial and Organizational Support

Biuletyn Historii Sztuki is published, financed, and organizationally supported by the [Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences](#) in partnership with a non-profit organization [Liber Pro Arte](#). All information about any additional specific support is always displayed in the printed edition and on the website. The journal does not publish advertisements or any other paid content. The editorial board is fully independent in all decisions; publication decisions are not influenced by the publisher. Articles submitted by researchers employed at the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences are processed and reviewed like any other, without any kind of preference. Publication decisions are not determined by any factors of political or censorship nature.

Open Access and Copyright Statement

Open Access is one of the most important aspects of our editorial policy and publication ethics. We adhere to Open Access principles stated in [The Budapest Open Access Initiative \(BOAI\)](#). *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* is published quarterly, the printed version of every issue is the original one (ISSN: 0006-3967). All articles are published in fully Open Access, under a Creative Commons license [CC BY 4.0](#).^{*} The author grants a royalty-free nonexclusive license [CC BY 4.0](#) to use the article in *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, retains full copyright, and agrees to identify the work as first having been published in *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* should it be published or used again ([download license agreement](#)).

In special cases, individual articles may be published under a different license; notice of such an exception will be included in the appropriate places in the print and online versions of the journal. The journal does not charge any fees to authors. All issues are published online in Open Access simultaneously with the publication of the printed edition. All content is available free of charge, without embargo, content access does not require registration. Any kind of use of the content is permitted as long as all license and copyright information remain intact, and the authors are indicated as the copyright holders.

Archiving and Self-archiving

The preservation of access to *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* is provided thanks to archiving in POLONA repository (a digital library created by the National Library of Poland through which

^{*} In issues from 1(2019) to 4(2022) all articles were published under the [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0](#) licence. During this period the authors granted a royalty-free nonexclusive license [CC BY-ND 4.0](#) to use their article in *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, retained full copyright, and agreed to identify the work as first having been published in our journal should it be published or used again. Since the issue 1(2023) all articles are published under a Creative Commons license [CC BY 4.0](#).

the resources of the National Library and other institutions are made available free of charge in digital form). All published content will also be available in POLONA repository should the magazine cease to be published. We encourage authors to self-archive publisher's version of the article on Internet, that includes personal or institutional websites and academic repositories, after publication, while providing bibliographic details (with DOI) that credit its publication in this journal.

Dissemination and Promotion

We disseminate and promote *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* articles and issues using an e-mail Newsletter and in social media (a Facebook page managed by the publisher). The editors of *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* promote its content in an appropriate, well targeted, and unobtrusive manner, in line with the [International Public Relations Code of Conduct](#).

Personal Data Protection

With regard to personal data protection, in fulfillment of the information obligation specified in Article 13 of the Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC, we inform that the personal data controller is The Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw, with its registered seat at ul. Długa 26/28, 00-950 Warsaw. The personal data controller has appointed a Data Protection Officer to supervise the correctness of personal data processing, who can be contacted via e-mail at: iod@ispan.pl.