

# Publication ethics and malpractice statement

## Ethical guidelines for journal publication

The publication of an article in the peer-reviewed journal *Colloquia Maruliana* is a direct reflection of the quality of the work of the authors and the institutions that support them. Peer-reviewed articles support and embody the scientific method. It is therefore important to agree upon standards of expected ethical behaviour for all parties involved in the act of publishing: the author, the journal editor, the peer reviewer, the publisher and the society.

Any complaints regarding any material published in the journal should be directly sent to the editors. Cogent criticisms of published work will be published unless editors have convincing reasons why they cannot be. Authors of criticized material will be given the opportunity to respond. Studies that challenge previous work published in the journal will be given an especially sympathetic hearing. Studies reporting negative results will not be excluded.

## Duties of authors

### *Reporting standards*

Authors of reports 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 paper. 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. Plagiarism takes many forms, from "passing off" another's paper as the author's own paper, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), to claiming results from research conducted by others.

Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

### *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. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable. In general, an author should not submit for consideration in another journal a previously published paper.

Publication of some kinds of articles (e.g. translations) in more than one journal is sometimes justifiable, provided certain conditions are met. The authors and editors of the journals concerned must agree to the secondary publication, which must reflect the same data and interpretation of the primary document. The primary reference must be cited in the secondary publication.

### *Acknowledgement of sources*

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, must not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, must not be used without the explicit written permission of the author of the work involved in these services.

### ***Authorship of the paper***

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.

### ***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 editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper. If the editor or the publisher learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error, it is the obligation of the author to promptly retract or correct the paper or provide evidence to the editor of the correctness of the original paper.

### ***Appeal against the editorial decision***

The authors have the right to appeal against any editorial decision. A statement with rebuttal should be sent directly to the editors for further action. Only in genuine case, the matter will be considered. An editorial decision will not be reversed to accept submission unless serious problems are identified with the submission.

New Editors cannot overturn decisions to publish submissions made by the previous Editor unless serious problems are identified.

## **Duties of the Editorial Board**

### ***Relations with authors***

Editors should take all reasonable steps to ensure the quality of the material they recommend, recognizing that journals and sections within journals will have different aims and standards. Editors' decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based only on the paper's importance, originality, and clarity, and the study's relevance to the remit of the journal.

### ***Ensuring the integrity of the academic record***

Review and professional publication articles should also be accurate and objective, and editorial "opinion" works should be clearly identified as such.

Whenever it is recognized that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.

If, after an appropriate investigation, an item proves to be fraudulent, it will be retracted.

### ***Publication decisions***

The editors of the peer-reviewed journal *Colloquia Maruliana* are responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The validation of the work in question and its importance to researchers and readers must always drive such decisions. The editor may be constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editors may confer with other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

### ***Peer review***

All manuscripts will be subject to a well established, fair, unbiased peer review and refereeing procedure, and are considered on the basis of their significance, novelty and usefulness to the Journals readership. The review output will be accept, revision, or reject. A paper once rejected will not be considered again for review. The review process may take approximately 6 months to be completed. For accepted paper, should authors be requested by the editor to

revise the text and minor changes, the revised version should be submitted within 1 month. All editors should ensure that material submitted to the journal remains confidential while under review.

### ***Fair play***

Editors 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.

### ***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 and conflicts of interest***

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. 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.

### ***Involvement and cooperation in investigations***

The editors should take reasonably responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper, in conjunction with the publisher (or society). Such measures will generally include contacting the author of the manuscript or paper and giving due consideration of the respective complaint or claims made, but may also include further communications to the relevant institutions and research bodies, and if the complaint is upheld, the publication of a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or other note, as may be relevant. Every reported act of unethical publishing behaviour must be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication.

## **Duties of reviewers**

### ***Contribution to editorial decisions***

Peer reviewers and editors may assist the author in improving the paper. Peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication, and lies at the heart of the scientific method. The editors of *Colloquia Maruliana* share the view of many that all scholars who wish to contribute to publications have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

### ***Promptness***

Any 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 excuse himself from the review process.

### ***Confidentiality***

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

### ***Standards of objectivity***

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

### ***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 paper of which they have personal knowledge.