

## ***Screen Bodies***

### **Publication Ethics and Publication Misconduct Statement**

This publication ethics and publication misconduct statement has been shaped by the Code of Conduct and Best-Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors (Committee on Publication Ethics, 2011). A similar statement by PsychOpen has also been helpful in preparing this document (PsychOpen, n.d.). Berghahn Journals adheres where possible to [COPE's Core Practices](#).

### **Editors' responsibilities**

Publication decisions: Editors are collectively responsible for deciding which of the papers submitted to the journal will be published. Our editors evaluate manuscripts without regard to the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy. Decisions on publication are ultimately based on the paper's contribution to the field, its originality and clarity, and its relevance to the journal's aims and scope. Current legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism are also considered.

Confidentiality: The editors and editorial staff undertake not to 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Disclosure and conflicts of interest: Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted paper will not be used by the editor or the members of the editorial board for their own research purposes without the author's explicit written consent.

### Retractions, Corrections and Expressions of Concern

The editors will consider retractions, corrections or expressions of concern in line with [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#). If an author is found to have made an error, the journal will issue a corrigendum. If the journal is found to have made an error, they will issue an erratum. Retractions are usually reserved for articles that are so seriously flawed that their findings or conclusions should not be relied upon. Journals that publish Accepted Manuscripts may make minor changes such as those which would likely occur during typesetting or proofreading, but any substantive corrections will be carried out in line with [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#).

### **Reviewers' responsibilities**

Contribution to editorial decisions: The peer-review process assists the editors in making sound editorial decisions and is useful to the author/s in revising and improving the paper. Even in cases where a paper is ultimately rejected, conscientious reviewer feedback, offered with the intention to help the author/s improve their work, is encouraged where possible.

Promptness: Any selected peer reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that responding within the journal's preferred 4-6 week peer review period will be impossible should notify the editor timeously and withdraw from the review process.

Confidentiality: Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shared or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor/s.

Standards of objectivity: Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. Papers should be fairly evaluated in respect to their fit with the journal, their contribution to the field/area of research, and the way in which the author has expressed and substantiated their argument. Reviewers are asked to consider their tone and offer, as far as possible, feedback that is clearly articulated and encouraging, with the development of both the author/s and the field of study or research in mind.

Acknowledgement of sources: Reviewers must identify instances where published work referred to in the paper has not been cited in the reference section (mismatch between in-text references and the reference list). They should also indicate instances where they believe observations or arguments derived from other publications are not accompanied by the relevant source or reference. Reviewers should notify the editor of any notable similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper or papers of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflict of interest: Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must not be used for personal advantage, and should be kept confidential. Reviewers approached to review manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest arising from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors or institutions associated with the manuscripts should remove themselves from the review process.

### **Authors' duties**

Reporting standards: Authors of original research papers should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as a clear discussion of its significance. Relevant data should be represented accurately and appropriately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit readers to access works referenced in the paper, and draw on the work in their own research if desired. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements are considered unethical and unacceptable.

Data access and retention: Authors should ensure accessibility of raw data to other competent professionals for at least ten years after publication (preferably via an institutional or subject-based data repository or other data centre), provided that the confidentiality of the participants can be protected and legal rights concerning proprietary data do not preclude their release.

Originality, plagiarism and acknowledgement of sources: Authors will submit only entirely original works, and must cite or quote the work and/or words of others in an appropriate manner and in line with the journal's published guidelines. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work should also be cited. Additionally, the author/s' own previous works must be cited, including works published in popular and/or online spaces (i.e., blogs, newspaper articles, and so on). Authors must ensure that they submit a version of the paper for review in which their identity is removed in all ways, to enable double-blind peer review.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication: Submitting the same paper to more than one journal simultaneously constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable. Authors submitting an original paper to the journal should not have the paper under consideration with any other journal at that time. Authors may only withdraw their paper if the paper is rejected before or after peer review, or if authors notify the editor of their intention to withdraw as soon as a decision on the manuscript is communicated by the editors, including where such a decision indicates the need for revisions. Manuscripts which have been published as copyrighted material elsewhere cannot be submitted. In addition, manuscripts under review by the journal should not be resubmitted to copyrighted publications.

Copyright/License Agreement: By submitting a manuscript, the author/s agrees to enter into a copyright agreement with Berghahn Journals, New York, and must be prepared to sign a Copyright or License agreement.

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 authors who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. The corresponding

author ensures that all contributing co-authors are included in the author list. The corresponding author will also verify that all co-authors have approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication. All communication will be conducted between the editor/s and corresponding author only, except where co-authors request otherwise.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest: All authors should include in their submission a clear statement disclosing any financial or other substantive conflicts of interest that may be interpreted as influencing the research included in the manuscript, this could also be ideological. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed, including where relevant project or funding reference numbers.

Fundamental errors in published works: If an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, the author is obliged to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and to cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper in form of an erratum. Authors should take care to review their own manuscripts carefully during the production process to avoid such errors being published.

### **Publisher's Duties**

Publisher and editors shall take reasonable steps to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct had occurred; in no event shall a journal or its editors encourage such misconduct, or knowingly allow such misconduct to take place. In the event that the publisher or the editors are made aware of any allegation of research misconduct the publisher or editor shall deal with the allegations appropriately. The journal has guidelines for retracting and/or correcting articles (see above). The publishers are always willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

### Integrity of Record

The publisher maintains a record of the existence of everything published with information (metadata) describing each publication.

Conflict of Interest: The publisher follows best practices as outlined in the COPE flowcharts linked below with regard to [suspected conflict of interest in a submitted manuscript](#) and [suspected conflict in a published article](#).

### Metrics, Usage and Reporting

The publisher to ensure that our reporting of content usage remains compliant with the industry standards and the [COUNTER Code of Practice](#). The publisher partners with third parties, including commercial services, to provide users with metrics to illustrate the impact and reception of content.

### **References**

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). (2011, March 7). Code of Conduct and Best-Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors. Retrieved from [http://publicationethics.org/files/Code\\_of\\_conduct\\_for\\_journal\\_editors\\_Mar11.pdf](http://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf).

PsychOpen (n.d.). Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement. Retrieved from [PsychOpen](#).