



## ALTERNATIF POLITIKA

### Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

Below is a summary of our key expectations of editors, peer-reviewers, and authors. Our publication ethics and publication malpractice statement is mainly based on the Code of Conduct and Best-Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors. For more information, please visit: <https://publicationethics.org/>

Please visit this page for the journal's scope and general principles: <http://alternatifpolitika.com/eng/hakkinda>

#### **A. ETHICAL EXPECTATIONS**

##### **EDITORS' RESPONSIBILITIES**

Please visit this page for editorial information: <http://alternatifpolitika.com/eng/editorial>

###### *1. Publication Decisions:*

The editors ensure that all submitted manuscripts being considered for publication undergo peer-review by at least two reviewers who are expert in the field. The editor is responsible for deciding which of the papers submitted to the journal will be published. The editor will evaluate manuscripts without regard to the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy. The decision will be based on the paper's importance, originality and clarity, and the study's validity and its relevance to the journal's scope. Current legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism should also be considered. Decisions to edit and publish are not determined by the policies of governments or any other agencies outside of the journal itself. The editors have full authority over the entire editorial content of the journal and the timing of publication of that content.

###### *2. 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.

###### *3. 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Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted paper will not be used by the editor or the members of the editorial board for their own research purposes without the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.

###### *4. Involvement and cooperation in investigations:*

Editors (in conjunction with the publisher) will take responsive measures when ethical concerns are raised with regard to a submitted manuscript or published paper. Every reported act of unethical publishing behaviour will be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication. Editors follow the COPE Flowcharts

when dealing with cases of suspected misconduct. If, on investigation, the ethical concern is well-founded, a correction, retraction, expression of concern or other note as may be relevant, will be published in the journal.

## **REVIEWERS' RESPONSIBILITIES**

### *1. Contribution to editorial decisions:*

The peer-reviewing process assists the editor and the editorial board in making editorial decisions and may also serve the author in improving the paper. Alternatif Politika shares the view that peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication and lies at the heart of scientific endeavour.

### *2. Promptness:*

Any selected 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 withdraw from the review process.

### *3. Confidentiality:*

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be disclosed to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor. This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

### *4. Standards of objectivity:*

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

### *5. Acknowledgement of sources:*

Reviewers should identify cases in which relevant published work referred to in the paper has not been cited in the reference section. They should point out whether observations or arguments derived from other publications are accompanied by the respective source. Reviewers will notify the editor of any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

### *6. Disclosure and conflict of interest:*

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions associated with the papers. The work described therein should immediately notify the editors to declare their conflicts of interest and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

## **AUTHORS' DUTIES**

Please visit this page for the journal's double-blind peer review policy and guidelines: <http://alternatifpolitika.com/eng/double-blind-peer-review-policy>

### *1. Reporting standards:*

Authors of original research reports 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 behavior and are unacceptable.

### *2. Data access and retention:*

Authors could be asked to provide the raw data of their study together with the paper for editorial review and should be prepared to make the data publicly available if practicable. In any event, authors should ensure accessibility of such data to other competent professionals for at least ten years after publication (preferably via an institutional or subject-based data repository or other data center), provided that the confidentiality of the participants can be protected and legal rights concerning proprietary data do not preclude their release.

### *3. Originality, plagiarism and acknowledgement of sources:*

Authors will submit only entirely original works, and will appropriately cite or quote the work and/or words of others. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work should also be cited.

### *4. Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication:*

In general, papers describing essentially the same research should not be published in more than one journal. Submitting the same paper to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. 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. However, by submitting a manuscript, the author(s) retain the rights to the published material. In case of publication they permit the use of their work under a CC-BY license [<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>], which allows others to copy, distribute and transmit the work as well as to adapt the work and to make commercial use of it.

### *5. 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. All persons who made substantial 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 an author, but should be acknowledged in the "Acknowledgements" section after their written permission to be named as been obtained. The corresponding author ensures that all contributing co-authors and no uninvolved persons 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.

*6. Disclosure and conflicts of interest:*

All authors should -at the earliest stage possible (generally by submitting a disclosure form at the time of submission and including a statement in the manuscript)- include a statement disclosing any financial or other substantive conflicts of interest that may be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. Examples of potential conflicts of interest that should be disclosed include financial ones such as honoraria, educational grants or other funding, participation in speakers' bureaus, membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest, and paid expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements, as well as non-financial ones such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs in the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

*7. Peer review:*

Authors are obliged to participate in the peer review process and cooperate fully by responding promptly to editors' requests for raw data, clarifications, and proof of ethics approval, patient consents and copyright permissions. In the case of a first decision of "revisions necessary", authors should respond to the reviewers' comments systematically, point by point, and in a timely manner, revising and re-submitting their manuscript to the journal by the deadline given.

*8. 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 to cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper in form of an erratum.

## **B. PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR**

Editors will follow the COPE Flowcharts when dealing with cases of suspected misconduct. For detailed instructions, see: <https://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts>

*1. Identification of unethical behaviour:*

Misconduct and unethical behaviour may be identified and brought to the attention of the editor and publisher at any time, by anyone. Misconduct and unethical behaviour may include, but need not be limited to, examples as outlined above. Whoever informs the editor or publisher of such conduct should provide sufficient information and evidence in order for an investigation to be initiated. All allegations should be taken seriously and treated in the same way, until a successful decision or conclusion is reached.

*2. Investigation:*

An initial decision should be taken by the editor, who should consult with or seek advice from the publisher, if appropriate. Evidence should be gathered, while avoiding spreading any allegations beyond those who need to know.

### *3. Minor breaches:*

Minor misconduct might be dealt with without the need to consult more widely. In any event, the author should be given the opportunity to respond to any allegations.

### *4. Serious breaches:*

Serious misconduct might require that the employers of the accused be notified. The editor, in consultation with the publisher or Society as appropriate, should make the decision whether or not to involve the employers, either by examining the available evidence themselves or by further consultation with a limited number of experts.

### *5. Outcomes (in increasing order of severity; may be applied separately or in conjunction):*

- Informing or educating the author or reviewer where there appears to be a misunderstanding or misapplication of acceptable standards.
- A more strongly worded letter to the author or reviewer covering the misconduct and as a warning to future behaviour.
- Publication of a formal notice detailing the misconduct.
- Publication of an editorial detailing the misconduct.
- A formal letter to the head of the author's or reviewer's department or funding agency.
- Formal retraction or withdrawal of a publication from the journal, in conjunction with informing the head of the author or reviewer's department, Abstracting & Indexing services and the readership of the publication.
- Imposition of a formal embargo on contributions from an individual for a defined period.
- Reporting the case and outcome to a professional organisation or higher authority for further investigation and action.

For detailed information on publication ethics, please visit: Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), <http://publicationethics.org>

If you need to contact us, please email at here: [alternatifpolitika@gmail.com](mailto:alternatifpolitika@gmail.com)