

## Code of Ethics

### Preamble

1. The Forum A+P Editorial Board aspires to select and publish, through peer review, the highest quality research in the fields of architecture and urbanism. To achieve this goal, the entire peer review and publication process should be thorough, objective and fair. Journal reputation depends heavily on the trust by all stakeholders in the fairness of the peer review and publication process. A formal Journals Code of Ethics, outlining guidelines for good behavior and proposing solutions to ethical dilemmas facing Authors, Reviewers and Editors can build stakeholder trust and improve journal reputation.
2. With this goal in mind, the Forum A+P of Ethics is designed to be a comprehensive policy for peer review and publication ethics in all its publications. This Code describes the Journals' policies for ensuring the ethical treatment of all participants in the peer review and publication process.
3. Authors, Reviewers and Editors of the Journal are encouraged to study the Code and address any questions or concerns to the respective Journal Editor-in-Chief or the Managing Editor.
4. Forum A+P relies on the guidelines dictated by COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics), and endorses its Core Practices. By submitting one's work for review and publication, all authors attest to, and agree to abide by, the COPE code of ethical conduct. Furthermore, COPE's Core Practices should be considered alongside specific national and international codes of conduct for research and are not intended to replace these.

*This document combines the original COPE Guidelines from 1999, the Code of Conduct developed in 2003, and the Best Practice Guidelines developed in 2007*

### Background/Structure

The COPE Code of Conduct for Journal Editors is designed to provide a set of minimum standards to which all COPE members are expected to adhere. The Best Practice Guidelines are more aspirational and were developed in response to requests from editors for guidance about a wide range of increasingly complex ethical issues. While COPE expects all members to adhere to the Code of Conduct for Journal Editors (and will consider complaints against members who have not followed it), we realise that editors may not be able to implement all the Best Practice recommendations (which are therefore voluntary), but we hope that our suggestions will identify aspects of journal policy and practice that should be reviewed and discussed. In this combined version of the documents, the mandatory Code of Conduct for Journal Editors standards are shown in regular script and with numbered clauses, and the more aspirational Best Practice recommendations are shown in italics.

## Scopes/Definitions

### Scope

- FORUM A+P Journals Code of Ethics (“Journals Code of Ethics”) is binding on all persons involved in matters or activities involving the Journal.
- The scope of the FORUM A+P Journals Code of Ethics does not apply to matters and activities involving non-Journal member. However, members in good standing are expected to know the Journals Code of Ethics and, where appropriate, to follow these policies for peer review and publication ethics in all their scholarly publication.

### Definitions

The phrase "all persons involved in matters or activities involving FORUM A+P" should be interpreted broadly as applying to all individuals who participate in matters or activities involving the Journal, including Authors, Reviewers, Editors, Publishers and Staff.

## AUTHORS

### 3.1 Originality

3.1.1. When an Author submits a manuscript to the Journal, the manuscript must be an original work.

3.1.2. Authors must not submit the same work, in whole or in part, to two places of publication at the same time, or at any time while the manuscript is under review at FORUM A+P. It is also improper for an Author to submit a manuscript describing essentially the same research to more than one place of publication, unless it is a resubmission of a manuscript rejected for or withdrawn from publication. Thus, an Author may not submit to the Journal a work that is in whole or in part under review elsewhere, nor submit to another publication outlet a work that is in whole or in part under review.

3.1.3. The manuscript must not have been published previously or accepted for publication elsewhere, either in whole (including book chapters) or in part (including paragraphs of text or exhibits), whether in English or another language. The only exception to the “originality” rule is a conference proceedings paper, where the paper is work in progress toward the manuscript submitted to FORUM A+P. Manuscripts that originated from unpublished dissertations are also acceptable.

3.1.4. If the manuscript contains materials that overlap with work that has been published previously, that is in press, or that is under consideration for publication elsewhere, the Author must cite this work in the manuscript. The Author must also inform the Journal Office of the related work and, if requested, send the related work to the Editor.

3.1.5. Authors must explicitly cite their own earlier work and ideas, even when the work or ideas are not quoted verbatim or paraphrased in the manuscript. If exact sentences or paragraphs that appear in another work by the Author are included in the manuscript, the material should be put in quotation marks and appropriately cited in a way that does not compromise the double-blind review process.

3.1.6. The manuscript should identify the origin, and originality, of any proprietary, non-standard datasets used in the paper, for example, a primary dataset created by the Author using a survey. If the proprietary dataset has been used elsewhere by this or another Author, the manuscript should cite these other works, whether published or not.

3.1.7. While self-citation is encouraged, Authors should avoid excessively citing their earlier works to inflate their citation count. Authors should also avoid self-citation that might violate the double-blind review process. If self-identifying information is unavoidable, the Author should include the information in the manuscript's Acknowledgements (which are not forwarded to the Reviewers) and inform the Journal Managing Editor.

3.1.8. Authors should not submit a manuscript to a FORUM A+P that was submitted previously to the Journal, sent out for review, and rejected after review by an Editor. If an earlier version was previously rejected by the Journal, and the Author wishes to submit a revised version for review, this fact and a detailed justification for resubmission should be clearly communicated by the Author to the Managing Editor at the time of submission. Manuscripts that have been rejected at one POLIS\_Press Journal can be submitted to a different POLIS\_Press Journal if the Author informs the Managing Editor at the time of submission.

3.1.9. Only under exceptional circumstances will a second submission be permissible. Such rare circumstances to be considered by the Editor-in-Chief may include: adding an empirical component to a previously submitted and rejected conceptual paper; completing a full reframing of the conceptual portion of the paper; upgrading the paper's initial cross-sectional data to include longitudinal data and corresponding empirical analysis; and substituting the original empirical dataset by a completely new and up-to-date dataset.

## **3.2 Plagiarism and Self-Plagiarism**

3.2.1. All work in the manuscript should be free of any plagiarism, falsification, fabrications, or omission of significant material.

3.2.2. Plagiarism takes many forms, from deliberately misrepresenting 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. Authors are expected to explicitly cite others' work and ideas, even if the work or ideas are not quoted verbatim or paraphrased. This standard applies whether the previous work is published, unpublished, or electronically available. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

3.2.3. Redundancy (or "self-plagiarism") is unacceptable publishing behavior. Redundancy can occur in at least two ways: (1) Authors recycle portions of their previous writings

by using identical or nearly identical sentences or paragraphs from earlier writings in subsequent research papers, without quotation or acknowledgement; or (2) Authors create multiple papers that are slight variations on each other, which are submitted for publication in different journals but without acknowledgement of the other papers. Authors can and often do develop different aspects of an argument in more than one manuscript. However, manuscripts that differ primarily in appearance, but are presented as separate and distinct research without acknowledging other related work, constitute attempts (whether unintentional or deliberate) to deceive reviewers and readers by overinflating the intellectual contribution of the manuscript. Since publication decisions are influenced by the novelty and innovativeness of manuscripts, such deception is inappropriate and unethical.

3.2.4. Authors should minimize their recycling of previous writings. If recycling is unavoidable, the Author should inform the Editor at the time of submission and reference the previous writings in the manuscript. Such self-referencing should be worded carefully to avoid compromising the double-blind review process.

3.2.5. If exact sentences or paragraphs that appear in another work by the Author are included in the manuscript, the material must be put in quotation marks and appropriately cited.

### **3.3 Conflicts of Interest**

3.3.1. Authors should avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest throughout the research process. A conflict of interest is some fact known to a participant in the publication process that if revealed later, would make a reasonable reader feel misled or deceived (or an Author, Reviewer, or Editor feel uncomfortable as to the integrity of the process). Conflicts of interest may influence the judgment of Authors, Reviewers, and Editors. Possible conflicts often are not immediately apparent to others. They may be personal, commercial, political, academic, or financial. Examples of financial interest conflicts may include employment, research funding (received or pending), stock or share ownership, patents, payment for lectures or travel, consultancies or non-financial support.

3.3.2. All such interests should be declared in writing by Authors upon submission of the manuscript. If there is doubt about whether a circumstance represents a conflict, it should be disclosed, so that Editors may assess its significance. Any queries about possible conflicts of interest should be addressed to the Journal Office or Editor-in-Chief.

3.3.3. Authors should disclose in the manuscript's Acknowledgements any conflict of interest that might be seen to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. Authors may withhold the names of specific sponsors if they provide an adequate and full description of the sponsor's nature and interest.

3.3.4. Examples of possible conflicts of interest that could affect nomination of an Editor or Reviewer include: (1) one of the Authors is at the same institution as the nominated Editor or Reviewer; (2) one of the Authors was a member of the Editor or Reviewer's dissertation committee,

or vice versa; or (3) one of the Authors, and the Editor or Reviewer, are currently Co-Authors on another manuscript or have been Co-Authors on a manuscript within the past three years.

### **3.4 Double-Blind Review**

3.4.1. FORUM A+P Journal follow a double-blind review process, whereby Authors do not know Reviewers and vice versa. Authors should respect the confidentiality of the review process and should not reveal themselves to Reviewers, and vice versa. For example, the manuscript should not include any self-revealing information that would identify the Author.

3.4.2. Authors should not post their submitted manuscript (including working papers and prior drafts) on websites where it could be easily discovered by potential Reviewers.

3.4.3. Authors should not nominate individuals as Reviewers who have already read and provided comments on the manuscript or a previous version of the manuscript since such knowledge would automatically violate the double-blind review process. Authors should not contact potential Reviewers for their manuscript when it is submitted, nor ask these individuals whether they are willing to have their names suggested, nor inform them that they have been proposed for this role.

### **3.5 Accuracy**

3.5.1. Authors have the ultimate responsibility for all materials included in a manuscript submitted to a POLIS\_Press Journal. Authors are obligated to present an accurate account of the research performed as well as an objective discussion of the significance of the research.

3.5.2. Authors should report their findings fully and should not omit data that are relevant within the context of the research question(s). Results should be reported whether they support or contradict expected outcomes. Authors should take care to present relevant qualifications to their research or to the findings and interpretations of them. Underlying assumptions, theories, methods, measures and research designs relevant to the findings and interpretations of their work should be disclosed.

3.5.3. The manuscript should contain sufficient detail and references to permit peers with access to the same dataset to repeat the work.

3.5.4. If an Author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own work, it is the Author's obligation to promptly notify the journal Editor 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 manuscript or provide evidence to the Editor of the correctness of the original paper.

### **3.6 Co-Authorship**

3.6.1. All Co-Authors of papers should have made significant contributions to the work and share accountability for the results. Authorship and credit should be shared in proportion to the various parties' contributions. Authors should take responsibility and credit, including authorship

credit, only for work they have performed or to which they have contributed. Other contributions should be cited in the manuscript's Acknowledgements or an endnote.

3.6.2. Authors should normally list a student as the principal Co-Author on multiple-authored publications that substantially derive from the student's dissertation or thesis.

3.6.3. Authors who analyze data from others should explicitly acknowledge the contribution of the initial researchers.

3.6.4. The Corresponding Author who submits a manuscript to a POLIS\_Press Journal should have sent all living CoAuthors a draft and obtained their assent to submission and publication.

### **3.7 Human Subjects**

3.7.1. Authors have a responsibility to preserve and protect the privacy, dignity, well-being and freedom of human subjects and research participants. Informed consent should be sought from all human subjects, and if confidentiality or anonymity is requested, it should be honored.

3.7.2. Manuscripts involving human subjects (surveys, simulations, interviews) should comply with the relevant Human Subject Protocol requirements at the Author's (Authors') university(ies).

### **3.8 Copyright Law**

3.8.1. Authors should check their manuscripts for possible breaches of copyright law (e.g., where permissions are needed for quotations, artwork, tables or any protected content taken from other publications) and secure the necessary permissions before submission.

3.8.2. Authors should avoid anything in the text of the manuscript that might be actionable, such as defamation. Authors should avoid using sexist and biased language that could be interpreted as denigrating to ethnic or other groups; for example, plural rather than single pronouns ("they" rather than "he") are recommended.

### **3.9 Timeliness**

3.9.1. Authors should be prompt with their manuscript revisions. If an Author cannot meet the deadline given, the Author should contact the Managing Editor as soon as possible and be truthful about the reasons for the delay so that the Managing Editor can determine whether a longer time or withdrawal from the review process should be chosen.

### **3.10 Post publication**

3.10.1. FORUM A+P | Interdisciplinary Journal of Architecture and Built Environment is an Open Access Journal. It allows the author to retain the copyright in their articles. Articles are instead made available under a Creative Commons license (usually Attribution-Only, or CC-BY) to allow others to freely access, copy and use research provided the author is correctly attributed. Creative Commons licenses are likely to be added to the article by the journal/publisher, but you

should check with them when submitting. As you retain the copyright, you would be able to use the final published version of the article in any way you wished. All the articles are indeed released under the Open Access protocol.

## **REVIEWERS**

### **4.1 Reciprocity**

4.1.1. Reviewing for journals is a professional activity that provides value for the profession and should be encouraged. Scholars who submit manuscripts to POLIS\_Press Journals are normally expected to reciprocate by accepting an invitation to review for the Journals.

### **4.2 Right of Refusal**

4.2.1. Refusals to review a manuscript are from time to time necessary. For example, a Reviewer who feels inadequately qualified to judge the research reported in a manuscript should refuse to review the manuscript. Reviewers should refuse to review a manuscript if there is a potential conflict of interest.

4.2.2. If asked to review a manuscript they have reviewed previously, Reviewers should make that prior review known to the Journal Editor, unless they are being asked to provide a reappraisal.

### **4.3 Double-Blind Review**

4.3.1. FORUM A+P Journal has a double-blind review process. Reviewers should refuse to review manuscripts where they have provided written comments on the manuscript or an earlier version to the Author. If a Reviewer knows the identity of an Author or Co-Author, the Reviewer should inform the Editor and discuss whether this knowledge would be grounds for refusal to review.

4.3.2. Reviewers also have a responsibility to avoid writing, doing or saying anything that could identify them to an Author.

### **4.4 Conflict of Interest**

4.4.1. Reviewers should avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest throughout the research process. A conflict of interest is some fact known to a participant in the publication process that if revealed later, would make a reasonable reader feel misled or deceived (or an Author, Reviewer, or Editor feel uncomfortable as to the integrity of the process). Conflicts of interest may influence the judgment of Authors, Reviewers, and Editors. Possible conflicts often are not immediately apparent to others. They may be personal, commercial, political, academic, or financial. Examples of financial interest conflicts may include employment, research funding (received or pending), stock or share ownership, patents, payment for lectures or travel, consultancies or non-financial support.

4.4.2. Normally, Reviewers should refuse to review manuscripts in which they have any or potential conflicts of interest. Reviewers who might have a conflict of interest on a manuscript should reveal that conflict to the Editor, who will then determine their appropriate level of involvement. An example occurs when the Reviewer has a similar manuscript under review in the same or another journal or a similar research project nearing completion.

4.4.3. Note that under the double-blind review process, since Reviewers do not know Authors, Reviewers are unlikely to be aware of and are therefore may not be bound by conflicts of interest involving Authors. If Reviewers do become aware of such conflicts, they should inform the Editor.

#### **4.5 Unbiased Reviews**

4.5.1. Reviewers should evaluate manuscripts objectively, fairly and professionally. Reviewers should avoid personal biases in their comments and judgments.

#### **4.6 Confidentiality**

4.6.1. Reviewers should respect the confidentiality of the review process. It is important to recognize that the manuscript is confidential. Reviewers should not discuss the manuscript with anyone other than the Editor and Managing Editor, nor should they discuss any information from the manuscript without permission.

4.6.2. If Reviewers suspect misconduct, they should notify the Managing Editor in confidence, and should not share their concerns with other parties unless officially notified by the Managing Editor that they may do so.

4.6.3. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submission should not be used in a Reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the Author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review should be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

#### **4.7 Accuracy**

4.7.1. In evaluating the manuscript and crafting comments to the Author(s), Reviewers should always keep in mind that their review should capture their scholarly judgment about the manuscript. Reviewers should be honest with the Author in terms of their concerns about the manuscript.

4.7.2. Reviewers should explain and support their scholarly judgments adequately; that is, they should provide sufficient detail to the Author to justify their recommendation to the Editor.

4.7.3. Reviews should not be "two-faced", providing overly friendly reviews to the Author but very negative reviews in private to the Editor.

#### **4.8 Timeliness**



4.8.1. Reviewers should be prompt with their reviews. If a Reviewer cannot meet the deadline given, the Reviewer should contact the Managing Editor as soon as possible to determine whether a longer time or a new Reviewer should be chosen.

4.8.2. Reviewers should also read and follow the Journals Guidelines when completing reviews for the journal.

## **EDITORS**

### **5.1 Indipendence**

5.1.1. Journal Editors must maintain their editorial independence. Responsibility for acceptance or rejection of manuscripts rests with the Editors. Doing so normally entails advice from Reviewers; however, manuscripts that Editors deem clearly inappropriate may be rejected without such review.

### **5.2 Unbiased**

5.2.1. Editors should exercise their position of privilege in a confidential, unbiased, prompt, constructive and sensitive manner. Editors have the duty to judge manuscripts only on their scholarly merits. Editors should operate without personal or ideological favoritism or malice.

### **5.3 Conflict of Interest**

5.3.1. Editors should avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest throughout the research process. A conflict of interest is some fact known to a participant in the publication process that if revealed later, would make a reasonable reader feel misled or deceived (or an Author, Reviewer, or Editor feel uncomfortable as to the integrity of the process). Conflicts of interest may influence the judgment of Authors, Reviewers, and Editors. Possible conflicts often are not immediately apparent to others. They may be personal, commercial, political, academic, or financial. Examples of financial interest conflicts may include employment, research funding (received or pending), stock or share ownership, patents, payment for lectures or travel, consultancies or non-financial support.

5.3.2. Editors should avoid any practice that gives rise to a conflict of interest or the reasonable appearance of one. For example:

a. To avoid any appearance of a potential conflict of interest, the Editor-in-Chief should not publish in the Journal except for materials that are clearly identifiable or identified as non-refereed or singleblind refereed. An example of this would be an editorial.

b. Editorial responsibility and authority for any manuscript authored by a Journal Editor and submitted to a POLIS\_Press Journal should be delegated by the POLIS\_Press Journal Editor-in-Chief to another qualified person, such as a past Editor of the Journal or

a member of the Journal Editors Board. Editorial consideration of the manuscript in any way or form by the Author-Editor is never acceptable.

c. Editors should excuse themselves from considering a manuscript in which they have a real or potential conflict of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, financial or other relationships or connections with any of the Authors, companies or institutions connected to the manuscript.

d. Examples of connections that represent possible Editor-Author conflicts of interest include: (1) the Editor and Author are both employed by the same institution; (2) the Editor was a member of the Author's dissertation committee, or vice versa; or (3) the Author and Editor are currently Co-Authors on another manuscript or have been Co-Authors on a manuscript within the past three years.

#### **5.4 Double-Blind Review**

5.4.1. FORUM A+P Journal follows a double-blind review process, whereby Authors do not know Reviewers and vice versa. Where articles appear in the Journal that were not double-blind reviewed, the standard of review should be clearly stated in the printed Acknowledgements accompanying the article.

#### **5.5 Confidentiality**

5.5.1. Editors and their editorial staff including student workers shall not disclose information about a manuscript to anyone other than Reviewers and Authors. Office procedures should be in place to maintain confidentiality of the review process.

5.5.2. FORUM A+P Editors are expected to ensure the confidentiality of the double-blind review process and not divulge any information that might identify Authors to Reviewers or vice versa.

5.5.3. The anonymity of Reviewers can only be lifted if Editors receive permission from Reviewers to reveal their identities. Editors should ensure that their staff members conform to this practice.

5.5.4. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submission should 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 should be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

#### **5.6 Review Quality**

5.6.1. Normally, two Reviewers should be invited to comment on a manuscript. Authors may request that certain Reviewers not be used, but this decision should be left to Editor's discretion.

5.6.2. In difficult cases, the Editor may decide to invite an additional Reviewer or outside Expert to provide an additional, confidential assessment to the Editor, which may or may not be

provided to the Author. This extra step should be done rarely and only where the additional advice would improve the Editor's ability to judge the manuscript on its scholarly merits. In these cases, the Editor should consult with the Editor-in-Chief and Managing Editor to ensure that the process meets the standards of the Journals Code of Ethics.

5.6.3. The Editor should routinely assess all reviews for quality. In rare circumstances, an Editor may edit a review before sending it to an Author (for example, to remove a phrase that could identify the Reviewer) or not send the review to the Author if it is not constructive or appropriate. Ratings of review quality and other performance characteristics should be periodically assessed by the Journal Editor-in-Chief to assure optimal journal performance. These ratings should also contribute to decisions on reappointment to the Journal Editorial Review Board and to ongoing review requests. Individual performance data on Reviewers should be available to the Editors but otherwise kept confidential.

### **5.7 Timeliness**

5.7.1. Editors should take steps to ensure the timely review of all manuscripts and respond promptly to inquiries from Authors about the status of a review

### **5.8 Decision Quality**

5.8.1. Editors have a responsibility to provide the Author with an explanation of the editorial decision on a manuscript. Editors should write high-quality editorial letters that integrate reviewer comments and offer additional suggestions to the Author. Editors should not send a decision letter, without explanation, attached to a set of reviewer comments.

5.8.2. Editors have a responsibility to discourage authors from "gaming" activities designed to either inflate their own citations or the journal's citations, and editors should not engage in such "gaming" activities themselves on behalf of the Journal or any other journal.

5.8.3. Author and journal self-cites should be included where appropriate and as needed, but editors should not encourage or request authors to engage in frivolous or unnecessary citations, either by the authors to their own previous publications or to other articles published in the Journal targeted or any other specific journal.

### **5.9 Accuracy**

5.9.1. An Editor presented with convincing evidence by a Reviewer that the substance or conclusion of an unpublished manuscript is erroneous should promptly inform the Author. If similar evidence is presented for a published manuscript, the Editor should ensure prompt publication of a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or another note, as appropriate.

### **5.10 Authority**

5.10.1. The Editor-in-Chief of FORUM A+P Journal is selected by, reports directly to and serves at the pleasure of the Journal Board.

5.10.2. The Editor-in-Chief has ultimate authority and responsibility for the Journal.

5.10.3. The Editor-in-Chief should respect the Journal's stakeholders (readers, Authors, Reviewers, Editors, editorial staff and publisher), and work to ensure the honesty and integrity of the Journal's contents and continuous improvement in journal quality.

5.10.4. The Editor-in-Chief should select the members of the editorial team, including an Editorial Review Board; outline the rights and responsibilities of these individuals; and regularly assess their performance.

5.10.5. The Editor-in-Chief should develop a strategic plan for the Journal, including facilitating transition to the next editorial team.

### **5.11 Performance**

5.11.1. The Editor-in-Chief and Managing Editor should develop performance metrics for the Journal. These metrics should be presented to the Executive Board on a regular basis.

5.11.2. The Journal should publish annual audits of acceptance rates, publication intervals, percentage of submissions sent out for external peer review, and other performance data. Performance measures should be used to assess changes in peer review and publication processes, and to improve specific performance outcomes when deficiencies are observed.

## **IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT**

### **6.1. Ascribing to the POLIS Press Journals Code of Ethics**

6.1.1. Uphold the Code: Authors, Reviewers and Editors of POLIS\_Press Journals are expected to uphold and promote the principles of the Journals Code of Ethics and to adhere to its ethical standards.

6.1.2. Know the Code: Authors, Reviewers and Editors of POLIS\_Press Journals have an obligation to be familiar with the Journals Code of Ethics. Lack of awareness or misunderstanding of an ethical standard is not a defense to a charge of unethical conduct.

6.1.3. Confronting Ethical Issues: When Authors, Reviewers or Editors of the Journal are uncertain whether a situation or course of action might violate the Journals Code of Ethics, they should first consult the Editor-in-Chief or Managing Editor of the Journal. They may also seek advice from the Ethics Review Committee and/or from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

6.1.4. Reporting Ethical Violations: When Authors, Reviewers or Editors of POLIS\_Press Journals have substantial reason to believe that there has been an ethical violation of the Journals Code of Ethics, they should bring the issue to the attention of the Journal Editor-in-Chief and/or Managing Editor of the Journal. They may also seek advice from the Ethics Review Committee and/or from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

## **6.2. Interpretation of the FORUM A+P Journal Code of Ethics**

6.2.1. The Editors-in-Chief of FORUM A+P Journal are ultimately responsible for immediate interpretation, application and enforcement of the Journals Code of Ethics.

6.2.2. The Editors-in-Chief of POLIS\_Press Journals shall ensure that the practice of this policy will be fair, just and equitable in all situations of interpretation and application.

## **6.3. The Ethics Review Process**

6.3.1. The ethics review process may be initiated by an Author, Reviewer or Editor or by someone who believes an ethics violation has occurred with respect to the Journal. Each Journal shall have an internal review procedure for handling possible ethical violations by an Author, Reviewer or Editor that involve a POLIS\_Press Journal. These procedures should follow best practices as recommended by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). These procedures and penalties may differ from, but should be consistent in spirit with, those outlined in the Code of Ethics.

6.3.2. Authors have the right to appeal an Editor's decision. Normally, appeals should only be allowed on procedural grounds (e.g., an Editor or Reviewers missed a critical step in the review process and the procedural mistake materially affected the decision). There may be cases where an appeal on substantive grounds would be allowable. Such cases could include, for example, situations where the reviews or decision letter were non-substantive or inappropriate or where a conflict of interest existed and may have affected the review process.

6.3.3. Where appropriate, the Ethics Review Committee may be asked by the Journal Editor-in-Chief, the Managing Editor or the Executive Board to participate in an ethical matter involving the Journal. Such a request should come only after all internal procedures have been followed within the Journal and/or where the ethical issue is sufficiently egregious or material to be appropriately moved to the Ethics Review Committee.

## **6.4. Penalties**

6.4.1. Penalties for violation of the Journal Code of Ethics will normally be determined internally by the Journal Editor-in-Chief and the Managing Editor. In particularly egregious cases, the Ethics Review Committee and the Executive Board may also be involved.

6.4.2. Cases of plagiarism and redundancy by an Author will be handled by the Journal according to the practices recommended by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). In instances the Editor deems as "major" redundancy (e.g., multiple overlapping paragraphs), the paper will be rejected, and authors may be barred from submitting to the Journal for a period of time. In cases of "minor" redundancy (e.g., a single duplicate paragraph describing the research methods), the authors would be asked to rephrase the duplicate sentences.

6.4.3. Evidence that an Author has stolen someone else's manuscript and attempted to publish or has published it elsewhere will be treated as an extremely serious ethical violation for which the penalties may include notification of the Author's university, adding a "Retracted" notice

to the publication, publicly identifying the Author and publication, and denial of membership in the Academy of International Business.

6.4.4. The Journal reserve the right to evaluate issues of plagiarism and redundancy on a case-by-case basis.