

## **Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement**

When you submit an article for review in the *arbitrator & mediator* you agree to abide by the following Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement.

### **Duties and responsibilities of authors**

#### **Originality and Plagiarism**

All manuscripts must be the original work of authors and not evidence plagiarism.

#### **Authorship of the Paper**

Authorship of a manuscript should be limited to authors who have made significant contributions.

#### **Multiple or concurrent publication**

Authors must not submit the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently.

Should Resolution Institute decide to re-publish an already published article, it will do so only with permission/and or acknowledgement from the previous publisher.

#### **Acknowledgement of sources**

Authors are responsible for the accuracy of case names, citations, and other references, spelling of names, accuracy of quotations etc, and must properly and accurately acknowledge the work of others.

#### **Disclosure and conflicts of interest and financial support**

Authors should disclose any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript and acknowledge individuals or organisations that have provided financial support for research.

#### **Fundamental errors in published works**

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal's General Editor or Managing Editor and cooperate with them to either retract the paper or to publish an appropriate correction.

If the manuscript is still under consideration, it may be rejected.

If the manuscript is already published online:

- A correction may be issued with the manuscript.
- An Editor's note may be published with the manuscript.
- Or, in the most extreme case, retraction of the manuscript may occur.

### **Duties and responsibilities of editors**

The editors are accountable for everything published in this journal. The editors strive to:

- Meet the needs of readers and authors
- Constantly improve the journal
- Champion freedom of expression
- Maintain the integrity of the academic record
- Preclude business needs from comprising intellectual and ethical standards
- Be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

### **Publication decisions**

The General Editor is responsible for deciding which of the manuscripts submitted to the journal should be reviewed or published. Guidance may be requested from the Managing Editor, other editors, or peer reviewers in making this decision.

### **Fair play**

Editors should ensure the integrity of the publication review process. As such, editors should not reveal either the identity of authors of manuscripts to the reviewers, or the identity of reviewers to authors (during the review process).

Manuscripts will be evaluated without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

### **Confidentiality**

Editors must treat received manuscripts for review as confidential documents and must not disclose any information about submitted manuscripts to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher.

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

Editors and any editorial staff must not use materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript (published or unpublished) for their own research without the author's written authorisation.

### **Investigations**

Editors shall conduct proper and fair investigation into ethical complaints. The following steps will be taken:

1. The General Editor will raise the matter with the corresponding author (co-author) seeking an explanation
2. The General Editor will seek an explanation from the complainant
3. Evidence will be sought from both parties should the need arise
4. If it is decided no ethical violation has been made, the General Editor will advise all parties and publish the article
5. If the matter is not resolved, the General Editor will investigate further
6. If it is decided there is a violation, the article will not be published
7. If violation is discovered after publication, the General Editor will consider a retraction

**Responsibility of reviewers**

Peer reviewers assist in making editorial decisions and may offer suggestions for improving the manuscript.

**Standards of objectivity**

Reviews should be conducted objectively, with no personal criticism of the author.

**Contribution to editorial decision**

Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. They should bring to the attention of the General Editor any similarity between the article and any other published data they may be aware of.

**Promptness**

Reviewers should complete their reviews within a specified timeframe.

**Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

Reviewers should not review 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 connected to the papers.

## **Action the General and Managing Editors (editors) will take in event of malpractice**

When suspicion or allegations arise regarding any of misstatement or malpractice, the editors will ideally address such issues after submission and prior to publication. Editors will investigate suspicions and any allegations made and reach a conclusion based on those investigations.

When the editors suspect an ethics violation may exist in relation to an article submitted or allegation concerning a submitted article, the editors will take the following steps:

1. Editors, as a matter of due process, will raise the issue with the corresponding author and in some cases with a specific co-author whose actions are complained about— in some circumstances all co-authors of the article in question may need to be contacted. Editors will seek an explanation and, where necessary, the provision of evidence supporting that explanation.
2. Editors will also seek an explanation from, and the views of, any complainant together, where necessary, with evidence supporting that explanation.
3. Editors will seek the complainant's views on any explanation and evidence provided by the author. Similarly, editors will seek the views of the author on any explanation and evidence provided by the complainant.

At this point in the investigation, editors may be satisfied that there has been no ethical violation. If not, editors will continue to investigate the matter.

4. If the authors are unable to satisfy editors on a balance of probabilities that there has been no violation, then the editors will carry out further investigation. The depth of the investigation will vary from case to case, but may include the following steps:

- Further investigating any allegations made by third parties
- Speaking to colleagues of any author
- Speaking to officials at any institutions where the research in question was carried out
- Speaking to officials at any professional body or institution of which any author is a member
- Speaking to other leading experts in the field of research in question
- Speaking to members of the editorial advisory board of the journal
- Working with any professional body with an investigative mission such as the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

### **Caution regarding defamation claims**

In carrying out any investigation, editors will take great care to act fairly and objectively and not to defame any author (or complainant) in any way, which could give rise to legal liabilities, including damages. To avoid defamation claims by authors, editors will bear in mind the following guidelines in investigation:

- Any inquiries of an author's institution will be made in terms of an 'alleged' or 'apparent' violation. The inquiries should clearly state the facts and the allegation without premature judgment of the author's culpability.
- Care will be taken to gather information while imparting as little information as possible about the suspicion or accusation.

### **Practical consequences of findings**

If editors decide that, prima facie, there is no issue, publication may take place or continue (as the case may be) in the normal way.

If editors decide that there has been unethical practice, editors may reject the paper. If unethical practice is discovered after the article has been published, editors will consider whether retraction of the article or, in very exceptional cases, removal is appropriate.

### **Legal consequences of findings**

In the case of plagiarism, there may be an infringement of copyright and, possibly, also moral rights. Moral rights include the right of an author of a work to be identified as such, as well as the right of an author to prevent changes to his or her work that are of a derogatory nature.

In the case of research results not being original to the purported author and allegations about authorship of contributions, there may be an infringement of the moral rights outlined above, but also infringement of a person's moral right not to have a work attributed to him or her when not the author.

In all cases of ethical misconduct, there is likely to be a breach by the author, who will have contravened the terms of his or her publishing agreement with the publisher or the relevant instructions to authors.

### **Publisher's confirmation**

In cases of alleged or proven fraudulent publication or plagiarism the publisher, in close collaboration with the General Editor, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum or, in the most severe cases, the complete retraction of the affected work.