

# **Ethics and Peer Review**

## *Irodalomtörténet*

*Irodalomtörténet* is committed to maintaining, representing and promulgating the highest ethical standards. Authors, editors, peer reviewers and all other individuals involved in the production of the journal are obliged to keep to the principles laid out below, which are in line with the guidelines for journal publications provided by the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#).

### **The Editorial Board's Obligations**

#### **1) The peer review process**

If the editor-in-chief and the editorial board deem that a submitted manuscript meets the basic standards of the journal, they will ask a member of the editorial board to arrange for a peer review of it. This will be a double-blind peer review, in which the opinions of two reviewers with the appropriate competencies will be sought.

#### **2) Decisions on whether to publish**

The editorial board will decide on how to proceed with the submitted manuscript: to publish it, to publish it following a reworking or to reject it. This decision, which will take into account the opinions of the peer reviewers, will be made at a meeting of the board during which every member of the editorial board will express an opinion.

Decisions on whether to publish manuscripts must be made without regard to the author's race, gender, sexual orientation, religious convictions, ethnicity, citizenship or political leanings. Such decisions must be based exclusively on judgements relating to the merits of the manuscript. Submissions written by members of the editorial board may only be published if those members are excluded from this assessment process.

#### **3) Confidential treatment of data**

The editor-in-chief, the editor and others working for the editorial board may only pass on information about the submitted manuscript to the authors of the manuscript, the designated peer reviewers and members of the editorial board who have been asked for their opinion on it.

#### **4) Avoiding a conflict of interest**

Members of the editorial board may not make use of any previously unpublished material provided in the submitted manuscripts for their own research or publication purposes unless they have the express written consent of the author to do so.

## **Peer Reviewers' Obligations**

### **1) Assisting the editors in making decisions on a manuscript**

Peer reviews assist the editors to reach a decision on the publication of the manuscripts submitted. They also assist the author to make corrections to their article, should that be necessary.

### **2) Competency and providing an assessment in a timely manner**

Peer reviewers must agree to review an article only if they have the appropriate expertise. If the reviewer feels that they do not have this expertise or is unable to complete a peer review of it by the deadline as defined by the editors, they must inform the editorial board that they cannot undertake to provide the peer review.

### **3) Objectivity**

The peer review process must be unbiased and objective, and the review must be based solely on the assertions made in the article. Reviewers must make a clear case for their assessment of the article.

### **4) Checking of sources and citations**

Peer reviewers must indicate if the author has not used sources appropriately or has failed to acknowledge published literature pertinent to the topic of the article. They must inform the editorial board if they believe the content of the article they are reviewing shows significant similarities to or overlaps with the content of another published article of which they have personal knowledge.

### **5) Data protection**

Articles sent for review must be treated as confidential documents, and as such the peer reviewer may not share any information regarding the manuscript with anyone who is not involved in the peer review process.

### **6) Avoiding a conflict of interest**

Information come by in the course of writing a peer review may not be used by reviewers for their own private purposes. Peer reviewers are not permitted to assess a manuscript if they are in the process of collaborating with the author or if there are any other conflicts of interest.

## **Authors' Obligations**

### **1) Originality**

Authors must guarantee that the manuscript they are submitting is their own, original work, and that it has neither been published nor submitted for publication anywhere else.

### **2) Use of sources**

Authors must ensure that when quoting from the work of others, they do so accurately, and that they acknowledge every publication which has influenced their own research. Plagiarism in any form will result in the rejection of the manuscript.

### **3) Authorship**

Only individuals who have taken part in the writing of the manuscript or who have contributed significantly to the intellectual content of it may be listed as an author. Unethical claims to authorship will result in rejection of the manuscript.

### **4) Avoiding a conflict of interest**

If there is a danger of a conflict of interest either of a financial nature or of any other kind, authors must attach a statement outlining this. All forms of financial support received in the course of research must be declared.

### **The Handling of Ethics Violations**

If it should become apparent that any individual involved in the publication process has violated any of the principles outlined above, the violation must be precisely documented and investigated. The individuals responsible for it must be immediately informed and given the opportunity to defend themselves.

In less serious cases, the error, once proven, must be rectified, and the person committing the error must be warned to conduct themselves in an ethical manner in future. In more serious cases, the entire publication process must be reevaluated as it relates to the manuscript in question. Depending on the seriousness of the ethical misconduct, legal proceedings may also be initiated.