**Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement**

This ethic statement is based on the Committee on Publication Ethics’ (COPE) *Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors*. Cf. also the *Danish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity* (Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science, 2014).

**1. DUTIES OF THE EDITORS**

**Publication decisions**  
The editors of the given issue of the journal are responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The editors may be guided by the policies of the journal’s editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editors may confer with other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

In the case of peer reviewed research articles, the editors have the responsibility to decide when the author has resolved any minor or major revisions recommended by the peer reviewer. In cases where an article is assessed by the reviewer as “not publishable”, the editor can decide to offer the author an option to resubmit for another peer review, but the article cannot be published as a research article without a positive review (publishable with major revisions or better).

**Diversity and Fair play**  
Peripeti strives to be inclusive, both in terms of artistic and academic formats, and the profile and capabilities of writers. The editors will at any time evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, functional variations, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political orientation of the authors.

**Sensitive content**

In the visual and textual content of the journal, the editorial team aims to treat representations of violence, hate, sexism and racism with the utmost care and strives to avoid unprocessed, uncontextualized or uncommented reproduction of racist, sexist, violent or hate-filled speech and imagery.

**Confidentiality**  
The editors 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. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor’s own research without the express written consent of the author.

**Qualifications**

Editors of peer reviewed research articles must have attained the level of Ph.D. or equivalent, or they must be supervised by other editors with such appropriate research qualifications.

**Conflicts of interest**  
Editors should declare any conflict of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the submitted papers, in which case the responsibility for the material should be assigned to other members of the editorial team.

**Contributing editors**

When a member of an editorial team of an issue is also contributing as an author to the same issue, decisions regarding publication must be supervised by a senior member of the editorial board outside the editorial team of the given issue – as a default by the editor-in-chief if they are available.

**2. DUTIES OF REVIEWERS**

**Purpose**   
The peer review procedure of the journal serves to maintain and develop the academic standards of the journal by providing expert assessments as the basis for editorial decisions regarding whether an article is publishable as academic research or not and by advising on how the given article may be improved by the author.

**Standards of criticism**  
Reviews must adhere to the professional standards and criteria outlined in the review guide. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should articulate their views clearly, providing well-supported arguments. The language and tone of reviews should be suitable for direct communication with the author, ensuring constructive and respectful feedback

**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 excuse themselves from the review process.

**Confidentiality**  
Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

**Conflict of Interest**  
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 connected to the papers. As the reviewed articles are anonymized, it is the general responsibility of the editor to avoid such conflicts of interest, but the reviewer should declare any conflict of interest if they recognize the authorship of the paper.

**Transparency**

Reviews are anonymized. The editors communicate the content of the review to the author, usually supplemented by the editors’ comments and guidelines for eventual revisions.  As a default, the anonymized review is sent directly to the author. If the editor has communicated a summary of the review, the author has the right to retrieve the exact formulations of the original review by request. The final decision on publication lies with the editor (see Publication decisions).

**3: DUTIES OF AUTHORS**

**Concurrent Publication**

We do not consider manuscripts that have been sent concurrently to other journals.

The journal editor will make every effort to process and evaluate submissions in a timely fashion. Should an author decide to submit the manuscript to another journal, they must request the journal editor to withdraw the manuscript from consideration.

**Reporting Standards and Retention of data**  
Authors of reports of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. A paper should contain sufficiently detailed references to permit others to reconstruct its argument. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable. Evidence and underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. Authors are obliged to ensure that the raw evidence and data in connection with a paper are available by request for the editorial review and to retain such evidence and data for a reasonable time after publication.

**Plagiarism and Acknowledgement of Sources**  
Proper acknowledgment of the work of others is essential. Authors must cite publications that have significantly influenced their scholarly understanding of the research question. When using the work and/or words of others, authors must ensure appropriate citation or quotation. This requirement extends to the reworking and citation of their own previous work and the use of generative artificial intelligence. Additionally, quotations exceeding 400 words from the same work of art (e.g., a play, a novel) in total must be clarified in terms of rights.

**Authorship**  
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. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

**Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest**  
All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

**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 cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

**4: PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR**

**Identification of unethical behaviour**

* Misconduct and unethical behaviour may be identified and brought to the attention of the editors at any time, by anyone.
* Misconduct and unethical behaviour may include, but need not be limited to, examples as outlined above.
* Whoever informs the editors 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.

**Investigation**

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

**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.

**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.

**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.
* Formal retraction or withdrawal of a publication from the journal, in conjunction with informing Abstracting & Indexing services and the readership of the publication.