

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

The publication ethics and publication malpractice statement of *Communicationes Archaeologicae Hungariae* follows the COPE guidelines, the *Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors* and the *Code of Conduct for Journal Publishers*.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Publication decisions

The editor-in-chief ensures that all submitted research papers being considered for publication will undergo double-blind peer-review by at least two reviewers who are expert in the field. Article types that are not peer reviewed (e. g., book reviews) will undergo full editorial review by at least one member of the editorial team. The editor-in-chief is responsible for deciding which of the manuscripts submitted to the journal will be published. The decision must always be based on the importance, originality, validity, and clarity of the paper, its relevance to the scope of the journal and the reviewers' comments – without regard to the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, citizenship, religious beliefs, political philosophy, or institutional affiliation. The editor-in-chief consults other editors or reviewers in making the final decision.

The editor-in-chief has full authority over the entire editorial content of the journal and the timing of publishing that content.

Such legal requirements as libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism will also be considered.

Confidentiality

Editors and 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.

Disclosure

Editors and editorial board members will not use unpublished information disclosed in a submitted manuscript for their own research purposes without the authors' explicit written consent.

Involvement and cooperation in investigations

Editors (in conjunction with the publisher) will take responsive measures when ethical concerns are raised regarding a submitted manuscript or published paper. Every reported act of unethical publishing behavior will be investigated, even if it is discovered years after publication. Editors follow the COPE Flowcharts when dealing with cases of suspected misconduct. If the ethical

concern is found to be well-established, a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or another relevant note will be published in the journal.

REVIEWERS' RESPONSIBILITIES

Contribution to editorial decisions

The peer review process assists editors in making editorial decisions and, through editorial communications with authors, may assist authors in improving their manuscripts. Peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication.

Promptness

Any invited 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 decline the invitation to review.

Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review are confidential documents and must be treated as such; they must not be shown to or discussed with others, except if authorized by the editor-in-chief (who would only do so under exceptional and specific circumstances). This also applies to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively; observations should be clearly formulated with supporting arguments so that authors can use them for improving the manuscript. Personal criticism of the authors is inappropriate.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any observation, derivation, or argument that has been reported in previous publications but not referenced in the manuscript should be noted and accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also notify the editors of any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other unacknowledged manuscript (published or unpublished) of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure

Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the authors' express written consent. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for the reviewer's personal advantage. This also applies to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

AUTHORS' DUTIES

Reporting standards

Authors of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed and its results, followed by an objective discussion of the significance of the undertaking. The manuscript should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Review articles should be accurate, objective, and comprehensive, while editorial 'opinion' or perspective pieces should be clearly identified as such. Knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

Data access and retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data of their study together with the manuscript 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 following publication (preferably via an institutional or subject-based data repository or other data center), provided that the confidentiality of participants can be protected and legal rights concerning proprietary data do not preclude their release.

Originality, plagiarism and acknowledgement of sources

Authors should ensure that they have written and submit only entirely original work, and if they have used the ideas and/or words of others, that this has been appropriately cited. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the work reported in the manuscript should also be cited. Plagiarism takes many forms, from "passing off" another's paper as the author's own, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), to claiming results from research conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Multiple, duplicate, redundant or concurrent submission/publication

Papers describing essentially the same research should not be published in more than one journal or primary publication. Hence, authors should not submit for consideration a manuscript that has already been published in another journal. Submission of a manuscript concurrently to more than one journal is unethical publishing behavior and unacceptable.

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. 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.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

All sources of financial support for the work should be disclosed (including the grant number or other reference number if any).

Fundamental errors in published works

When authors discover significant errors or inaccuracies in their own published work, it is their obligation to promptly notify the journal's editors or publisher and cooperate with them to either correct the paper in the form of an erratum or to retract the paper. If the publisher or editors learn from a third party that a published work contains a significant error or inaccuracy, then it is the authors' obligation to promptly correct or retract the paper or provide evidence to the journal editors of the correctness of the paper.

Acknowledgement of sources

Authors should ensure that they have properly acknowledged the work of others, and should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately (from conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties) must not be used or reported without explicit written permission from the source. Authors should not use information obtained while providing confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, unless they have obtained the explicit written permission of the author(s) involved in these services.

Peer review

Authors are obliged to participate in the peer review process and cooperate fully by responding promptly to editors' requests for clarifications, and proof of ethics approval 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.

DUTIES OF THE PUBLISHER

Handling of unethical publishing behavior

In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism, the publisher, in close collaboration with the editors, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum, clarification or, in the most severe case, the retraction of the affected work. The publisher, together with the editors, shall take reasonable steps to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred, and under no circumstances encourage such misconduct or knowingly allow such misconduct to take place.

Access to journal content

The publisher is committed to the permanent availability and preservation of scholarly research and ensures accessibility by partnering with organizations and maintaining our own digital archive.

