

Studia Neoaristotelica

A Journal of Analytical Scholasticism

PUBLICATION ETHICS STATEMENT

(Accepted February 21, 2014; revisions approved February 27, 2014)

The editorial team of *Studia Neoaristotelica* is committed to ensuring the integrity of the publication process by upholding the Code of Conduct of the Committee of Publication Ethics ([COPE](#)). Conformance to standards of ethical behavior is therefore expected of all parties involved: Authors, Editors, Reviewers, and the Publisher.

- **Authors**

Authors should present an objective discussion of the significance of research work as well as sufficient detail and references to permit others to judge the academic and scientific merits of the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable. Review articles should also be objective, comprehensive, and accurate accounts of the state of the art. The authors should ensure that their work is entirely original works, and if the work and/or words of others have been used, this has been appropriately acknowledged. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. Authors should not submit articles describing essentially the same research to more than one journal. The corresponding author should ensure that there is a full consensus of all co-authors in approving the final version of the paper and its submission for publication. Authors have permission to suggest potential reviewers (which the editors are free to ignore if they so decide).

- **Editors**

Editors should evaluate manuscripts exclusively on the basis of their academic merit. An editor must not use unpublished information in the editor's own research without the express written consent of the author. Editors should take reasonable responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper.

- **Reviewers**

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviews should be conducted objectively, and observations should be formulated clearly with supporting arguments, so that authors can use them for improving the paper. 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 himself from the review process. 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 paper. The review process is double blind, i.e. the reviewer and author don't know each other's identity. The deadline for reviews is negotiable and should be clarified with the editors and the authors at the beginning of the review process.

