Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

For all parties involved in the act of publishing (the author, the journal editor(s), the peer reviewer and the publisher) it is necessary to agree upon standards of expected ethical behaviour. The ethics statements for our journal are based on the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors and Publishers.

Duties of Editors

Fair play and editorial independence

Submitted manuscripts to „Forum Exegese and Hochschuldidaktik: Verstehen von Anfang an“/”Forum Exegesis and Didactics for Higher Education: Understanding from the very Beginning“ are evaluated exclusively on the basis of their academic or rather didactical merit (importance, originality, validity, clarity) and without regard to the author’s race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy. Decisions to edit and publish are independent of the policies of governments or any other agencies outside of the journal itself. The Editors have full authority over the entire editorial content of the journal and the timing of publication of that content.

Confidentiality

The 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 and conflicts of interest

Editors and editorial board members must not use unpublished information disclosed in a submitted manuscript for their personal research purposes without having the authors’ explicit written consent. Privileged information or ideas obtained by editors as a result of handling the manuscript will be kept confidential and not used for their personal advantage. Editors will recuse themselves from considering manuscripts in which personal conflicts of interest might result from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships/connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions connected to the papers; instead, they will ask another member of the editorial board to handle the manuscript.

Publication decisions
The editors ensure that all submitted manuscripts being considered for publication undergo peer-review by at least two reviewers who are expert in the corresponding field. The handling editor of the journal is responsible for deciding which of the submitted articles will be published. The editor will 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 editor may consult with other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

**Involvement and cooperation in investigations**

Editors will take responsive measures when ethical concerns are raised regarding a submitted manuscript or published paper. Every reported act of unethical publishing behaviour will be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication. If, on investigation, the ethical concern is reasonable, a correction, retraction, expression of concern or other note as may be relevant, will be published in the journal.

**Duties of Reviewers**

**Contribution to editorial decisions**

Peer review assists editors in making editorial decisions and, through editorial communications with authors, may also assist authors in improving their manuscripts. Peer review is an essential component of each formal scholarly communication and is a foundation of scientific endeavour. Every scholar who wishes to contribute to the scientific process has an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

**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 immediately inform the editors and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

**Confidentiality**

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the editor (who would only do so under exceptional and specific circumstances). This is also valid for invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

**Standards of objectivity**

Reviews should be conducted objectively and observations formulated clearly with supporting arguments that help authors to improve their manuscripts. Personal criticism of the authors is regarded as being inappropriate.

**Acknowledgement of sources**
Reviewers need to identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that is an observation, derivation or argument that has been reported in previous publications has to be necessarily accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor’s attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other manuscript (published or unpublished) of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage without the explicit written consent of the authors. This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

Reviewers should not consider evaluating 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 submission.

Duties of Authors

Reporting standards

Authors of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed and the results, followed by an objective discussion of its significance. The manuscript should contain sufficient detail and references to prevent others from replicating the work. Review articles should be accurate, objective and comprehensive, while editorial ‘opinion’ or perspective pieces should be identifiable as such. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

Data access and retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data of their study in addition to 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 10 years after the date of publication (preferably via an institutional or subject-based data repository or other data centre), provided that the confidentiality of the participants can be protected and legal rights concerning proprietary data do not preclude their release.

Originality and plagiarism

Authors should ensure that they have written and submitted only entirely original works, and if they have used the work and/or words of others, that this has been quoted correctly and cited appropriately. Furthermore, publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the work reported in the manuscript should 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 behaviour and is unacceptable.

**Multiple, duplicate, redundant or concurrent submission/publication**

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

**Authorship of the manuscript**

Only persons who meet the following authorship criteria should be listed as (co-)authors in the manuscript as they must be able to take public responsibility for the content: (a) made significant contributions to the conception, design, execution, data acquisition, or analysis/interpretation of the study; (b) drafted the manuscript or revised it critically for important intellectual content; (c) have seen and approved the final version of the paper and agreed to its submission for publication. Every person who made substantial contributions to the work reported in the manuscript (such as technical help, writing and editing assistance, general support) but who do not meet the criteria for authorship must not be listed as an author, but should be acknowledged in the ”Acknowledgements” section after their written permission to be named has been obtained. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate coauthors (according to the above definition) and no inappropriate co-authors are included in the list of authors and verify that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to its submission for publication.

**Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

Authors should—as early as possible (generally by submitting a disclosure form at the time of submission and including a statement in the manuscript)—disclose any conflicts of interest that might have an influence on the results or their interpretation in the manuscript. Examples of potential conflicts of interest that should be disclosed include financial ones such as honoraria, educational grants or other funding, participation in speakers’ bureaus, membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest, and paid expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements, as well as non-financial ones such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs in the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript. All sources of financial support for the work should be disclosed.

**Acknowledgement of sources**

Authors should ensure that they have properly acknowledged the work of others, and are to 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 any information obtained in the course of providing confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, unless they have obtained the explicit written permission of the author(s) of the work involved in the referring services.

**Human or animal subjects**

If the work involves the use of human participants, the authors are to ensure that all procedures were performed in compliance with all relevant laws and institutional guidelines and that the appropriate institutional committee(s) has approved them. Authors should include a statement in the manuscript that informed consent was obtained for experimentation with human participants. The privacy rights of human participants must always be observed.

**Peer review**

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

**Fundamental errors in published works**

When an author discovers significant errors or inaccuracies in his or her own published work, it is the author’s obligation to promptly notify the journal’s editors and cooperate with them to either correct the paper in the form of an appropriate erratum or to retract the paper. If the 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 to provide evidence to the journal editors of the correctness of his or her own paper.

**Duties of the Publisher**

**Handling of unethical publishing behaviour**

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.