

Momentum Quarterly

Publication code of ethics and conduct^[1]

Version 1.0, December 21, 2020

All parties involved in the publication process (authors, editors, peer reviewers, publisher) are requested to abide by common standards of ethical behaviour and be clear on the conflict resolution mechanism in place at *Momentum Quarterly*.

General ethical principles

The publication code of ethics and conduct for our journal adheres to the Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors of COPE - the Committee on Publication Ethics (<https://publicationethics.org/files/2008%20Code%20of%20Conduct.pdf>).

COPE's 17 pillars are:

1. General duties and responsibilities of editors
2. Relations with readers
3. Relations with authors
4. Relations with reviewers
5. Relations with editorial board members
6. Relations with journal owners and publishers
7. Editorial and peer review processes
8. Quality assurance
9. Protecting individual data
10. Encouraging ethical research (e.g. research involving humans or animals)
11. Dealing with possible misconduct
12. Ensuring the integrity of the academic record
13. Intellectual property

14. Encouraging debate
15. Complaints
16. Commercial considerations
17. Conflicts of interest

Beyond the general terms, to which we adhere, *Momentum Quarterly* has put a mechanism in place to handle complaints. Complaints can be related to possible misconduct (point 11), conflict of interest (point 17) or any other malpractice.

Complaints mechanism

Step 1

If an author of a manuscript feels unduly treated, appeals should in the first instance be made directly to the editor concerned in writing.

Step 2

If the appeal is not resolved satisfactorily, the editorial team will discuss the appeal. The responsible editor will abstain from taking part in the ultimate decision on the appeal.

Step 3

If an issue cannot be resolved, any party involved can refer a complaint to the academic ombudsperson of *Momentum Quarterly*.

The academic ombudsperson is Prof. Dr. Jakob Kapeller
(<https://www.uni-due.de/soziooekonomie/kapeller.php>),

University Duisburg-Essen
Institute for Socio-Economics
Forsthausweg 2, 47057 Duisburg
Germany
Phone: +49/203/379-4325
Email: jakob.kapeller@uni-due.de

If the academic ombudsperson has links to the subject of the complaint, either via the journal, or complainant, the Managing board of the Publishing institution will promptly name a replacement.

Step 4

The ombudsperson checks that the complaint:

- is against a party to the publication process,

- is within the remit of the present 'Publication code of ethics and conduct',
- includes all required information.

Step 5

The ombudsperson listens to all parties involved, negotiates a compromise and publishes a succinct report including actionable steps to resolve the matter. The report is sent to the editors and complainant. In case where no compromise is found, the ombudsperson has the authority and obligation to impose a decision.

Step 6

The responsible editor has the duty to ensure that the compromise / decision is implemented promptly.

Conduct

Conduct of Editors

Fair play

All articles published in Momentum Quarterly undergo a rigorous double-blind peer review process, which is conducted by a member of the editorial team. Submitted manuscripts are evaluated for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors. The Publishing institution does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, gender, genetic predisposition or carrier status, or sexual orientation in its publishing programmes, services and activities.

Confidentiality

The identity of the reviewer and author are always concealed from both parties. 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 Publishing institution, as appropriate.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an Editor's own research without the explicit written consent of the author(s).

Publication decisions

The publication decision is made by the editorial team based upon the reviews. In case of doubt, i.e. with at least one vote in favor of publishing, the article will be published.

Conduct of Peer reviewers

Contribution to editorial decisions

Peer review assists the editors in making editorial decisions and, through the editorial communication with the author, assists the author in improving the manuscript. Each manuscript is reviewed by at least two referees.

Promptness

Momentum Quarterly seeks to accomplish the review process in a timely manner. The deadline for handing in reviews is four weeks, a first decision (rejection / revise and resubmit / acceptance for publication) should take no longer than eight weeks. Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its timely review will be impossible should immediately notify the Editor so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

Confidentiality

Submitted manuscripts under review are treated confidentially prior to their publication. They are not shown to or discussed with others except if authorised by the editor.

Standards of constructive criticism

Reviews should be conducted in good faith. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable. Referees should express their views clearly with appropriate supporting arguments. Important points to be addressed by reviewers are: scientific, but (ideally) understandable for non-academics too; strengths (esp. if that's something that should be expanded) and weaknesses of the paper (e.g., lack of literature, empirical evidence, contradictory reasoning, and how to improve it). Articles should have a good balance between scientific argument and socio-political relevance.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be 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 published data of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have overt conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the

submission. Reviewers should be transparent about any link they might have to the author of the submission under review.

Conduct of Authors

Reporting standards

Authors reporting results of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the manuscript. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour. They are unacceptable and need to be reported to the editor or Ombudsperson by any party involved. In case of research misconduct or malpractice, authors face action including, but not limited to: publishing an erratum or corrigendum (correction); retracting the article; taking up the matter with the head of department or dean of the author's institution and/or relevant academic bodies or societies; or taking appropriate legal action.

Originality and plagiarism

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Submitted manuscripts will be checked with plagiarism-checking software as part of the editorial process.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Undisclosed submission of the same manuscript to more than one journal constitutes unethical behaviour. It is unacceptable and will be reported.

Acknowledgement of sources

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.

Authorship

All parties who have made a substantive contribution to the article need to be listed as authors. All authors listed have substantially contributed to the research. All authors have given consent for publication.

Acknowledgements

All contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an Acknowledgements section. Please supply any personal acknowledgements separately to the main text to facilitate anonymous peer review.

Human subjects and personal information

If the work involved human subjects and personal information, the author must follow rigorous data protection standards and clearly identify these in the manuscript.

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 their interpretation in the manuscript. *Momentum Quarterly* requires all authors to acknowledge any financial support received that supported the work on the manuscript.

Fundamental errors in published works

Momentum Quarterly is committed to maintaining an accurate and transparent academic record, including publishing corrections and retractions. Authors must contact the editors to identify and correct any material errors upon discovery, whether prior or subsequent to publication of their work. *Momentum Quarterly* will always publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

[1] We prepared *Momentum Quarterly*'s publication code of ethics and conduct following closely the Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors of COPE - the Committee on Publication Ethics (<https://publicationethics.org/files/2008%20Code%20of%20Conduct.pdf>), the De Gruyter's Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement (https://www.degruyter.com/staticfiles/pdfs/140117_Publication_ethics_and_publication_malpractice_FINAL.pdf), and the *Internet Policy Review*'s Publication code of ethics and conduct (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1cN8pFKUJETaKi0JIWFCVcGDbLyFGvLW/view?usp=sharing>).