

The Code of Conduct of the scientific journal “Zagreber germanistische Beiträge” adheres to the European Code of Conduct for Integrity in Research established by ALLEA (All European Academies) and the Code of Conduct of COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics). To ensure the comprehensive application and implementation of these codes, the following text incorporates language and structure derived from both sources. Whenever feasible, gender-neutral references to individuals are employed, irrespective of grammatical gender.

## **1. Editorial Responsibilities**

### **1.1 Decision on Publication**

The editorial board ensures that all submitted research papers considered for publication undergo a double-blind review by at least two experts. Papers not requiring a peer review process (such as reviews and reports) will be assessed by at least one member of the editorial team. The final decision regarding the publication of the submitted manuscripts rests with the Editor-in-Chief. This decision is based on the relevance, originality, and clarity of the contribution, its significance to the journal's field of research and the comments provided by the reviewers. It is imperative to note that extraneous circumstances such as the authors' origin, gender, lifestyle choices etc. will not influence the decision. The Editor-in-Chief may seek input from other members of the Editorial Board, the journal's advisory board, or additional reviewers in reaching the final decision. The Editor-in-Chief possesses full authority in decision-making and is accountable for all editorial content of the journal as well as the publication schedule.

### **1.2 Confidentiality**

Members of the editorial board and editorial staff are prohibited from disclosing any information regarding a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the respective author, reviewers, other editorial advisors and, if applicable, the journal's publisher. They are also prohibited from utilizing unpublished information from a submitted manuscript for their own research purposes without the explicit written consent of the author.

### **1.3 Handling Ethical Concerns**

The Editorial Board will take appropriate action upon the emergence of ethical concerns regarding a submitted manuscript or published paper. Any reported instances or suspicion of unethical behavior will be thoroughly investigated.

Should the concerns be substantiated, an appropriate notice will subsequently be published in the following issue of the journal.

## **2. Responsibilities of the Authors**

### **2.1 Expectations Specific to Text Type**

An original scientific paper [Croatian: izvorni znanstveni rad] presents heretofore unpublished results derived from the author's own scientific research. The conducted research and its presentation must be comprehensible and verifiable.

A research review [Croatian: pregledni rad] is a scientific paper that comprehensively and critically presents a (partial) field of research in which the author is actively engaged. The author should clearly articulate the position of their previously published work within this field of research.

A professional paper [Croatian: stručni rad] begins with already established results of scientific research and emphasizes their practical application or dissemination for educational purposes. Such a paper provides valuable contributions to the subject matter, irrespective of the author's original research.

### **2.2 Truthfulness, Originality, Tolerance**

The authors guarantee that the submitted work is entirely based on their own research and contains no knowingly false statements. Any research findings, ideas, or formulations borrowed from other authors (including previously published results of the author's own work) should be appropriately cited and the sources fully disclosed.

Plagiarism can manifest in various forms, ranging from presenting someone else's work or research findings as one's own to surreptitiously copying or rephrasing significant portions or even just fragments of others' work. Any form of plagiarism is the result of a serious lapse in academic integrity or unethical conduct and as such will not be tolerated.

Respect for the diversity of approaches and ideas in research must be paramount, and all forms of hate speech and discrimination must be avoided. Measures should be taken to prevent any conflict of interest.

### **2.3 Multiple Submission**

Submitting a manuscript to multiple journals constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is hence deemed unacceptable. Papers whose main parts have already been published will not be accepted. In exceptional circumstances, justified by thematic relevance to the journal, the already published text must undergo substantial revision and recontextualisation. However, such submissions cannot be categorized as original scientific papers (see above, 2.1.).

Once accepted for publication, no contribution may be published elsewhere without the explicit permission of the Editorial Board.

## **2.4 Authorship**

Designated authorship should be restricted to individuals who have significantly contributed to the conception, execution, or interpretation of the submitted paper. All individuals who have made substantial contributions should be listed as authors. The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that all contributing co-authors are included and no uninvolved individuals are listed as authors. In addition to that, the author corresponding with the Editorial Board should ensure that all co-authors have reviewed and approved the final version of the paper and consented to its publication.

## **2.5 Acknowledgement of Sources**

Authors are required to ensure that they acknowledge the work of others in adherence to the previously established guidelines. All pertinent titles relevant to the paper should be cited in the bibliography. Conversely, inclusion of titles not referenced in the paper should be avoided. Information acquired privately (via conversations, correspondence, or discussions with third parties) must not be used or disclosed without the express permission of the source. Authors should refrain from using information obtained during the provision of confidential services, such as peer review of manuscripts, unless they have obtained the written consent for such usage from the involved author.

## **2.6 Peer Review**

Authors are obligated to engage in the peer review process and cooperate fully by promptly addressing the editors' requests for clarification of outstanding issues, evidence of ethical conduct, and copyright permissions. In instances of revisions following peer review, authors should provide comprehensive and timely responses to the reviewers' comments, revise their manuscript accordingly, and submit the revised version to the journal by the specified deadline.

### **3. Reviewers' Responsibilities**

#### **3.1 Contribution to Editorial Decisions**

Reviewers assist the Editorial Board members in making decisions and can help authors in enhancing their manuscripts through communication. The peer review process is a fundamental part of scholarly communication.

#### **3.2 Meeting Deadlines**

Invited reviewers who do not feel qualified to review the work at hand or who are aware that they cannot provide a timely review should promptly notify the Editorial Board and decline the invitation to review.

#### **3.3 Confidentiality**

All manuscripts received for review are confidential documents and must be treated as such. They should not be shared or discussed with others unless authorized by the Editor-in-Chief under special circumstances. This also applies to invited reviewers who decline the invitation to review.

Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted paper may not be used for the reviewer's own research without the explicit written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained in the review process must be kept confidential and should not be exploited for the reviewer's personal benefit. This stipulation also applies to reviewers who decline the invitation to review.

#### **3.4 Standards of Objectivity**

Assessments should be conducted impartially. Observations should be clearly articulated and supported with arguments, enabling authors to use them for manuscript improvement. Personal criticism of authors is inappropriate.

#### **3.5 Acknowledgement of Sources**

Where appropriate, reviewers should identify relevant work, findings, and contexts (with references) that have not been addressed by the authors. If significant similarities or overlaps between the manuscript under review and other (published or unpublished) manuscripts are noted, it is imperative to inform the editors.