The Journal of Illiberalism Studies

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

The Journal of Illiberalism Studies (JIS) Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement (PEM) follows the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Core Topics (2022) and its Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing. The following selected principles are drawn from these practices.

Academic Standards:

Book reviews, discussions, and symposiums are the only materials the JIS publishes that are not peer reviewed. All research articles undergo a rigorous and equitable double-blind peer-review performed by professionals in the field of illiberalism studies selected by the chief editor and assistant editor. Before a manuscript is reviewed, it is first vetted by the JIS chief editor. Following the review process, the chief editor assesses the quality of the peer review to ensure the journals standards are mirrored in the reviewer's feedback.

Manuscripts will not be accepted without undergoing this process nor will an author be guaranteed acceptance of their initial manuscript submission. If an article is rejected, the author will be provided with an explanation as to why either the chief editor or assistant editor desk rejected it or why it did not pass the peer-review process. The date of publication will be provided with all published research, including non-peer reviewed material.

Policies on authorship and contribution:

All material published by the JIS is available for free online. In accordance with the regulations stipulated by the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), the JIS demands no publication fees from its authors, publishes articles under a Creative Commons license (CC BY 4.0), and the author(s) retain(s) unrestricted copyright and publishing rights to their own article(s).

The JIS is committed to equity. We encourage authors to be sensitive to their own epistemic practices, including as reflected in their citations' gender balance and representation of scholarship by authors from the country or countries under study.

The JIS expects that all authors use their legal name unless in cases where publishing could lead to acts of repression (e.g. the author is persecuted by a regime or non-state actor). Ghost authors are therefore forbidden.

Handling of complaints, appeals, and allegations of research misconduct:

All complaints, appeals, and allegations of research misconduct, whether related to authorship disputes, plagiarism, data falsification and / or fabrication, must be handled with transparency and fairness. The chief editor will assess each complaint, initiating fact-finding where appropriate.

Complainants against a specific author(s) must be informed that the issue cannot be pursued without notifying the corresponding or accused author(s), and the relevant funding body in cases where outside funding is allocated to support research. Complainants directed towards the JIS editorial board or peer reviewers will be given the appropriate attention they deserve. These may include breaches of confidentiality, undisclosed conflicts of interest, misuse of privileged information, irregularities in editorial processes, and complaints that journal staff are unresponsive. If the editor in chief deems this complaint to be legitimate, a thorough internal investigation will be conducted following COPE guidelines.

Plagiarism cases will involve textual comparison to determine if literal, substantial, or paraphrased content was used without appropriate credit. Finally, allegations of data falsification or fabrication warrant scrutiny of research integrity, including potential referral to the institution for formal investigation. The chief editor may solicit third-party input when clarifying facts. All parties involved should be given the opportunity to respond and resolve the matter constructively.

Options for post-publication discussion and correction:

In the case where an article published in the JIS demands substantive revisions due to analytical flaws discovered after the fact, the author(s) will have the opportunity to retract the piece in its entirety or to resubmit a revised version. This new manuscript will be provided with the same level of peer review as any other manuscript. If this revised version is accepted, an editor's note will be appended to the front matter of the article indicating that this research had originally appeared in the JIS and featured different findings.

If an article showcases no discernible flaws in its methodology but contradictory findings or novel data is uncovered, the chief editor retains the right to provide an editorial note clarifying what has changed since the articles first publication. In the case where another scholar disagrees with the results, they will be allowed to respond. However, their research will undergo the same peer review process as all other publications.

Measures to ensure academic integrity:

If an author(s) is found to have engaged in plagiarism, citation manipulation, data falsification and / or fabrication, their article will be denied and the author forbidden from submitting manuscripts to the JIS in the future.

If the article is discovered to have committed one or more of these acts after its publication, the piece will be deleted, a brief statement will be published on the JIS website indicating what had occurred, and the author will be denied the opportunity to publish their work in future editions of the journal.

Policy on conflicts of interest:

The JIS is committed to maintaining the integrity and transparency of the publication by identifying potential conflicts of interest that may influence editorial decisions, peer review, or research reporting. All participants in the publication process, including reviewers and editors, must disclose any financial, personal, or professional affiliations that could be perceived as influencing their judgment. Therefore, prior to submitting a manuscript, authors are required to disclose all sources of funding and the specific role of funders in the study design, data collection, analysis, and publication decisions. Reviewers, the chief editor, and assistant editor must also recuse themselves from handling manuscripts where a conflict exists.

Policy on data sharing and reproducibility:

To achieve greater transparency, replicability, and trust in findings, authors are invited to enhance their findings by sharing associated data and coding materials. However, while data sharing is encouraged, it is not mandated. If data is cited in a publication, it must be made available to the chief editor and reviewers for the sake of replicating their findings. Yet, if sensitive information is present in this data, the chief editor will judge whether an exception can be made following COPE guidelines.

Policy on ethical oversight:

In accordance with the COPE guidelines, manuscripts will be evaluated to ensure they meet the JIS ethical guidelines. To this end, the JIS editorial board will ensure that the privacy, dignity, and safety of human subjects is protected along with ensuring that sensitive or confidential information is used in an appropriate manner.

Authors are expected to:

- Obtain informed consent from their subjects in either a written or verbal format.
- Clarify to their subjects the extent to which their personal details will be publicly disclosed.
- Identify which individuals will have access to their personal information.
- When possible, anonymize their subjects.
- Omit information published in their research which can potentially compromise their subject's wellbeing.
- Ensure sensitive information is stored on a secure device.
- Consult with the IRB representative on the best practices to ensure their subject and their information is safeguarded.

Statement on Artificial Intelligence:

The JIS recognizes the benefits that Generative AI (GenAI) can bring to academic contributions along with the potential challenges it may pose. Therefore, in accordance with the Elsevier guidelines on the use of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in writing, the JIS lists the following requirements:

For Authors.

Authors remain accountable for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of their work ensuring transparency through disclosure statements regarding the usage of GenAI in their work and protecting data privacy and intellectual property. GenAI tools must not replace human critical thinking or be listed as authors.

Authors must disclose how and why AI tools were used, fostering transparency and trust. GenAI cannot be used to create or modify figures, images, or artwork in manuscripts, except when AI use is an integral, reproducible part of the research methodology, and even then, full details must be provided. AI-generated graphical abstracts are prohibited, though AI-assisted cover art may be allowed with prior approval and appropriate rights clearance. Regarding written content, GenAI is not allowed for written material. Authors may use AI to suggest how to present their research, questions relating to grammar or word choices, and general recommendations regarding how their manuscript can be improved. Still, the written portion of the article must fully be original and that of the author.

For Reviewers

As is emphasized by Elsevier, confidentiality is paramount in the peer review process, and reviewers must not upload manuscripts or review reports into GenAI tools. Doing so could violate authors' confidentiality, proprietary rights, and data privacy. Therefore, peer reviewers must rely on human judgment, critical thinking, and accountability rendering the usage of AI technologies to analyze or evaluate manuscripts unacceptable.

Reviewers remain solely responsible for the content and integrity of their reports. While authors may use GenAI tools responsibly and transparently in manuscript preparation, after disclosing their intent to do so, reviewers must not rely on such tools in their evaluations.