

Ethic Code of Medicus

Reviewing process

All research articles proposed for publishing in Medicus must undergo a rigorous review. The peer review process respects the originality and personal viewpoints of the authors, but reserves the editor's right to demand changes, based on reviewers' comments in order to preserve high scientific quality. The review process consists in an initial editor screening and an anti-plagiarism scan using Turnitin platform. If the manuscript passes the initial tests, it is being sent to at least two reviewers in order to be blindly evaluated.

The Double-Blind Peer Review process

The initial appraisal of each manuscript is made by the Editors. In case the topic, treatment and geographical focus fit to journal's aims and objectives, the anonymized manuscript is assigned to peer-reviewers. Once the reviewers have decided, i.e., acceptance, revision, or rejection of your manuscript, the Editor-in-Chief makes the final decision. We apply a double-blind peer review, meaning that the author's name and affiliation are not made public to the reviewers. The reviewers name and affiliation are also not revealed to the author. Review requests are sent to peers that are qualified to assess the works in terms of the relevance of their thematic, theoretical, methodological, and/or geographic expertise. In cases of desk-rejections, the argumentation will be motivated, but cannot unfortunately be extended and detailed. A rejection based on the outcome of a review process will be backed up by the actual reviews, and a motivation by the editor. A decision on the manuscript generally may be expected within 5 weeks of submission, although delays in obtaining reviews may prolong this process. Manuscripts are sent out for review electronically, and all correspondence takes place via e-mail. If reviewers recommend revision of the manuscript, authors are requested to resubmit their revisions within 5 weeks after receiving the notification. They are asked to then also submit a letter (as attachment to the editor's e-mail) with a detailed description of how they have responded to the separate issues raised by the reviewers. Occasionally, Medicus invites guest-editors who wish to organize a special issue. In such cases, the guest-editors are responsible for setting up and carrying out the review process. After completion of the review process, they will issue an editorial advice. Also in this case, the Editor-in-Chief is responsible for the final decision.

Medicus is committed in assuring the highest academic standards in the publication process and an ethical behaviour for all the parties involved in publication process (editors, authors, and reviewers). Therefore, Medicus adopted an ethic code based on the guidelines developed by the Committee on Publications Ethics (COPE) to ensure an objective, impartial and fair review process.

EDITORS' OBLIGATIONS

➤ **Review and publication decision**

The editor has complete responsibility and authority to accept or reject a submitted manuscript. Based on an initial screening process an anti-plagiarism scan, the editor decides whether the manuscript is suitable for review or not. The reviewing process consists in an initial check for plagiarism using the Turnitin platform and requiring opinions from at least two anonymous reviewers. The editor reserves the right to reject the manuscript, considering reviewers' opinions or any concerns relating copyright or plagiarism violations. The editor may also refuse to publish future articles from the authors who have committed plagiarism. When necessary, editors should be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies from anyone who might have made a mistake.

- **Anti-Discrimination Policy.** The editor should evaluate all manuscripts submitted for publication without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship and respecting the intellectual independence of the authors.
- **Confidentiality.** The editor and any editorial staff should treat manuscripts as confidential documents, not providing information about submitted manuscripts, to anyone else except for the corresponding author, reviewers, or other editorial advisers.
- **Privileged information.** The editor should not use the information gained from unpublished submitted manuscripts for its own research.
- **Conflicts of interest.** Any potential conflict of interest relating to a manuscript should be immediately disclosed to the editor in chief of the journal.
- **Appealing publication decision.** An author may contest the decision of rejecting his/her submitted manuscript by giving his/her arguments. The final decision is taken in any case by the editor in chief. In this process, the editor in chief may consult other editorial members of the journal or the reviewers.
- **Corrections and retraction.** If after publication errors are identified, the editor will ask author to make necessary corrections, mentioning the date when corrections have been made. If these corrections are significant, implying the invalidation of a considerable part of the research, the manuscript may be retracted, indicating the reason for this decision.
- **Steps in case of detection of plagiarism.** If the editor identifies suspected plagiarism, they contact the author(s) who submitted the manuscript and ask for an explanation within two weeks. If the editor does not receive any response from the author(s), he/she will reject the manuscript immediately. If the editor (or the reviewers who notify him/her) finds that the suspected manuscript has been plagiarized from a previously published work, it informs the chief representative of the institution where the author(s)' works or is affiliated. In addition, the editor informs the author(s) that her/manuscript has been flagged as plagiarism and that author may not be allowed to submit his manuscripts to Medicus journal again.

AUTHORS' OBLIGATIONS

- **Multiple or concurrent publication.** Authors should ensure that they submit original manuscripts, which are not essentially the same research as in other manuscripts and which have not previously been published. Authors should not submit the same manuscript to more than one journal simultaneously.
- **Originality and plagiarism.** Authors should make sure that they appropriately cite/quote meticulously when using work of other authors. Plagiarism constitutes unethical scientific behaviour and is not acceptable, whether is related to copying or paraphrasing the work of others without mentioning or citing them correctly according to the citation (APA) style which Medicus journal applies.
- **Access to manuscript data.** Authors must be prepared to provide the raw data for editorial review if requested and should be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after the publication.
- **Conflicts of interest.** Authors should disclose to the editor in chief any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript.
- **Errors after publication.** When an error/inaccuracy is identified after the manuscript has been published, it is authors' responsibility to correct/retract the manuscript.

REVIEWERS' OBLIGATIONS

- **Objectivity.** The reviewing process should be objectively done by the reviewers. Reviewers should adhere and complete the evaluation form of the journal by providing clear and concise recommendations in order to improve manuscripts, but without knowing any information regarding the authors. The reviewer should not address any personal criticism to the authors. If they recommend that a manuscript should not be published, they should justify their decisions and support it with arguments. Reviewers may be asked to read the revised manuscript if there are concerns that the paper has not been revised according to their recommendations. If the reviewers consider that they are unqualified in order to evaluate the manuscript or the objectivity/correctness of evaluation is threatened by any reason, he/she should announce the editor in chief of the journal.
- **Anonymity.** All manuscripts received by reviewers as part of the review process must be treated as confidential documents. The reviewer may not show them to other people or discuss them with other people unless the editors have given permission in advance.

- **Originality.** The reviewer should inform the editors in case of any suspicion that the content of the reviewed article resembles or overlaps with the content of another already published work that the reviewer is familiar with.
- **Source citations.** The reviewers should include in the recommendations they provide to the authors any concerns regarding mis-conducted or any omitted citations.
- **Privileged information.** The reviewer should not use the information gained from reviewing submitted manuscripts for its own research or personal advantage.