

## PUBLICATION ETHICS AND PUBLICATION MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

The publication of an article in a peer-reviewed *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* is a direct reflection of the quality of the work of the authors and the institutions that support them. Peer-reviewed articles support and embody the scientific method. It is therefore important to agree upon standards of expected ethical behavior for all parties involved in the act of publishing: the author, the journal editor, the peer reviewer, the publisher and the society. Any complaints regarding any material published in the journal should be directly sent to the Managing Editor (nenad.vekaric@du.t-com.hr).

## DUTIES AND RIGHTS OF THE AUTHORS

*Reporting standards* Authors of reports 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 paper. A paper should contain all the references to permit others to locate and consult the sources on which the work is based. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

*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. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. The journal actively checks for plagiarism by selecting eminent reviewers from related fields and by specifically stressing the issue of plagiarism.

*Licence terms* This journal employs the CC-BY-NC open access licence. Authors who publish with our journal retain copyright and grant the journal the right of publication with the work licensed under a Creative Commons Licence CC-BY-NC that allows others to share the work with an acknowledgement of the work's authorship and publication in this journal.

*Acknowledgement of sources* Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given by means of notes written according to bibliographical standards. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, must not be used or reported without explicit permission from the source, and the acknowledgement should be made clearly. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, must not be used without the explicit written permission of the author of the work involved in these services.

*Authorship of the paper* All those who have made significant contributions to the paper should be listed as co-authors.

*Appeal against the editorial decision* The authors have the right to appeal against any editorial decision. A statement with rebuttal should be sent directly to the Editor-in-Chief or Managing Editors.

## DUTIES OF EDITORS

### *Criteria*

Editors should take all reasonable steps to ensure the quality of the edition. Editors' decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based only on the paper's importance, originality, clarity, and the relevance to the history of Dubrovnik and its area.

*Publication decisions* The editors of the journal are responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. In doing so, they follow the procedure established by the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts. The validation of the work in question and its importance to researchers and readers must always drive such decisions.

*Peer review* All manuscripts will be subject to a well-established, fair, unbiased double-blind peer review and refereeing procedure of at least two reviewers, and are considered on the basis of their significance, novelty and relevance to the topic of the journal. The review output will be: accepted, subject to revision, or rejected. A paper once rejected will not be considered again for review. The review process may take approximately 9 months to be completed. For accepted paper, should authors be requested by the editor to revise the text, the revised version should be submitted within 1 month, unless otherwise agreed.

*Fair play* The editors should give manuscripts for evaluation with regard to their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

*The confidentiality of the peer-review process* All editors should ensure that material submitted to the journal remains confidential while under review.

*Conflicts of interest* Editors will make fair and unbiased decisions independent of commercial considerations, and should ensure a fair and appropriate peer-review process. Editors will recuse themselves (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors or institutions connected to the papers. When deciding upon the reviewers, editors will take in consideration any risk of conflict of interest.

*Unethical publishing* When ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper, or when they receive notice of the questionable publishing behavior, the editors will discuss and take all the appropriate measures to investigate the claim, even if it is discovered years after publication.

## DUTIES OF REVIEWERS

*Contribution to editorial decisions* Peer-review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper. Peer-review is an essential component of scholarly communication, and lies at the heart of the scientific method.

*Promptness* Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process.

*Conflict of interest* Reviewers should notify the editors and recuse themselves from the review process in any case of conflict of interest regarding the author, topic, etc.

*Confidentiality* Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

*Standards of objectivity* Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

*Acknowledgement of sources* Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an 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 paper of which they have personal knowledge. Besides on the already established editorial practice, these guidelines are based on: <http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/rights> and <http://www.publicationethics.org/files/u2>