

Obligations

Obligations for Authors

1. An author's central obligation is to present a concise, accurate account of the research performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance.
2. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to public sources of information to permit the author's peers to repeat the work.
3. An author should cite those publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work and that will guide the reader quickly to the earlier work that is essential for understanding the present investigation. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, should not be used or reported in the author's work without explicit permission from the investigator with whom the information originated. If the permission is obtained, the information should be referred to in a footnote. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, e.g. while refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, should be treated similarly.
4. Fragmentation of research papers should be avoided. A scientist who has done extensive work should organise publication so that each paper gives a complete account of a particular aspect of the general study.
5. It is inappropriate for an author to submit manuscripts describing essentially the same research to more than one journal of primary publication.
6. A criticism of a published paper may sometimes be justified, and in book reviews and review essays even advisable; however, in no case, including comments and discussion, is personal criticism considered to be appropriate.
7. To protect the integrity of authorship, only persons who have significantly contributed to the research and paper preparation should be listed as authors. The corresponding author attests to the fact that any others named as authors have seen the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication. Deceased persons who meet the criterion for co-authorship should be included, with a footnote reporting date of death. No fictitious names should be listed as authors or co-authors. The author who submits a manuscript for publication accepts the re-

sponsibility of having included as co-authors all persons who are appropriate and none who are inappropriate.

8. All contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an 'Acknowledgements' section. Examples of those who might be acknowledged include a person who provided purely technical help, writing assistance, spiritual support or a department chair who provided only general support.
9. It is advisable for authors to acknowledge their funding in a consistent fashion under a separate heading immediately following the heading 'Acknowledgements' and specified as 'Funding'. All research articles should have a funding acknowledgement in the form of a sentence as follows, with the funding agency written out in full, followed by the grant number in square brackets: This work was supported by the Ministry of Sciences and Higher Education [grant number xxx].
10. Adding acknowledgments for reviewers and/or editors who contribute to the improvement of the final version of the manuscript considerably is the Authors' duty. Editors reserve the right to add the respective footnote if the Authors omit the contribution of the indicated persons.

Editorial obligations

1. The editor gives unbiased consideration to all manuscripts offered for publication, judging each on its merits without regard to race, gender, ethnic origin, citizenship, world view, religious belief, political views or academic position of the author(s).
2. The editor processes manuscripts promptly.
3. The Editor-in-Chief has complete authority to accept a submitted paper for publication or to reject it. The editor may confer with other editors or referees for an evaluation to use in making this decision.
4. The editor and the editorial staff do not disclose any non-public information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than referees and potential referees.

5. The editor respects the intellectual independence of authors. The Editor-in-Chief may, however, reject manuscripts that approve or appeal to violence, racism, xenophobia, or present explicit lies.
6. The editor informs authors of the reviewed book and criticised articles, if their e-addresses are known, about the publication of criticisms of their works and invites them to discussion in the columns of the journal.
7. Editors avoid situations of real or perceived conflicts of interest. Editorial responsibility and authority for any manuscript authored by an editor and submitted to the editor's journal is delegated to some other qualified person, i.e. another editor of that journal.
8. Unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations disclosed in a submitted manuscript cannot be used in an editor's own research except with the consent of the author.
9. If the Editor-in-Chief is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance or conclusions of a paper published in his own journal are erroneous, he will facilitate publication of an appropriate paper pointing out the error and, if possible, correcting it.

Obligations for members of the Editorial Board

1. The role of the members of the Editorial Board is to create a practical programme of the journal within the general direction granted by the founders.
2. The members of the Editorial Board are expected to promote the journal by encouraging potential authors to submit their manuscripts to the editor.
3. The members of the Editorial Board are expected to peer review manuscripts received from the editor, which had been submitted for publication in the journal.
4. General regulations apply to manuscripts authored by the members of the Editorial Board submitted for publication in *PS/SS*.

Obligations for referees

1. In as much as the reviewing of manuscripts is an essential step in the publication process, every scientist has an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing within three weeks from obtaining the manuscript.
2. A chosen referee who feels inadequately qualified or being in an interest conflict or lacks the time to judge the research reported in a manuscript should return it promptly to the editor.
3. A referee of a manuscript should judge impartially the quality of the manuscript and respect the intellectual independence of the authors. In no case is personal criticism appropriate.
4. A referee should be sensitive to a conflict of interest when the manuscript under review is closely related to the referee's work in progress or published. If in doubt, the referee should return the manuscript promptly without review, advising the editor of the conflict of interest.
5. A referee should not evaluate a manuscript authored or co-authored by a person with whom the referee has a personal or professional connection if the relationship would bias judgment of the manuscript.
6. A referee should treat a manuscript sent for review as a confidential document. It should neither be shown to nor discussed with others except, in special cases, to persons from whom specific advice may be sought; in that event, the identities of those consulted should be disclosed to the editor.
7. Referees should explain and support their judgments adequately so that editors and authors may understand the basis of their comments. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation.
8. A referee should be alert to failure of authors to cite relevant work by other scientists. A referee should call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper or any manuscript submitted concurrently to another journal.
9. Referees should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, except with the consent of the author.