

## Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Name of the journal .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Ownership and management .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Revenue sources .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Advertising.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Open access policy.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Publication schedule .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Copyright and licensing information.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Data sharing and reproducibility.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Archiving .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Access to current and past journal content.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Archiving policy.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>The website .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Editorial board – profile and tasks .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Scientific advisory board - profile and tasks.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>TATuP "Special Topic" editors - profile and tasks .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Editorial team - profile and tasks .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Editorial processes .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Editorial processes for peer-reviewed manuscripts in the journal section "Special Topic".....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Editorial processes for peer-reviewed manuscripts in the journal section "Research".....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Editorial processes for reviewed manuscripts in the journal sections “Reflections” and “Interview” .....</i>	<i>7</i>
<b>Editors’ responsibilities .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>Fairness and objectivity.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Confidentiality .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Disclosure and conflicts of interest .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Publication decisions.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<b>Peer-review process.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Reviewers’ responsibilities .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<i>Contribution to editorial decisions .....</i>	<i>9</i>

# TATuP

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR TECHNIKFOLGENABSCHÄTZUNG IN THEORIE UND PRAXIS  
JOURNAL FOR TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

<i>Confidentiality</i> .....	9
<i>Standards of objectivity</i> .....	9
<i>Acknowledgement of sources, avoidance of similarity</i> .....	10
<i>Disclosure and conflicts of interest</i> .....	10
<b>Authors and authors' responsibilities</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<i>Reporting standards regarding original research</i> .....	10
<i>Originality and acknowledgement of sources</i> .....	10
<i>Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication</i> .....	10
<i>Pre-prints</i> .....	11
<i>Authorship and contributorship</i> .....	11
<i>Hazards and human or animal subjects</i> .....	11
<i>Disclosure and conflicts of interest</i> .....	11
<i>Significant errors in published works</i> .....	11
<b>Publication ethics</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<i>Ethical oversight</i> .....	12
<i>Allegations of misconduct</i> .....	12
<i>Data fabrication and data falsification</i> .....	12
<i>Plagiarism</i> .....	12
<i>Retractions, corrections and expressions of concern</i> .....	13
<b>Complaints and appeals</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<i>Complaints and appeals during the editorial processes</i> .....	13
<i>Complaints and appeals after the editorial processes</i> .....	13
<i>Conflicts of interest</i> .....	14
<b>Confirmation from the publishing house</b> .....	<b>14</b>

## Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

### Introduction

TATuP is owned and edited by the [Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems Analysis \(ITAS\)](#) at [Karlsruhe Institute of Technology \(KIT\)](#), on whose behalf it is published at regular intervals three times a year in printed and electronic form by the publishing house [oekom – Gesellschaft für ökologische Kommunikation mbH, Munich](#) (oekom).

TATuP recognizes its responsibilities in upholding ethical standards and pursues best practices in scholarly publishing. TATuP supports the recommendations of the German Research Foundation (DFG) regarding „[Leitlinien zur Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis](#)“ (Kodex) 2019. TATuP also fully supports the [Core Practices](#) developed by the Committee on Publication Ethics ([COPE](#)), and since March 2023, TATuP is a member of COPE.

In this statement, TATuP provides basic information about the journal and outlines its principles of expected ethical behavior. It is consistent with [COPE guidelines](#). The following list of tasks and responsibilities of the members of the editorial and scientific advisory boards, the editorial team, “Special Topic” editors, authors, peer reviewers and publishing house is intended to give a broad overview; it is not exhaustive.

### Name of the journal

TATuP – Zeitschrift für Technikfolgenabschätzung in Theorie und Praxis  
TATuP – Journal for Technology Assessment in Theory and Practice

### Ownership and management

TATuP has been owned, funded, managed and edited since 1992 by the Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems Analysis (ITAS) at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT). Beginning with issue 2017/1–2, the journal was relaunched in cooperation with the publishing house oekom in Munich under its new name TATuP – Zeitschrift für Technikfolgenabschätzung in Theorie und Praxis/ TATuP – Journal for Technology Assessment in Theory and Practice as a peer-reviewed open access journal.

TATuP’s scientific coordination is located at the Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems Analysis (ITAS) at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), a member of the Helmholtz Association, Germany’s national research organization.

### Revenue sources

TATuP is financed by [ITAS](#) from its basic funds provided by the [Program-Oriented Funding of the Helmholtz Association](#). Neither author processing charges (APCs) nor subscription fees apply (diamond open access).

### Advertising

The institutional owner ([ITAS](#)) and the publishing house (oekom) decide together whether and which advertisements will be published in the journal. Advertisements are limited to a maximum of four pages in print per issue. By no means will advertisements influence journal content or editorial decision making. All advertisements will be kept separate from published content and will be clearly marked.

### Open access policy

TATuP is an open access journal. No author processing charges (APC) apply for peer review, editorial processing or publication of a manuscript.

TATuP is indexed in the Directory of Open Access Journals ([DOAJ](#)) and has been awarded the DOAJ Seal. The DOAJ Seal is given to journals that demonstrate best practice in open access publishing. Only around 10 % of journals indexed in DOAJ have been awarded the DOAJ Seal.

The journal website provides free online access to the entire current issue and complete archive of the journal.

Individual print issues can be ordered free of charge from the publishing house oekom, Munich (please send your request to [oekom-abo@verlegerdienst.de](mailto:oekom-abo@verlegerdienst.de)). A print subscription can be ordered free of charge by registering on the [publishing house’s webpage](#). All access information is provided on the [subscription webpage](#).

## Publication schedule

TATuP is published at regular intervals three times a year in print and online.

## Copyright and licensing information

TATuP is an open access journal. If not otherwise indicated, all articles are published under the [Creative Commons license CC BY 4.0](#). According to this CC license, TATuP contributions may be reprinted or otherwise distributed as long as the authors are credited and the complete bibliographical data are cited. Authors agree to publish their articles under the Creative Commons license CC BY 4.0 by giving their approval for publication in TATuP. Full copyright as well as all other exploitation rights remain with the authors. Copyright and licensing information is clearly stated on the website under the heading "[Open access policy](#)" under the heading "For authors" by [Submission](#) and in the author guidelines.

## Data sharing and reproducibility

TATuP encourages authors to share the data and other artefacts supporting the results in the paper by archiving it in an appropriate public repository. Authors may draft a data availability statement, including a link to the repository they have used, in order that this statement can be published in their paper. This statement will describe how the data can be accessed, and include a persistent identifier (e.g., a DOI for the data, or an accession number) from the repository where you shared the data. Shared data should be cited.

## Archiving

*Access to current and past journal content* Current and past issues are freely accessible online via <https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/issue/archive>.

## Archiving policy

To ensure permanent availability and accessibility, TATuP pursues various strategies:

- Portico – digital long-term preservation service: TATuP archives its published content in Portico, a community-supported preservation archive that safeguards access to e-journals, e-books, and digital collections. Content will remain accessible and usable for researchers, scholars, and students in the future (preservation, post-cancellation, perpetual access).
- German National Library (DNB) mandatory deposits: The publishing house oekom verlag GmbH is obliged to submit all online issues of TATuP to the DNB, which catalogues and archives online publications, guarantees their authenticity and ensures long-term preservation.
- TATuP digital archives: Furthermore, TATuP maintains its own digital archive (see "Access to current and past journal content" above) and preserves all information on external computers and disks.

## The website

All TATuP journal content and information – including that provided in this statement– are available on the website <https://www.tatup.de>. The website has an English and a German version.

The website <https://www.tatup.de> uses the publishing system Open Journal Systems (OJS). Open Journal Systems (OJS) is a journal management and publishing system that has been developed by the Public Knowledge Project (PKP) through its federally funded efforts to expand and improve access to research.

## Editorial board – profile and tasks

Members of TATuP's editorial board are appointed by the Editor in Chief (Main Handling Editor 1) by virtue of their internationally recognized expertise in the interdisciplinary field of technology assessment and systems analysis. Members of the editorial board

- serve a period of three years with an option for renewed appointment upon consensual decision of the editorial board. In the event of a tie the Editor in Chief makes the final decision;
- define the journal's general thematic and editorial guidelines at regular meetings;
- appoint the members of the scientific advisory board;
- evaluate and select themes for the journal section "Special Topic" (dedicated in each issue to a different specific topic relevant to technology assessment in theory and practice);

- appoint external scientific experts to serve as "Special Topic" editors for one issue of the journal;
- assure the quality of calls for papers for the journal section "Special Topic";
- decide on the rejection of manuscripts in the journal section "Research" upon suggestions from the editorial team, and may be consulted by "Special Topic" editors regarding the rejection of manuscripts in the journal section "Special Topic";
- counsel the editorial team and act, if necessary, as arbitrators in all matters of conflict between the editorial team, "Special Topic" editors, authors, reviewers and readers;
- support the journal in gaining a profile in the field of technology assessment and renown in the fields of politics, business and civil society.

## The Editor in Chief (Main Handling Editor 1)

- is the director of the Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems Analysis (ITAS) at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT);
- acts as first ombudsperson in cases of conflict or appeals between anyone involved in the journal's editorial process;
- may name one or more co-ombudsperson(s) from the editorial board to contribute to a solution in cases of conflict or appeals from anyone involved or appeals from anyone involved in the journal's editorial process;
- appoints the members of the editorial board and the editorial team.

The full names and affiliations of current appointments to the editorial board are listed at <https://tatup.de/index.php/tatup/EditorialBoard>.

## Scientific advisory board - profile and tasks

Members of the scientific advisory board of TATuP are appointed by the editorial board by virtue of their internationally recognized expertise in the interdisciplinary field of technology assessment, systems analysis and related research areas. Members of the scientific advisory board

- serve a period of three years with an option for renewed appointment upon consensual decision of the editorial board. In the event of a tie the Editor in Chief makes the final decision;
- suggest thematic contributions that correspond with the journal's profile;
- suggest authors and reviewers;
- may act as third reviewer in the case of conflicting first and second reviews;
- support the journal in gaining a profile in the field of technology assessment and renown in the fields of politics, business and civil society.

The full names and affiliations of current appointments to the scientific advisory board are listed at <http://tatup.de/index.php/tatup/AdvisoryBoard>.

## TATuP "Special Topic" editors - profile and tasks

Every issue of TATuP contains a "Special Topic" section with a focus on a specific theme with high significance for technology assessment, for example new technologies and their applications, theories, or methods of technology assessment. For each issue the TATuP the editorial board appoints a team of external experts in a specific field of technology assessment to edit the "Special Topic" section in cooperation with the TATuP editorial team.

The "Special Topic" section explores a specific field of technology assessment with around six peer-reviewed papers from different disciplinary perspectives. The editorial process begins about nine months prior to publication with an open call for abstracts. The "Special Topic" features prominently on the journal's cover, with a headline and an illustration.

"Special Topic" editors are qualified by their expertise in a specific field of technology assessment. They hold authority over the scientific content of the journal section "Special Topic" for one issue: this involves authoring

the call for papers, evaluating submitted abstracts, selecting authors to submit a full paper and authoring an introductory chapter to the "Special Topic". In cooperation with the journal's editorial team, they manage the editorial process and review process together with the external reviewers until the final acceptance/rejection decision.

## **Editorial team - profile and tasks**

TATuP's editorial team is appointed by the Editor in Chief. It is composed of the journal's managing editor (Main Handling Editor 2), academic editors, "TA-Focus" editors and assistant editors. The members of the editorial team are qualified by their recognized scientific expertise in the fields of technology assessment, systems analysis and/or neighboring disciplines as well as science communication.

The editorial team manages the editorial as well as quality assurance (review) processes and prepares the journal issues for publication in print and online in cooperation with the publishing house.

The editorial team is responsible for finding reviewers for manuscripts submitted for publication in the journal section "Research". For manuscripts submitted for publication in the journal section "Special Topic" they cooperate with the "Special Topic" editors to find reviewers.

The managing editor and academic editors check all submissions prior to review to ensure that the manuscripts comply with the journal's publication ethics, fall within its remit, and meet its standards of scientific and formal editorial quality. They also ensure that they are accessible to readers in terms of language, illustrations and figures.

For the journal sections "Interview" and "Reflections" (book reviews, conference reports, comments etc.) the managing editor and academic editors review each manuscript to ensure it complies with the journal's publication ethics and meets its scientific and formal editorial standards. If necessary, they draw on the expertise of members of the editorial board or scientific advisory board.

The "TA-Focus" editor is responsible for the journal section "TA-Focus", which comprises short news items and information relevant to the field of technology assessment.

The full names and affiliations of current members of the editorial team are listed at <http://tatup.de/index.php/tatup/EditorialTeam>.

## **Editorial processes**

TATuP is committed to editorial independence, and strives in all cases to prevent this principle from being compromised through conflicts of interest, fear, or any other corporate or political influence. Any person involved in TATuP's editorial processes is required to respect this commitment to editorial independence. Further information about complaints and appeals during and after the editorial process can be found below in this [Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement](#) and on the webpage ["Editorial processes"](#).

### *Editorial processes for peer-reviewed manuscripts in the journal section "Special Topic"*

1. Corresponding authors submit an abstract proposal for a contribution to a proposed TATuP "Special topic" to the editorial team in response to the journal's current call for abstracts (found at [announcements](#)).
2. "Special topic" editors pre-select potential contributions from the submitted abstracts on the basis of thematic remit and anticipated scientific quality. The editorial team then invite the corresponding authors of the selected abstracts to submit a full manuscript for the "Special topic" for peer review, and reject the remaining abstracts. Unsuccessful authors may resubmit at any time to the journal section "Research". (Authors can expect a response within approx. two weeks.)
3. Invited corresponding authors are given a maximum period of three months within which to submit their full manuscript. Authors must use the [TATuP Word template](#) and comply with TATuP's publication ethics as well as scientific and formal editorial standards (see [submission check list](#) and [author guidelines](#)).

4. Submitted manuscripts are pre-checked by the "Special topic" editors for their scientific quality and by the editorial team to ensure they comply with the journal's publication ethics as well as its formal editorial standards. (Approximate timescale - two weeks.)  
TATuP uses the plagiarism checking tool [iThenticate](#) to check submissions against previous publications. "Special topic" editors and the editorial team reserve the right to reject manuscripts that contain suspected plagiarism or do not comply with the required criteria.
5. If the pre-check is successful, then the corresponding author is informed that their manuscript will enter the double-open ("non-blind") [peer review process](#). (Approximate timescale - four weeks.)
6. Reviews are forwarded to the corresponding author within approx. two weeks. If the outcome of the peer review process is positive ("acceptance without revisions", or "acceptance with minor or major revisions"), the corresponding author is granted up to six weeks for revisions. If the reviews are conflicting ("acceptance without revisions" and "rejection"), the "Special topic" editors draw on their expertise to produce a third review. Two negative peer reviews result in the rejection of the manuscript, with the corresponding author being notified.
7. The final manuscript version is checked for scientific quality by the "Special topic" editors and for compliance with the journal's publication ethics and formal editorial standards by the editorial team. (The corresponding author will be notified within approx. two weeks.)
8. If the manuscript meets the scientific quality and complies with the journal's publication ethics and formal editorial standards, then the corresponding author is notified and the editorial copy editing and external layout processes begin. (Approximate timescale - three weeks.)
9. If, after a prolonged period of revisions, the manuscript still does not meet the reviewers' scientific requirements and/or does not comply with the journal's publication ethics and/or formal editorial standards, it may be rejected outright by the "Special topic" editors. Alternatively, corresponding authors may be offered the opportunity of additional time to revise the manuscript with view to a postponed final check and eventual publication in a later issue of the journal in the peer-reviewed "Research" section.
10. The corresponding author receives the galley proofs, and gives print approval within one week.
11. The manuscript is published in the upcoming issue of the journal in print and online. (Approximate timescale - four weeks.)

#### *Editorial processes for peer-reviewed manuscripts in the journal section "Research"*

1. Corresponding authors may submit a manuscript at any time to the journal's editorial team. The corresponding author uses the [TATuP Word template](#) and complies with TATuP's publication ethics as well as scientific and formal editorial standards (see submission [check list](#) and [author guidelines](#)).
2. Upon receipt, the editorial team, if necessary in cooperation with disciplinary experts from the journal's editorial board or scientific advisory board, pre-checks the submitted manuscript in view to its thematic fit with the journal's remit, scientific quality and compliance with the journal's publication ethics as well as scientific and formal editorial standards. TATuP uses the plagiarism checking tool [iThenticate](#) to check submissions against previous publications. "Special topic" editors and the editorial team reserve the right to reject manuscripts that contain suspected plagiarism or do not comply with content requirements, formal specifications, or quality standards of the journal. (The corresponding author will be notified within approx. two weeks.)
3. If the pre-check is successful, then the corresponding author is notified that their manuscript will enter the double-open ("non-blind") [peer review process](#). (Approximate timescale - four weeks.)
4. If the outcome of the peer review process is positive ("acceptance without revisions", or "acceptance with minor or major revisions"), the editorial team forwards the reviews to the corresponding author within approx. two weeks. The corresponding author is then given the necessary time for revisions. If the peer reviews are conflicting ("acceptance without revisions" and "rejection") the editorial team will request a third review, usually issued by one of the members of the editorial board or the scientific advisory board. If the manuscript receives two negative peer reviews, it is rejected and the corresponding author notified.
5. In case of reviews asking for major revisions, the revised manuscript will be sent again to the reviewer to ask her/his acceptance for publication with regard to scientific content.
6. The final manuscript version is checked by the editorial team for compliance with the journal's publication ethics, scientific and formal editorial standards, if necessary in cooperation with disciplinary experts from the journal's editorial board or scientific advisory board. (Approximate timescale - three weeks.)

7. If the manuscript meets the scientific quality and complies with editorial standards, then the corresponding author is notified and the editorial copy editing and external layout processes begin. If, after a prolonged period of revisions, the manuscript still does not meet the reviewers' scientific requirements and/or editorial standards it may be rejected by the journal's managing editor in coordination with the editorial board.
8. The corresponding author receives the galley proofs, and gives print approval within one week.
9. The manuscript is published in one of the upcoming issues of the journal in print and online. (Approximate timescale - four weeks.)

#### *Editorial processes for reviewed manuscripts in the journal sections "Reflections" and "Interview"*

1. Corresponding authors may submit to the editorial team at any time book reviews, conference reports, transcribed interviews, or other short texts such as comments, provided that they fall within the journal's thematic remit, comply with the journal's publication ethics and adhere to category-specific author guidelines.
2. The editorial team reviews the manuscript, if necessary, in cooperation with members of the editorial board, or scientific advisory board, and decides whether to accept the manuscript into the editorial process on the basis of its thematic fit and scientific quality.
3. The editorial team will notify the corresponding author within three weeks of receipt whether the manuscript has been accepted into the editorial process or not. The editorial team reserves the right to suggest and request alterations and improvements to the manuscript, in particular with regard to its scientific content, length and/or style.
4. If the manuscript meets the scientific quality and complies with the journal's publication ethics as well as scientific and formal editorial standards, then the corresponding author is notified and the editorial copy editing and external layout processes begin. (Approximate timescale - four weeks.)
5. The corresponding author receives the galley proofs, and gives print approval within one week.
6. The manuscript is published in one of the next issues of the journal in print and online. (Approximate timescale - four weeks.)

#### **Editors' responsibilities**

The following responsibilities apply to the managing editor, the academic editors, the "TA-Focus" editors, the assistant editors, the "Special Topic" editors and the editorial board, all subsumed in this section under the term "editor".

#### *Fairness and objectivity*

Editors of TATuP will evaluate manuscripts solely on their intellectual content, without any consideration given to the author(s)' age, gender, race, religion, ethnic origin, nationality, or political belief.

#### *Confidentiality*

Editors are committed to maintaining the confidentiality of all submitted manuscripts. They will not disclose any information regarding a manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial board or team members, and the publishing house, as necessary.

#### *Disclosure and conflicts of interest*

Editors must not use any unpublished material from a submitted manuscript for their own research without obtaining the authors' permission. Editors are also expected to maintain the confidentiality of any results or ideas obtained through the peer review process and must not use it for personal gain. To avoid conflicts of interest, editors should refrain from reviewing manuscripts in which they have any cooperative or other relationships or connections with the authors, businesses, or institutions associated with the work.

Where an editor, staff member or editorial board member is on the author list, they must declare this in the competing interests section of the submitted manuscript. These submissions will be treated the same as all other manuscripts.

#### *Publication decisions*

Policies regarding publication decisions are as follows: The managing editor and "Special Topic" editors are responsible for deciding which submitted articles will be published. They are bound in their decisions to the journal's high standards of quality assurance, thematic profile, and formal editorial standards, as well as legal

requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism. Their decisions must be based on the evaluation of the peer reviewers. The managing editor and "Special Topic" editors may consult with members of TATuP's editorial board, scientific advisory board, other editors, or reviewers when making these decisions.

## Peer-review process

The [peer-review process](#) is outlined on the webpage and detailed in the [reviewer guidelines](#). The reviewer guidelines and [peer review form](#) are publicly accessible.

TATuP's peer review process is non-blind and not public: the persons involved in the peer review process (authors, reviewers, editorial team, "Special Topic" editors, as well as, in the case of conflicting reviews, members of the editorial board or scientific advisory board) know each other by name and interact with equal rights in a fair and constructive way.

The central aim of the peer review process is quality assurance. The reviewers' comments support the editorial team, "Special Topic" editors, and editorial board of the journal in their assessment of manuscripts and include suggestions for their improvement. This also includes the reasoned rejection of manuscripts.

Reviewers are qualified by unbiased and proven scientific expertise in the field of the manuscript under review. This means:

- Reviewers should not evaluate manuscripts in which they have competing interests resulting from relationships with any one of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscripts.
- All judgements and findings in the peer review process should be objective.
- Reviewers should sustain their critique by pointing to relevant published work which is not yet cited.
- Reviewers must treat all information from manuscripts under review confidentially before publication, or in the event that the manuscript is rejected.
- Reviews and possible replies from the authors are not published.

In both of the peer-reviewed journal sections ("Special Topic" and "Research"), manuscripts are reviewed by two external reviewers who are not members of the editorial board, scientific advisory board, or editorial team. In the case of conflicting peer reviews ("acceptance without revisions" and "rejection") a third review is issued: for manuscripts submitted to the journal section "Special Topic", the third review is issued by one of the "Special Topic" editors; for manuscripts submitted to the journal section "Research", the third review is usually issued by one of the members of the editorial board or scientific advisory board. Manuscripts submitted to the journal section "Reflections" are reviewed by the editorial team, if necessary, in cooperation with members of the editorial board, or scientific advisory board.

It is important for reviewers to the following ethical standards in order to maintain the integrity and credibility of the research being published.

## Reviewers' responsibilities

### *Contribution to editorial decisions*

Reviewers assist the editorial team and "Special Topic" editors of TATuP in making editorial decisions and may also help the author(s) improve their paper through editorial communications. Any reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research presented in a manuscript or believes that it is not possible to review it within the stipulated time should immediately notify the journal's editorial team.

### *Confidentiality*

Reviewers must treat manuscripts they have received for peer review as confidential documents. Reviewers must not disclose or discuss them with other individuals unless authorized by a member of the editorial team of the journal, or the authors themselves.

### *Standards of objectivity*

Peer reviews of submitted manuscripts shall be objective. Reviewers should avoid personal criticism of the author(s) and express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Based on a [standardized review form](#), all reviews include an assessment of the submitted manuscripts according to the following seven dimensions: 1. scientific quality (the article complies with scientific standards); 2. relevance (the article raises a current issue significant within the respective context); 3. substance (the article provides sufficient theoretical, argumentative, and, if applicable, empirical substance); 4. style (language, figures, tables), 5. novelty (the material used and/or the argumentation have novelty value); 6. adequateness (the article falls thematically within the remit of TATuP and the "Special Topic"); 7. audience (the article considers TATuP's interdisciplinary readership and is written in comprehensible language).

#### *Acknowledgement of sources, avoidance of similarity*

Reviewers are expected to identify any relevant published work that has not been cited by the author(s). Any claims that an observation, derivation, or argument has been reported before should be accompanied by the relevant citation.

Reviewers must notify the editorial team and "Special Topic" editors of any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published work of which they possess personal knowledge.

#### *Disclosure and conflicts of interest*

Reviewers must not evaluate manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from any connections or relationships with any of the authors, businesses, or institutions that are involved with the manuscript. Reviewers must not use any unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript for their own research without the authors' permission. Any information, results or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal gain. TATuP does not permit the use of trade names unless they form a relevant aspect of the empirical analysis or argument.

#### **Authors and authors' responsibilities**

TATuP lays out detailed principles of the ethical behavior that is expected from authors in its [guidelines for authors](#). The most important authors' responsibilities are summarized below.

TATuP is an open access journal. No author processing charges (APC) apply for peer review, editorial processing or publication of a manuscript. Authors interested in submitting a paper to TATuP can find this information clearly stated on the TATuP website, for example, under "[For authors](#)" and in the [author guidelines](#) under the subheading "Fees".

TATuP is a peer-reviewed journal, as stated on the website under "[For authors](#)", in the author guidelines under the subheading "Peer review process" (p. 1) as well as "[Peer review](#)".

#### *Reporting standards regarding original research*

Authors presenting the results of original research must provide an accurate report of the work performed, followed by an objective discussion of its significance. The underlying data should be accurately represented in the article. The manuscript should contain sufficient detail as well as references to enable others to replicate the study. Including fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements is considered unethical behavior and is unacceptable. Review articles should also be accurate and objective, and editorial "opinion" articles should be clearly marked as such.

#### *Originality and acknowledgement of sources*

All submitted articles must be original works. If authors have used the work and/or words of others, they must ensure that proper citation or quotation is used and permission has been obtained where necessary. Authors must always give proper acknowledgment of the work of others, and must cite all publications that have influenced the nature of the submitted articles. Plagiarism in any form is considered unethical behavior and is unacceptable.

#### *Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication*

It is not appropriate for authors to publish manuscripts that describe basically the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal at the same time is considered unethical behavior and is unacceptable.

## *Pre-prints*

TATuP will consider for review articles previously available as preprints, on condition that the authors agree to the following: The authors retain copyright to the preprint and are permitted to submit to the journal; The authors declare that a preprint is available within the cover letter presented during submission. This must include a link to the location of the preprint; Should the submission be published, the authors are expected to update the information associated with the preprint version to show that a final version has been published in the journal, including the DOI linking directly to the publication. Any previous publication as a preprint should be disclosed in the paper.

## *Authorship and contributorship*

In order to allow for transparency around who contributed to the work and in what capacity, the following policies apply. Authorship should be limited to individuals who have significantly contributed to the conception, or design of the work; or to the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work. Individuals listed as authors should have made a significant contribution to drafting the work or to revising it critically for intellectual content. All co-authors should have given final approval for the version to be published and should have agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are addressed. All significant contributors should be acknowledged as co-authors, while those who have assisted in certain substantive aspects of the study should be acknowledged as contributors. So-called guest, honorary or gift authorships are unacceptable.

The corresponding author must ensure that all appropriate co-authors are included, and that no inappropriate co-authors are added. Authors are jointly responsible for the content of their scientific publications.

Moreover, TATuP integrates established and emerging industry standards to increase transparency in authorship (for example, [ORCID](#)).

## *Hazards and human or animal subjects*

TATuP is committed to publishing research that adheres to ethical and responsible standards. Authors are required to obtain all necessary consents and approvals to publish their work, particularly if the study involves chemicals, procedures, or equipment with inherent hazards. If the study involves human or animal subjects, the authors should include in the submitted documents a statement that all procedures were conducted in compliance with relevant laws and institutional guidelines and have obtained the appropriate institutional committee(s) approval.

## *Disclosure and conflicts of interest*

Authors are responsible for disclosing any financial or other significant conflict of interest that could influence the results or interpretation of their work. They must also disclose all sources of financial support for the study. TATuP does not accept the use of trade names, except if these are relevant to the empirical analysis or argument. At the time of manuscript submission, authors must declare any affiliations with organizations that could have a direct, especially financial, interest in the subject matter or materials discussed. The primary piece of information to be disclosed is the funding source for the study.

## *Significant errors in published works*

If an author discovers any significant errors or inaccuracies in their published articles, they have the responsibility to inform the editorial team or board of the journal promptly. The author should also collaborate with the editorial team to retract or correct the paper as necessary.

Adhering to this ethical standard is crucial for authors publishing in TATuP to ensure the integrity and credibility of the research being published.

## **Publication ethics**

In order to ensure ethical behavior in the publication process, it is crucial for all parties involved to adhere to established standards. TATuP provides a clear set of principles for ethical conduct that apply to the editorial team, editorial board, scientific advisory board, "Special Topic" editors, authors, reviewers, and publishing

house. These guidelines are outlined in the [Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement](#), its [guidelines for authors](#) and [reviewers](#).

### *Ethical oversight*

TATuP is committed to following these guidelines and enforcing the stated standards of behavior. To comply with ethical oversight, TATuP asks the members of the editorial team, editorial board, and scientific advisory board, "Special Topic" editors, authors, and reviewers to read the journal's guidelines and this statement carefully and adhere to the conditions. Where TATuP suspects or is made aware of ethical breaches by members of the editorial team, editorial board, scientific advisory board, "Special Topic" editors, authors, or reviewers, TATuP will proceed to take the necessary measures, handling the suspected case with confidentiality. Depending on the scope and severity of the case, measures taken can range from contacting and investigating those under suspicion, to informing relevant institutions (e. g. those of members of the editorial team, editorial board, scientific advisory board, "Special Topic" editors, authors, and reviewers), and involving further institutions or organizations as appropriate. In doing so, TATuP will follow [COPE guidelines](#) and [flowcharts](#).

### *Allegations of misconduct*

TATuP is committed to upholding the integrity of the work TATuP publishes. In accordance with the *Rules for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT)* ([https://www.kit.edu/downloads/gute\\_wiss\\_praxis\\_en.pdf](https://www.kit.edu/downloads/gute_wiss_praxis_en.pdf), p. 6), TATuP regards as scientific misconduct "the intentional and grossly negligent statement of falsehoods in a scientific context, the violation of intellectual property rights or impeding another person's research work". Particular examples of scientific misconduct include (but are not confined to) fabrication of data, falsification of data and plagiarism (see below).

TATuP will take all appropriate measures against publication malpractices such as alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism pre-publication and post-publication. In order to actively identify and prevent such publication malpractices, TATuP has various systems in place. The managing editor checks that all submissions adhere to scientific quality and standards. External reviewers evaluate scientific quality, substance and novelty during the peer-review process. TATuP follows COPE guidelines and flowcharts on dealing with allegations of misconduct, in particular

- if fabricated data is suspected in a [submitted manuscript](#) or in a [published article](#),
- if plagiarism is suspected in a [submitted manuscript](#) or in a [published article](#),
- if redundant (duplicate) publication is suspected in a [submitted manuscript](#) or in a [published article](#)

### *Data fabrication and data falsification*

Making false assertions in performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results seriously deviates from good scientific practice and is unacceptable:

- Data fabrication concerns making up results and recording them as if they were real.
- Data falsification concerns manipulating research materials, equipment or processes or changing, omitting or suppressing data or results without justification (for instance, by selecting desirable results or evaluation methods or dismissing unwanted results or evaluation methods, without disclosing this decision, or by manipulating reports, diagrams or illustrations. Manipulating images and figures by obscuring, enhancing, deleting and/or introducing new elements into an image or figure is considered improper.

### *Plagiarism*

TATuP understands plagiarism according to the *Rules for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT)* as "unauthorized use following the claim of authorship" ([https://www.kit.edu/downloads/gute\\_wiss\\_praxis\\_en.pdf](https://www.kit.edu/downloads/gute_wiss_praxis_en.pdf), p. 7). TATuP does not tolerate plagiarism. To verify the originality of content submitted to our journal, TATuP uses the plagiarism checking tool [iThenticate](#) to check submissions against previous publications. Submissions containing suspected plagiarism, in whole or part, will be rejected. If plagiarism is discovered post-publication, TATuP will follow its guidance outlined in the *Retractions, corrections and expressions of concern* section of this Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement (also published at <https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/PublicationEthics>).

## *Retractions, corrections and expressions of concern*

Where TATuP suspects or is made aware of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism, it will launch investigations and take all reasonable steps to prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred. This includes the prompt publication of corrections as errata or, in the most severe cases, the complete retraction of the affected work.

Cases of alleged plagiarism initiate a process in which authors must provide exonerating evidence and/or correct the manuscript. The editorial team will evaluate the evidence and/or corrections, for manuscripts submitted to the journal section "Special Topic" in cooperation with "Special Topic" editors, and/or the editorial board. Together these bodies will make a decision whether to reject the manuscript or continue with the editorial process.

In the event of demonstrable fundamental errors in a published article, TATuP's editorial board may decide to retract the article from the TATuP online presence as well as from associated databases. This process is carried out in collaboration with an ombudsperson selected from the TATuP editorial board members and the managing editor. Fundamental errors include, amongst others, the deliberate or unconscious use of false empirical data that is central to the argumentation of the text, and the deliberate or unconscious omission of references to sources for empirical data or cited text passages. Authors may be given the opportunity to add the errata to the publication. If this is not possible, the result may be the permanent withdrawal of the article.

By publishing in TATuP, authors commit themselves to expressing any concerns and notifying the managing editor and/or members of the editorial board at the earliest possible opportunity should they become aware of any fundamental error in their text. TATuP expects its readers, reviewers and editors to notify them of any concerns about plagiarism, by contacting the Editor in Chief.

To verify the originality of content submitted to our journals, we use [iThenticate](#) to check submissions against previous publications.

## **Complaints and appeals**

Complaints and appeals against the journal, its editorial team, editorial board, scientific advisory board, "Special Topic" editor(s), reviewers, publishing house, or authors are handled by the Editor in Chief as the journal's ombudsperson (see the tasks and responsibilities of the editorial board and Editor in Chief listed above). The ombudsperson shall be the first point of contact and is responsible for investigating the issue, mediating between parties and taking a final decision on the issue. In this process the ombudsperson may consult the expertise of other members of the editorial board, the scientific advisory board, the "Special Topic" editors, or any other person the ombudsperson deems appropriate in order to resolve the conflict. The ombudsperson shall not be obliged to follow instructions. If the ombudsperson is accused of a conflict of interest, the editorial board shall appoint a substitute.

The editorial board, or its Editor in Chief, shall also handle conflicts of interest of authors, reviewers, the editorial team, "Special Topic" editors, journal and publishing house, whether identified during the editorial process or after publication. The same process as described above will apply.

## *Complaints and appeals during the editorial processes*

TATuP will consider appeals on decisions taken during the editorial processes listed above. The editorial team, together with the original reviewers and/or a third reviewer and/or members of the journal's editorial board, will consider any new data supplied by the author in support of their argument. The author will be notified of the outcome of their appeal along with an explanation of the decision.

## *Complaints and appeals after the editorial processes*

Such cases include:

1. If authors discover any significant errors or inaccuracies in their published articles, they have the responsibility to inform the editorial team or board of the journal promptly. The author should also collaborate with the editorial team to retract or correct the paper as necessary.

2. In the event of errors noted after publication, the corresponding author is obliged to provide corrections, which will be published as errata.
3. In the event of fundamental violations of the journal's publication ethics detected after publication of the manuscript, the corresponding author is obliged to consent to the retraction of the article.
4. In the event of errors detected only after publication of the manuscript and committed by the journal's editorial team, or the publishing house, the latter are willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies where needed.

### *Conflicts of interest*

A conflict of interest exists when any personal interests of the editorial team, editorial board, scientific advisory board, "Special Topic" editor(s), reviewers, publishing house, or authors conflict with the veracity or integrity of a publication, peer review, or editorial decision-making. Conflicts of interest can arise from commercial, intellectual, financial, and other grounds.

In the event that any member of the editorial team has a conflict of interest with any subject matter or authorship of any work, he or she should decline to manage the work, in order to avoid incurring any subjectivities or undue delays in the process of editing the work.

The editorial board or its Editor in Chief shall also handle conflicts of interest of authors, reviewers, the editorial team, "Special Topic" editors, journal and publishing house, whether identified during the editorial process or after publication. The same process as described above will apply.

Readers who wish to comment on a published work should declare their conflicts of interest with the subject matter or authors.

### **Confirmation from the publishing house**

In the event that the publishing house oekom ([oekom – Gesellschaft für ökologische Kommunikation mbH, Munich](https://www.oekom.de/)) is made aware of any allegation of research misconduct relating to a published article in TATuP, it will in cooperation with TATuP's editorial board or editorial team take all measures necessary, including the prompt publication of an erratum or, in the most severe cases, the complete retraction of the affected work (see *Retractions, corrections and expressions of concern* above). The publishing house, the editorial board and the editorial team declare that they shall follow the principles of expected ethical behavior developed in line with [COPE Core Practices](https://www.COPEcorepractices.org/) in this Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement (also published at <https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/PublicationEthics>) and shall turn in cases of controversial issues to the procedures and recommendations provided by COPE.

**Version: 2022-07-18, revised 2023-03-30**