

## Publication Ethics And Publication Malpractice Statement

<b>Introduction</b> .....	3
<b>Name of the journal</b> .....	3
<b>Ownership and management</b> .....	3
<b>Open access policy</b> .....	4
<b>Publication schedule</b> .....	4
<b>Copyright and licensing information</b> .....	4
<b>Archiving</b> .....	4
<i>Access to current and past journal content</i> .....	4
<i>Archiving policy</i> .....	4
<b>The website</b> .....	5
<b>Editorial board – profile and tasks</b> .....	5
<b>Scientific advisory board - profile and tasks</b> .....	6
<b>TATuP "Special Topic" editors - profile and tasks</b> .....	7
<b>Editorial team - profile and tasks</b> .....	7
<b>Editorial processes</b> .....	8
<i>Editorial processes for peer-reviewed manuscripts in the journal section "Special Topic"</i> .....	8
<b>Editors' responsibilities</b> .....	10
<i>Fair play</i> .....	11
<i>Confidentiality</i> .....	11
<i>Disclosure and conflicts of interest</i> .....	11
<i>Publication decisions</i> .....	11
<b>Peer-review process</b> .....	11
<b>Reviewers' responsibilities</b> .....	12
<i>Contribution to editorial decisions</i> .....	12
<i>Confidentiality</i> .....	12
<i>Standards of objectivity</i> .....	13
<i>Acknowledgement of sources</i> .....	13
<i>Disclosure and conflicts of interest</i> .....	13
<b>Authors and authors' responsibilities</b> .....	13
<i>Reporting standards</i> .....	14
<i>Originality and acknowledgement of sources</i> .....	14
	1

<i>Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication</i> .....	14
<i>Authorship</i> .....	14
<i>Hazards and human or animal subjects</i> .....	15
<i>Disclosure and conflicts of interest</i> .....	15
<i>Fundamental errors in published works</i> .....	15
<b>Publication ethics</b> .....	15
<i>Allegations of misconduct</i> .....	16
<i>Plagiarism</i> .....	16
<i>Retractions, corrections and expressions of concern</i> .....	16
<b>Complaints and appeals</b> .....	17
<i>Complaints and appeals during the editorial processes</i> .....	17
<i>Complaints and appeals after the editorial processes</i> .....	18
<i>Conflicts of interest</i> .....	18
<b>Confirmation from the publishing house</b> .....	18

## Publication Ethics And Publication Malpractice Statement

### Introduction

TATuP is owned and edited by the Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems Analysis (ITAS) (<https://www.itas.kit.edu/english/index.php>) at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT) (<http://www.kit.edu/english/>), on whose behalf it is published at regular intervals three times a year in printed and electronic form by the publishing house oekom verlag GmbH, Munich (<https://www.oekom.de/>).

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

([https://www.dfg.de/download/pdf/foerderung/rechtliche\\_rahmenbedingungen/gute\\_wissenschaftliche\\_praxis/kodex\\_gwp.pdf](https://www.dfg.de/download/pdf/foerderung/rechtliche_rahmenbedingungen/gute_wissenschaftliche_praxis/kodex_gwp.pdf)). TATuP also fully supports the Core Practices (<https://publicationethics.org/core-practices> or [https://publicationethics.org/files/editable-bean/COPE\\_Core\\_Practices\\_0.pdf](https://publicationethics.org/files/editable-bean/COPE_Core_Practices_0.pdf)) developed by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, <https://publicationethics.org/>).

In this statement, TATuP provides basic information about the journal and outlines its principles of expected ethical behavior. 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. It is consistent with COPE guidelines and the wording is partly based on Elsevier’s Publishing Ethics policy (<https://www.elsevier.com/about/our-business/policies/publishing-ethics>).

### 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 verlag GmbH 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.

## **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).

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 verlag GmbH, Munich (please send your request to [abo@oekom.de](mailto:abo@oekom.de)). A print subscription can be ordered free of charge by registering on the publishing house's webpage (<https://www.oekom.de/zeitschriften/tatup/bezug.html>).

All access information is provided on the subscription webpage (<https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/subscriptionStatic>).

## **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 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/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" (<https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/openAccess>), under the heading "For authors" by submission (<https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/Submit>) and in the author guidelines ([https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP\\_author\\_guidelines.pdf](https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP_author_guidelines.pdf)).

## **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:

- Public Knowledge Project (PKP) Private LOCKSS Network (PLN): TATuP uses Open Journal Systems (OJS), a journal management and publishing system developed by the Public Knowledge Project (PKP). Published content is deposited into the PKP Private LOCKSS Network (PLN) for preservation and post-cancellation and 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 chairman (see below) 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 chairman 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 chairman of the editorial board

- is the director of the Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems Analysis (ITAS) at Karlsruhe Institute for 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 <http://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 chairman of the editorial board 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 chairman of the editorial board. It is composed of the journal's managing editor, 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 (also published at <https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/PublicationEthics>) and on the webpage "Editorial processes" at <https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/EditorialProcess>.

### *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" <https://tatup.de/index.php/tatup/announcement>).
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 the 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.)  
"Special Topic" editors and the editorial team reserve the right to reject manuscripts that 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 (major) revisions"), the corresponding author is granted up to six weeks for revisions. If the reviews are conflicted ("acceptance without revisions" and "rejection"), the "Special Topic" editors draw on their expertise to produce a third review. Two negative peer reviews results 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.)  
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.
9. The corresponding author receives the galley proofs, and gives print approval within one week.
10. 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.
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.  
The editorial team reserves the right to reject any manuscript that does 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 (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. 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.)
6. 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.
7. The corresponding author receives the galley proofs, and gives print approval within one week.
8. 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"*

9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.)
13. The corresponding author receives the galley proofs, and gives print approval within one week.
14. 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".

## *Fair play*

Submitted manuscripts are evaluated for their intellectual content without regard to age, race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s).

## *Confidentiality*

The editors of TATuP must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publishing house, as appropriate.

## *Disclosure and conflicts of interest*

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in the own research of an editor without the express written consent of the author(s). Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. The editors should recuse themselves from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers.

## *Publication decisions*

The managing editor and the "Special Topic" editors are responsible for deciding which of the submitted articles will be published. They should be guided in their decisions by the journal's high standards of quality assurance, thematic profile and formal editorial standards. They are constrained by legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. They may confer with members of the journal's editorial board, its scientific advisory board, other editors or reviewers when making these decisions.

## **Peer-review process**

The peer-review process is outlined on the webpage (<https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/peerReview>) and detailed in the reviewer guidelines ([https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP\\_Guidelines\\_for\\_peer-review\\_process.pdf](https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP_Guidelines_for_peer-review_process.pdf)). The reviewer guidelines and peer review form ([https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP\\_Peer\\_Review\\_Form.docx](https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP_Peer_Review_Form.docx)) 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:

- Peer reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections 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.

## **Reviewers' responsibilities**

### *Contribution to editorial decisions*

Peer review assists the editorial team of TATuP and the journal's "Special Topic" editors in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author(s) may also assist the author(s) in improving the paper. Any selected referee who feels unqualified to peer review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its timely review will be impossible should immediately notify the journal's editorial team.

### *Confidentiality*

Any manuscripts received for peer review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the journal's managing editor.

## *Standards of objectivity*

Peer reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author(s) is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Based on a standardized review form

([https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP\\_Peer\\_Review\\_Form.docx](https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP_Peer_Review_Form.docx)), 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*

Peer reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the author(s). Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. Peer reviewers should also call to the editorial team and "Special Topic" editors' attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

## *Disclosure and conflicts of interest*

Peer reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscripts. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author(s). Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. TATuP does not accept the use of trade names unless these 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 ([https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP\\_author\\_guidelines.pdf](https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP_author_guidelines.pdf)). 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” (<https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/Submit>) and in the author guidelines ([https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP\\_author\\_guidelines.pdf](https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP_author_guidelines.pdf)) under the subheading “Fees” (p. 1).

TATuP is a peer-reviewed journal, as stated on the website under “For authors” (<https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/Submit>), in the author guidelines under the subheading “Peer review process” (p. 1) as well as “Peer review” (<https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/peerReview>).

### *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. The manuscript should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable. Review and professional publication articles should also be accurate and objective, and editorial ‘opinion’ works should be clearly identified as such.

### *Originality and acknowledgement of sources*

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 and permission has been obtained where necessary. Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical behavior and is unacceptable.

### *Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication*

Authors should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

### *Authorship*

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors. A so-called “honorary authorship” is inadmissible.

The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication. Authors of scientific

publications are always jointly responsible for their content.

Moreover, TATuP integrates established and emerging industry standards to increase transparency in authorship (for example, ORCID <https://orcid.org/>).

### *Hazards and human or animal subjects*

If the work involves chemicals, procedures or equipment that have any unusual hazards inherent in their use, the author(s) must clearly identify these in the manuscript. If the work involves the use of animal or human subjects, the author(s) should ensure that the manuscript contains a statement that all procedures were performed in compliance with relevant laws and institutional guidelines and that the appropriate institutional committee(s) have approved them.

### *Disclosure and conflicts of interest*

All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. TATuP does not accept the use of trade names unless these form a relevant aspect of the empirical analysis or argument.

### *Fundamental errors in published works*

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editorial team or editorial board and cooperate with the editorial team to retract or correct the paper.

## **Publication ethics**

For all parties involved in the act of publishing it is important to agree upon standards of proper ethical behavior. TATuP lays out its principles of expected ethical behavior for members of the editorial team, editorial board, and scientific advisory board, "Special Topic" editors, authors, reviewers and publishing house in this Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement (also published at <https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/PublicationEthics>), its guidelines for authors ([https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP\\_author\\_guidelines.pdf](https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP_author_guidelines.pdf)) and reviewers ([https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP\\_Review-Guidelines\\_en.pdf](https://www.tatup.de/downloads/TATuP_Review-Guidelines_en.pdf)). TATuP is committed to following these guidelines and enforcing the stated standards of behavior. 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 (<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts> and [https://publicationethics.org/files/Full%20set%20of%20English%20flowcharts\\_9Nov2016.pdf](https://publicationethics.org/files/Full%20set%20of%20English%20flowcharts_9Nov2016.pdf)).

### *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". 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.

### *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 in any of its publications, and reserves the right to check all submissions through appropriate plagiarism checking tools. 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 chairman of the editorial board.

## **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 chairman of the editorial board as the journal's ombudsperson (see the tasks and responsibilities of the editorial board and chairman 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 chairman, 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. When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal's editorial team or editorial board and cooperate with the editorial team to retract or correct the paper.
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 chairman 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 verlag GmbH, Munich, 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://publicationethics.org/core-practices> or [https://publicationethics.org/files/editable-bean/COPE\\_Core\\_Practices\\_0.pdf](https://publicationethics.org/files/editable-bean/COPE_Core_Practices_0.pdf)) and laid out 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.