

Modern History: Journal of the History of the 19th and 20th Centuries:

Publication Ethics Statement

Responsibilities of the editors:

- The editors of *Modern History* supported by Czech and foreign editorial board, bearing in mind the reputation of the publisher, The Institute of History of the Czech Academy of Sciences, undertakes to ensure ethical, objective, and fair course of the evaluative process, starting with the submission of a manuscript until the moment of its publication. The editors will prevent unethical and unscholarly conduct such as plagiarism, auto-plagiarism, or publishing texts hateful towards variously defined groups of population.
- Scholarly studies meeting basic ethical and academic requirements are accepted or declined by the editorial board only on the grounds of intellectual quality, capacity of the issue and appropriateness of the topic. The editorial board guarantees that it will not evaluate the text on the grounds of the author's non-academic public activities or any other facts such as origin, gender identity, age, confession, or sexual orientation.
- If the manuscript is accepted for peer review, the editors ensure that the text will be presented to two anonymous reviewers who do not share workplace with the author, nor they are in any institutional relationship, such as a grant project. The editors undertake to prevent all conflicts of interests that could occur during the peer review. The peer review process is always anonymous. The editors undertake not to present the text to anyone apart from the editorial board and reviewers before publication.

Responsibilities of the author:

- The authors undertake to submit texts that conform to international norms of individual academic work and are the result of an original research or (e.g., in case of essays) original intellectual performance. Any use of other authors' work (be it adoption of information, theses, formulations, or indirect inspiration) must be acknowledged by referencing the original work. In case of ascertainment of plagiarism on the part of the author, the problem is discussed with the domestic and foreign editorial board of the journal and the publisher, The Institute of History of the Czech Academy of Sciences. Their statement determines the development of further proceedings.

- It must be always possible to trace back and verify information and data contained in the submissions. The footnotes serve this purpose. The editors accept for peer review only texts whose authors have explained the procedure of their work in the introduction and summarized the results of the research in the conclusion. Misrepresentation or intentional withholding of (certain) outcomes of the research is considered ethical misconduct. If the author finds out about inconsistencies or incorrect information contained in their text after it is submitted or published, they are obliged to inform the editors who will decide about the manner of rectification.
- If a part or a larger section of the submission has already been published, the author is obliged to consult the editors about it beforehand and duly record the fact in the text. Submitting the same text to another periodical at the same time is considered ethical misconduct. Authors notify the editors of financing of the text, usually in the first footnote of the manuscript.
- For formal requirements for submissions see “guidelines for authors”.

Responsibilities of the reviewer in the review process:

- Reviewers evaluate manuscripts without any bias and ground their conclusions in objective arguments.
- Provided that in the peer review process the reviewer finds out that the same or a very similar text has already been published by the author or by someone else and the author has not stated this fact, the reviewer is obliged to report this to the editors. The reviewer reports to the editors any other suspicion of use of sources without appropriate reference.
- If the reviewer has a conflict of interests and the editorial board does not know about it, they are obliged to report the fact to the editors.
- The reviewer always approaches the evaluated text as a sensitive document. The evaluated text must not be used for the purposes of the reviewer’s work before publication. Providing the evaluated text to a third party before publication is considered serious ethical misconduct.

Review process:

1. The editorial board decides about acceptance of the offered manuscript for peer review on the grounds of its quality, capacity of the issue, and thematic proximity.

2. If the text is accepted for peer review, it is presented to two anonymous reviewers who do not share workplace with the author, nor they are in any institutional relationship.
3. If the reviews differ decisively in evaluation of the text, a third reviewer is asked to evaluate it.
4. Texts which have undergone peer review are presented to the editorial board of *Modern History* who have the right to decide about the texts' acceptance or refusal.
5. If the text is approved by all deliberative processes (editors, two anonymous reviews, editorial board), it is published in some of the following issues. The specific issue where the text will be published is determined on the grounds of previous agreement between the executive editor and the author.