



The British
Psychological Society

Special Group in
Coaching Psychology

Publication ethics and publication malpractice statement: *International Coaching Psychology Review*

We encourage the best standards of publication ethics and take all measures against publication malpractices. Our publication ethics and publication malpractice statement is based on the *Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors* (COPE, 2011).

Editors' responsibilities

Publication decisions

The editor/s have the sole authority to decide which papers are accepted or rejected for publication. In making this decision they will seek advice from the editorial board and peer review panel through a peer review process. Papers accepted for publication are judged on their academic merit, originality, the work's importance and relevance to the field of coaching. The editor/s will be constrained by legal requirements, such as copyright infringement, plagiarism, and libel. The editor/s will protect the integrity of the publication by publishing corrections and retractions where needed.

Confidentiality

The editor/s and editorial board will not disclose any information about the submitted work prior to publication, except to the corresponding author, editorial board, reviewers, and the publisher, as appropriate. The editor/s will ensure the submitted work remains confidential until publication. The editor/s will strive to preserve the anonymity of the peer review panel members.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

The editor/s will not disclose any unpublished material submitted to *ICPR* to use for their own research, unless given express permission by the author. If an author's work could cause a conflict of interest to a reviewer, an alternate member of the review team should be assigned to that submission. If a member of the editorial team submits a paper, another member of the editorial team will make the final decision for acceptance. Editor/s require all submitting authors to disclose any conflicts of interest, and will publish corrections if these come to light after publication.

Equality

Submissions should be considered equally and without bias, giving equal treatment for different races, religions, nationalities, genders, and political beliefs. Respect should be shown for the cultural differences of contributing authors. There should be no bias in favour, or against, institutional affiliations of either the submitting authors, peer review panel, or editorial team.

Retraction

The editor/s should be guided by COPE's guidelines for retracting articles, when considering retracting, issuing expressions of concern about, and issuing corrections for papers that have been published in *ICPR*.

Ethics

The editor/s will expect contributors and reviewers to abide by the British Psychological Society Code of Ethics.

Contributor's responsibilities

The peer review process

Authors must agree to participate in the peer review process. Their work will be blind reviewed by at least two members of the peer review panel.

Submission quality

Authors should present an accurate representation of their research, with an objective discussion of its significance, originality and methodological rigour, as relevant. The submitted work should provide sufficient detail and

references to allow replication by others as appropriate. Underlying data should be represented accurately. Reviews should be accurate and objective, and opinion and theory papers should be clearly labelled as such.

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. The corresponding author should ensure that all co-authors and responsible authorities at the institute or organisation where the research was carried out have approved the final version, and have agreed to its submission for publication. Others who have contributed in certain substantive aspects of the work should be listed in the acknowledgements section.

Originality, plagiarism and acknowledgement of sources

Authors should ensure they are submitting original work, and that the research and influence of others is appropriately cited. Plagiarism in all forms is unethical and unacceptable.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

The author's submission should contain new and original work. Authors should not submit their work for inclusion in another publication concurrently. Authors should not submit a previously published paper for consideration.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

Authors should disclose any financial or substantive conflicts of interest that may be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their paper. Examples of potential conflicts of interest that should be disclosed are employment, consultancies, honoraria, paid expert testimony, grants or other funding. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

Fundamental errors in published work

Authors are obliged to promptly notify the editor/s, or publisher, to retract the paper or publish an appropriate erratum if they discover a significant error or inaccuracy in their published work.

Reviewers' responsibilities

Contribution to editorial decision

The peer review process helps the editor/s and editorial panel make decisions about which papers to accept for publication, and the process should also improve the quality of the paper.

Promptness

Reviewers should only accept for review the papers for which they have the necessary expertise. The review should progress in a timely manner – as a guide we work towards providing review feedback within 21 days. If there is a delay beyond this period, the editor will communicate this to the authors.

Confidentiality

The peer review process is confidential and no details of the manuscript should be revealed prior to publication, except with permission of the editor. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted work must not be used in a reviewer's own work, except with the written consent of the author.

Standards of objectivity

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

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the attention of the editor/s any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage by the reviewer or editorial team. Reviewers should not consider 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 papers.

Reference

COPE (2011). *Code of conduct and best practice guidelines for journal editors*. Available from https://publicationethics.org/files/Code%20of%20Conduct_2.pdf