

Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society (JSEALS)
Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement (April 4, 2014)

JSEALS is the peer-reviewed journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society (SEALS).

SEALS is committed to ensuring ethics in publication and quality of articles. We require that Authors, Editors, and Reviewers conform to high standards of ethical behavior in all aspects of publication.

We endorse the Committee on Publication Ethics (<http://publicationethics.org>) and their codes of conduct and best practice guidelines for journal publishers and editors where appropriate.

Authors/Authorship:

The authors will ensure that their work is original works, and the work and/or words of others they have been used are appropriately acknowledged. This requires a complete and accurate list of references in works submitted for publication.

Authors must present an objective discussion of the significance of their research work as well as sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate data collection, experiments and/or analyses.

Authors must acknowledge all financial support received in connection with research activity contributing to their works submitted for publication.

All named authors must have contributed significantly to the research reported in articles.

The corresponding author must ensure that there is a full consensus of all co-authors in approving the final version of the work and its submission for publication.

Authors must cooperate with the peer review process fully and in good faith, to the satisfaction of editors and the Editorial Board.

Authors must provide written confirmation that the work is their original output, that the work of others utilized by the author(s) has been acknowledged, that the data are authentic (sourcing of recorded data is acknowledged and invented examples noted as such), and that primary data collected by the author(s) was done so in a manner consistent with their home institution's rules for ethical research.

Malpractices, such as plagiarism and/or making fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

Review articles should also be objective, comprehensive, and accurate accounts of the state of the art.

Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently without full disclosure to editors constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Works are received in good faith in the expectation that similar works effectively describing the same research will not be submitted to more than one journal or series.

Editors:

Editors are appointed/approved by the annual SELAS business meeting to take responsibility and exercise authority to approve or reject works offered for publication.

Editors should evaluate manuscripts objectively on the basis of their academic merit, having due regard to advice received from reviewers and other independent advice as appropriate.

Editors have a responsibility to reject a manuscript where they have reasonable doubts about its veracity or the author's intentions.

Editors must take retrospective corrective action when malpractice has been identified.

Editors must deal with manuscripts in a timely manner and take every reasonable opportunity to avoid unnecessary delays in the processing of manuscripts.

An editor must not use unpublished information in the editor's own research without the express written consent of the author.

Editors should take reasonable responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper.

In the event that malpractices are identified, editors will take appropriate actions. In the first place actions include issuing warnings and or rejection notices to authors, and in cases assessed to constitute deliberate malpractice, editors have the right to ban authors from further dealings. Where malpractice is detected after publication, works will be retracted and statements of retraction published in their place. All actions dealing with malpractice will be documented by the editors.

Reviewers:

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents.

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

Reviews should be conducted objectively, and observations should be formulated clearly with supporting arguments, so that authors can use them for improving the paper.

Reviewers should identify relevant published work which is not cited or appropriately taken into account in the work.

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process.

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. If reviewers are aware of a possible conflict of interest this must be discussed with the editor(s).

Reviewers must deal with manuscripts in a timely manner and take every reasonable opportunity to avoid unnecessary delays in the processing of manuscripts.