

## MUSEOLOGICAL REVIEW

### ETHICS STATEMENT

#### ABOUT THE JOURNAL

*Museological Review* is the online journal edited by the PhD community of the School of Museum Studies since 1994. MR is an open community engaged with contemporary subjects that uses the museum studies' perspective to make a contribution to knowledge. It includes current research, including practice-based research, in museum-related fields, through a variety of formats, disciplines and nationalities. MR is an accessible, learning-based journal that holds content by graduated students (MA and PhD) as well as early career researchers and practitioners. The journal is supportive and inclusive. It is open to new formats beyond the academic article that brings together theory and practice in original ways. It is critical and academic, publishing pieces that are well-evidenced, fair and precise, opening discussion within the field through debate, challenge and originality.

While every effort is made by the editors to see that no inaccurate or misleading data, opinions or statements appear in the journal, they wish to make it clear that the data and opinions appearing in MR are the sole responsibility of the contributors concerned. Accordingly, the editors and publishers and all respective employees, officers and agents accept no responsibility or liability whatsoever for the consequences of any such inaccurate or misleading data, opinions or statements. It is the responsibility of the author to ensure that research published in MR has been conducted with integrity and according to relevant codes of ethics, and has, where required, received approval from relevant ethics committees.

#### PUBLICATION PROCESS

*Museological Review* is a peer-reviewed journal. All submissions will be reviewed by the editors according to intellectual merit. They may also be guided by the aims and policies of the journal and relevance to the theme, contingent upon any legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. All selected materials, with the possible exception of editorial introductions, reviews and Question and Answer submissions will be sent for double-blind review to a scholar with relevant experience and expertise. Referees are asked to advise the editors on whether the submission should be published and if so, with what recommended changes. The editors respond to the author with a list of any changes needed to the submission to be accepted for publication. An anonymised copy of the referees' comments may also be sent to the author. Publication cannot be assured until final revisions are accepted.

During the copyediting stage, submissions which do not conform to the style guide may be returned to the author for amendment; the editors also reserve the right to alter usage to conform to the style guide. Authors may not supply new materials or request major alterations following the copyediting stage, and so they should ensure that the submission is final upon acceptance.

#### AUTHORS' RESPONSIBILITIES

All submissions must contain nothing that is abusive, defamatory, libellous, obscene, fraudulent or illegal.

All submissions should be original works and not previously been published (in print or electronic format) or is not concurrently under consideration or peer review by or accepted for any other publication. An author should not borrow substantially from or duplicate his or her own previously

published works nor submit manuscripts describing essentially the same research and conclusions in more than one journal or primary publication.

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in their own work and where the author has drawn on the work of others and/or directly quoted the words of others, such works and direct quotes must be appropriately acknowledged and cited. The Style Guide indicates the form of citation and quotation which should be used within *Museological Review*. A submission should contain sufficient detail and references to enable others to locate sources. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements are unethical and unacceptable. Should an author discover a significant inaccuracy or error in his or her own published work, it is the obligation of the author promptly to notify the editors of *Museological Review* and to cooperate with them to retract or correct the submission.

It is the author's responsibility to obtain copyright approval for non-original materials included in submissions. If the author wishes to include any material in which they do not hold copyright, written permission from the copyright owner must be obtained before submission. This applies to direct reproduction as well as 'derivative reproduction', where a new table or figure has been created which derives substantially from a copyrighted source. The author must provide appropriate acknowledgment of the permission granted to them for reuse by the copyright holder in each caption or figure. The author is solely responsible for any fees which the copyright holder may charge for reuse.

The corresponding author is responsible for communicating with *Museological Review* for publication. They should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the paper. All co-authors should have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission. The email address of the corresponding author will normally be displayed in the journal unless they expressly request otherwise.

Sources of funding for the research reported in the submission should be acknowledged at its end. All authors should disclose in their submission any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of the submission.

#### REVIEWERS' RESPONSIBILITIES

Peer review assists the editors in making decisions with regard to amendment and publication of submissions, while the comments arising from the peer review process may also assist the author in improving the submission.

Any reviewer who feels unqualified to review the submission or unable to provide a prompt review should notify the editor and excuse herself or himself from the review process.

All submissions which undergo review must be treated as confidential documents; they must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorised by the Editor in Chief. Reviews should be conducted objectively, constructively and clearly with supporting arguments. There will be no personal criticism of the author.

The reviewers may comment upon the aims, objectives of and methodology employed in the manuscript; and research and analysis, including any relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors or any substantial similarity or overlap between the submission and any other

published paper of which they have personal knowledge. The reviewer may also comment on the form of communication including sentence construction and grammar.

Reviewers should decline to review manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative or other relationships or connections with any of the authors.

#### EDITORS' RESPONSIBILITIES

The editors are responsible for deciding which submissions should be published within the journal. All submissions will be evaluated on intellectual merit. The editors may also be guided by the aims and policies of the journal, contingent upon any legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism; and relevance to the journal theme.

The editors must not disclose any information about a submission to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other advisers and the publisher. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submission must not be used by anyone who has a view of the manuscript while handling it in his or her own research without the express written consent of the author.