

## *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* Statement of Ethical Standards and Procedures

<https://slavica.indiana.edu/journalListings/jsl>

[jsl@indiana.edu](mailto:jsl@indiana.edu)

Steven Franks, Editor-in-Chief

Rosemarie Connolly, Managing Editor

The *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* (*JSL*) is a double-blind peer-review journal, published semiannually in May and November. *JSL* is the official journal of the Slavic Linguistics Society (SLS; <http://www.slaviclinguistics.org/>). The journal is managed through Indiana University and published by Slavic Publishers (owned and operated at Indiana University). A full list of Associate Editors and members of the Editorial Board, their affiliations, and their contact information are listed on Slavic Publishers' website. Volumes 16 through the current issue are available through Project MUSE; archived volumes (beginning with volume 1 and with a three-year publication delay) are available on JSTOR.

### *Responsibilities of the Editors*

- To evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.
- To ensure that inquiries from standing officers and members of the executive committee of the SLS or members of *JSL*'s editorial board about items submitted for review are to be treated in the same way as such inquiries from any member of the Society.
- To disclose any potential conflict of interest with respect to articles submitted to the journal.
- To maintain the anonymity of the reviewers.
- To treat all submissions confidentially.
- To respond to authors within a timely fashion.
- Editors have the authority to reject or accept a submission once they have a reasonable degree of certainty. See details of the review process, below.

### *Peer Review*

- *JSL* has a double-blind peer-review process based on initial editor screening and double-blind refereeing by a minimum of two reviewers who are experts in the field.
- *JSL* does not accept submissions that are concurrently under consideration with other publications.

### *Responsibilities of the Reviewers*

- To contribute to the decision-making process and to assist in improving the quality of the final published manuscript by reviewing the manuscript objectively, within a timely fashion.
- To notify the editor if the reviewer has a conflict of interest with the research resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with the authors or the work, or with the research funding support, and if necessary withdraw services for reviewing the manuscript.
- To maintain the confidentiality of any information supplied by the editor or author, including not retaining a copy of the manuscript.
- To notify the editor of any published or submitted content that is substantially similar to that which is under review.

### *Responsibilities of Authors*

- To submit only original contributions not previously published.
- To ensure that the author(s) have written entirely original works, and that all authors have significantly contributed to the work and that all who significantly contribute to the work are listed as authors.
- To disclose any financial or substantive conflict of interest.
- To confirm that the manuscript is not under consideration or accepted for publication elsewhere. Where portions of the content overlap with submitted or published material, to acknowledge and cite those sources. In cases of overlap with submitted material, the author may be asked to provide a copy of that manuscript.
- To cite explicitly others' work and ideas in references (see the journal's Submission Guidelines and Style Sheet, available on the journal's website). Plagiarism, falsification, omitting significant material, and fraudulent data are not acceptable.
- To affirm that all data and research are authentic. To ensure that any studies involving human subjects conform to national, local, and institutional laws and requirements and confirm that approval has been sought and obtained where appropriate. Authors should obtain express permission from subjects and respect their privacy.
- To notify the editors in the event that errors have been brought to the authors' attention, and to agree to the publication of corrections or retractions as necessary.
- Authors must complete any outstanding payment for membership in SLS before a manuscript is submitted for processing.
- Authors must consent to participate in *JSL*'s double-blind peer-review process.

### *Responsibility of the Slavic Linguistics Society*

- SLS will ensure that good practice will be maintained as outlined above.

### *Protecting against Unethical Behavior*

The editorial operation (including the main editorial office as well as remote participants, such as the editorial board and SLS officers) as a whole is responsible for monitoring and enforcing adherence to the ethical principles outlined above. The editorial office will take reasonable steps to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred. In no case will the editorial operation and those associated with it encourage misconduct in any form. The editorial office will maintain records of submission and revision so as to ensure the historiographic record, e.g., in establishing precedence in publishing submissions. The editorial office will not permit business considerations to influence its editorial decisions. The editorial office will publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies as required, and will take all reasonable measures to guard against possible plagiarism or fraudulent information. In the event that *JSL*'s editors or publisher is made aware of any allegation of misconduct, the editors will address the allegations appropriately.

### *Copyright and Access*

- Copyright of individual articles is maintained by the authors.
- Information regarding access to previously published content is available on the journal's website.

### **Review process details:**

1. When a paper is submitted, the Managing Editor (ME) and Editor-in-Chief (EC) decide if it is ready to be sent out for review and, if so, select an appropriate Associate Editor (AE) to take it on. The ME will let the author know which AE is in charge of the paper and also reminds the author that membership in SLS is required.
2. The AE contacts the author to identify him/herself and to explain the editorial process: reviewing is double blind, papers are generally sent to two reviewers, *JSL* aims to make an initial editorial decision and get reviews back to authors in 2–3 months, although it can take longer depending on the paper. After that, the fate of submissions depends on numerous factors, although in general the quicker a paper is accepted and a final version received, the sooner it will appear in print.
3. The responsible AE generally identifies two reviewers who agree to evaluate the paper. The AE lets the ME know at this time who the reviewers are (for internal) records. A comprehensive list acknowledging all manuscript reviewers (whether or not the paper was accepted) is printed every two years. Reviewers who do not wish to be identified are not included in the published list.
4. In general, it is up to the AE to keep tabs on status of papers they are handling, which means prompting errant reviewers for reviews and authors for rewrites. The ME and EC will however periodically review all papers in the pipeline and ask AEs to send reminders in order to move things along.
5. Optimal timeline for the whole process as follows: AE aims to get two initial reviews back to authors within 3 months, together with the AE's editorial recommendation. Outcomes are that the paper is (i) accepted with minor revisions, (ii) accepted pending significant specified revisions, (iii) will be reconsidered for publication once thoroughly revised, or (iv) rejected as unsuitable for publication in *JSL*. If the AE's decision is (i), (ii), or (iii), then the quicker the author returns the ms. to the AE, the quicker the paper should advance through the pipeline: for (i), the paper is not sent back to the reviewers, and the AE simply checks that the recommended revisions have been satisfactorily completed; for (ii), the AE will send the revised ms. back to the original reviewers to confirm they are satisfied and for any further suggestions (reviewers are asked to respond within a month); for (iii), AE will send the paper back to original reviewers for full review (in some cases, at the AE's discretion and in consultation with the ME, new reviewer(s) can be substituted).