Publication ethics and publication malpractice statement: 
Counselling 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).

Author’s responsibilities

The peer review process
Authors must participate in the peer review process, where their work will be blind reviewed by at least two members of the peer review panel.

Reporting standards
Authors should present an accurate representation of their research, with an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately. The submitted work should provide sufficient detail and references to allow replication by others. Reviews should be accurate and objective, and opinion pieces 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 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 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, and if there are any delays the editor should be notified so that the paper can be reassigned to another reviewer.

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 editor’s attention 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. 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.

Editors’ responsibilities

Publication decisions
The editor has the sole authority to decide which papers are accepted or rejected for publication, and may seek advice from the editorial board and peer review panel where necessary. Papers accepted for publication are judged on their academic merit, originality, the work’s importance and relevance to the field of counselling psychology. Editors are constrained by legal requirements, such as copyright infringement, plagiarism, and libel. Editors should protect the integrity of the publication by publishing corrections and retractions where needed.

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

Disclosure and conflict of interest
Editors must not disclose any unpublished material submitted to CPR 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 members of the editorial board submit papers for review, or if editors are unable to accept a paper due to their own potential conflict of interest, a guest editor should be used instead, to ensure fairness. Editors require all submitting authors to disclose any conflicts of interest, and should 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 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 CPR.
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