

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

Social Change Review

Social Change Review is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics. All parties involved in the publishing process — authors, editors, peer reviewers, and the publisher — are expected to adhere to these standards. The ethics policies set out below are based on the **Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors** (publicationethics.org). Where applicable, research involving human or animal subjects must comply with the principles of the **Declaration of Helsinki** and relevant national and institutional regulations.

Any suspected or proven cases of misconduct — including plagiarism, data fabrication, duplicate submission, or undisclosed conflicts of interest — will be investigated and addressed in accordance with COPE guidelines.

1. Editor Responsibilities

1.1 Accountability

The editor is responsible for deciding which articles submitted to the journal should be published and is accountable for all content published in the journal. In making these decisions, the editor may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and by legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism. The editor may consult other editors or reviewers when making publication decisions.

The editor should maintain the integrity of the academic record, ensure that business considerations do not compromise intellectual and ethical standards, and always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies when needed.

1.2 Fairness

Manuscripts shall be evaluated solely on the basis of their intellectual content, without regard to the race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s). The editor will not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than the author(s), reviewers and potential reviewers, and, where appropriate, members of the editorial board.

1.3 Confidentiality

The editor and all editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

1.4 Disclosure and conflicts of interest

The editor should recuse themselves from considering manuscripts in which they have a conflict of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships with any of the authors, organizations, or institutions connected to the papers. In such cases, a co-editor, associate editor, or other member of the editorial board will handle the review and decision.

The editor is committed to ensuring that advertising, reprint, or other commercial revenue has no impact on editorial decisions. The editor should require all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication.

1.5 Corrections and retractions

The editor will follow [COPE's Guidelines for Retracting Articles](#) when considering issuing retractions, expressions of concern, or corrections pertaining to published articles. The following distinctions apply:

- **Erratum** — a correction of an error introduced by the journal during the production process.
 - **Corrigendum** — a correction of an error made by the author(s) that does not affect the conclusions or the integrity of the study.
 - **Retraction** — a withdrawal of a published article where serious errors, misconduct, or ethical violations are identified. Retraction notices will be published with a clear explanation of the reason.
 - **Expression of concern** — issued when an editor has grounds for concern about the integrity of a published article but where an investigation has not yet been concluded.
-

2. Reviewer Responsibilities

2.1 Contribution to editorial decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and may help improve the manuscript through reviewer feedback to the editor.. Reviewers are expected to provide honest, evidence-based assessments conducted within a reasonable timeframe.

2.2 Promptness

Any invited reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript, or who knows that its timely review will not be possible, should immediately notify the editor so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

2.3 Confidentiality

Manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorised by the editor. Reviewers must not retain copies of manuscripts after the review process is complete.

2.4 Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable. Reviewers should express their views clearly, with appropriate supporting arguments, and in a tone that is constructive and professional.

2.5 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 bring to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published work of which they are aware.

2.6 Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Reviewers should not evaluate manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the

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

3. Author Responsibilities

3.1 Reporting standards

Authors reporting the results of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed and an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the manuscript. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

3.2 Originality and plagiarism

Authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works. Where the work or words of others have been used, these must be appropriately cited or quoted. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable. Submitted manuscripts may be screened for plagiarism using dedicated software. For guidance on what constitutes plagiarism, authors are encouraged to consult [COPE's guidance on plagiarism](#).

3.3 Multiple, redundant, or concurrent publication

Authors should not publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Parallel submission of the same manuscript to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

3.4 Acknowledgement of sources

Proper acknowledgement of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately must not be used without explicit written permission from the source.

3.5 Authorship and contributorship

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. The journal follows the [CRediT \(Contributor Roles Taxonomy\)](#) framework as a recommended reference for defining contributor roles. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors.

The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors are included in the author list and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

Changes to authorship after submission must be approved by all co-authors and communicated to the editor in writing, with a clear explanation of the reason for the change.

3.6 Data sharing and reproducibility

Authors are encouraged to make the data underlying their findings openly available wherever possible. A **data availability statement** must be included in the manuscript. Authors should also ensure that their methodology is described in sufficient detail to allow independent replication. For guidance, authors are encouraged to consult [COPE's guidance on data and reproducibility](#).

3.7 Disclosure and conflicts of interest

All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or their interpretation. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. If there are no conflicts of interest to declare, this must be explicitly stated.

3.8 Research involving human or animal subjects

Research involving human subjects must be conducted in accordance with the principles of the **Declaration of Helsinki** ([World Medical Association](#)). Authors must confirm that the study received approval from a relevant institutional review board or ethics committee, and that informed consent was obtained from all participants, where applicable. Where the research involves animal subjects, authors must confirm compliance with applicable national regulations and institutional guidelines.

If the work involves chemicals, procedures, or equipment that have any unusual hazards inherent in their use, authors must clearly identify these in the manuscript.

3.9 Fundamental errors in published works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and cooperate to either retract the paper or publish an appropriate erratum.

4. Publisher's Responsibilities

4.1 Editorial independence

The publisher supports the editor in maintaining the independence of editorial decisions. Commercial considerations, including advertising and sponsorship, have no influence on editorial decisions.

4.2 Research misconduct

In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication, or plagiarism, the publisher, in close collaboration with the editors, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. All investigations will be conducted in accordance with [COPE guidelines](#).

4.3 Access and archiving

The publisher is committed to the permanent availability and preservation of scholarly research. All articles are made freely accessible online immediately upon publication and are preserved in long-term digital archives.

5. Complaints

The journal takes all complaints seriously and is committed to resolving them in a fair, transparent, and timely manner, in accordance with [COPE's guidance on complaints](#).

The following procedures apply:

- **Complaints about editorial decisions** — authors who believe that an editorial decision was not made in accordance with the journal's stated policies, or that the peer review process was conducted improperly, may submit a written complaint to the editorial office. The complaint should specify the grounds and include any relevant supporting documentation.

- **Complaints about reviewer or editorial conduct** — any concerns about the conduct of a reviewer or editor (e.g. breach of confidentiality, conflicts of interest, or unprofessional behaviour) should be reported to the editorial office in writing.

All complaints should be submitted to: [scr\[at\]socialchangereview\[dot\]ro](mailto:scr[at]socialchangereview[dot]ro). Submissions will be acknowledged within ten working days. Where a complaint cannot be resolved at the editorial level, it may be escalated to the publisher. If the matter remains unresolved, further guidance is available from COPE at publicationethics.org.

Please note that *Social Change Review* publishes on a continuous basis and does not operate an appeals process for rejected manuscripts. The Editor's decision on manuscript acceptance or rejection is final. Occasionally, thematic special issues are published outside the regular submission cycle; these are announced on the journal website.

6. Post-Publication Discussions and Corrections

6.1 Post-publication discussions

Social Change Review encourages scholarly dialogue following publication. Readers, reviewers, and researchers who wish to comment on published articles or raise concerns about their findings are invited to contact the editorial office at [scr\[at\]socialchangereview\[dot\]ro](mailto:scr[at]socialchangereview[dot]ro). Substantive responses from the original authors may be invited and published as correspondence, at the editor's discretion. The journal's approach to post-publication review is informed by [COPE's guidance on post-publication review](#).

6.2 Corrections, expressions of concern, and retractions

When errors or concerns are identified in published articles, the journal will act promptly and transparently:

- **Erratum** — published when an error introduced by the journal affects the accuracy of the published record.
- **Corrigendum** — published when an error made by the author(s) does not affect the study's conclusions but requires correction for accuracy.
- **Retraction** — published when serious errors, data fabrication, plagiarism, or other ethical violations fundamentally undermine the validity of the findings, in accordance with [COPE's Retraction Guidelines](#).
- **Expression of concern** — issued when there are credible but unresolved concerns about the integrity of a published work.

All corrections and retractions are indexed and linked to the original article to ensure the completeness and integrity of the scholarly record.

7. Reporting Misconduct

Concerns about publication ethics — including suspected plagiarism, data fabrication, undisclosed conflicts of interest, citation manipulation, or other forms of misconduct — should be reported to the editorial office at: [scr\[at\]socialchangereview\[dot\]ro](mailto:scr[at]socialchangereview[dot]ro).

All allegations will be treated seriously and investigated in a fair and timely manner. The editor and publisher will follow the relevant [COPE flowcharts](#) for handling suspected misconduct.

Social Change Review is published by the **Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu**, Sibiu, Romania, in partnership with **Paradigm Publishing Services**.

This statement is based on COPE Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors (publicationethics.org), the Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing (COPE/DOAJ/OASPA/WAME), and the WMA Declaration of Helsinki.