

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

Phânes: Journal for Jung History adheres to the highest ethical publication practices and expects all submitting authors to uphold the high standards of publication ethics as set out by the **Commission on Publication Ethics (COPE)**. Any cases of ethical misconduct are treated very seriously and will be dealt with in accordance with the COPE guidelines.

1. Editors' Duties

Editors evaluate submitted manuscripts exclusively on the basis of their academic merit and its relevance to the journal's scope, regardless of the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, citizenship, religious belief, political philosophy or institutional affiliation. Decisions to edit and publish are not determined by the policies of governments or any other agencies outside of the journal itself.

Confidentiality

Editors and editorial members will not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, and other editorial advisers, as appropriate.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Editors and editorial members will not use unpublished information disclosed in a submitted manuscript for their own research purposes without the authors' explicit written consent. Editors will recuse themselves from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships/connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions connected to the papers.

Peer review

The editors ensure that all submitted manuscripts being considered for publication undergo double-blind peer review by at least two reviewers who are expert in the field. The editors are responsible for deciding which of the manuscripts submitted to the journal will be published, based on the validation of the work in question, its importance to researchers and readers, the reviewers' comments, and such legal requirements as are currently in force regarding copyright infringement and plagiarism.

Peer review feedback is delivered to the authors through a form called "Comments to the Author", in which six substantial points are addressed by the reviewers: (1) Is the manuscript appropriate for the scopes of the journal? (2) Does it significantly contribute to the knowledge of the subject of the journal and will it be of interest for a large proportion of readers? (3) Is the submission original and factually sound? (4) Is the manuscript complete as it stands? Has the author used all the primary and secondary sources appropriately? (5) Is the analysis rich? Or is revision necessary? (6) How well is the paper presented? Is it written clearly and in idiomatic English?

The feedback form is sent back to the author within 2 weeks of submission (3 weeks under exceptional circumstances if the submission is presented during a festive period). Following peer review, the editorial decision is made with three possible outcomes: accept, reject, accept with

minor revisions. If the manuscript is accepted with minor revisions, the author is given two weeks to edit the manuscript and send it back to the reviewer, who will proceed to final evaluation.

Handling of unethical publishing behaviour

In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism, the editors will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum, clarification or, in the most severe case, the retraction of the affected work.

Access to journal content

The journal is committed to the availability and preservation of scholarly research and ensures accessibility through the digital archive of *Phânes: Journal for Jung History*.

2. Reviewers' Duties

Phânes: Journal for Jung History is strongly committed to high standards of double blind peer review process to ensure the highest level of scientific quality for the submitted manuscripts.

Confidentiality

The manuscripts received for review are confidential documents and therefore must not be shown to or discussed with others, except if authorised by the Managing Editor, who would only do so under exceptional and specific circumstances. This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

Standards of objectivity

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

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that is an observation, derivation or argument that has been reported in previous publications should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also notify the editors of any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other manuscript (published or unpublished) of which they have personal knowledge.

Conflicts of interest

Any reviewer who has conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions connected to the manuscript and the work described therein should immediately notify the editors to declare their conflicts of interest and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

3. Authors' Duties

Authors of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed and the results, followed by an objective discussion of the significance of the work. The manuscript should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

Authors should ensure that they have properly acknowledged the work of others, and should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately (from conversation, correspondence or discussion with third parties) must not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source.

Originality and plagiarism

Authors should ensure that they have written and submit only entirely original works, and if they have used the work of others, that this has been appropriately cited. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the work reported in the manuscript should also be cited. Plagiarism takes many forms: passing off another's paper as the author's own, copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), claiming results from research conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

Redundant or concurrent submission/publication

Papers describing essentially the same research should not be published in more than one journal or primary publication. Hence, authors should not submit for consideration a manuscript that has already been published in another journal. Submission of a manuscript concurrently to more than one journal is unethical publishing behaviour and unacceptable.

Conflicts of interest

At the earliest stage possible, authors should disclose any conflicts of interest that might be construed to influence the results or their interpretation in the manuscript. Examples of potential conflicts of interest that should be disclosed include financial ones such as honoraria, educational grants or other funding, participation in speakers' bureaus, membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest, and paid expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements, as well as non-financial ones such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs in the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript.

Peer review

Authors are obliged to participate in the peer review process and cooperate fully by responding promptly to editors' requests for raw data, clarifications, and proof of ethics approval, patient consents and copyright permissions. Authors should respond to the reviewers' comments systematically, point by point, and in a timely manner, revising and re-submitting their manuscript to the journal by the deadline given.

Significant errors in published works

When authors discover significant errors or inaccuracies in their own published work, it is their obligation to promptly notify the journal's editors or publisher and cooperate with them to either correct the paper in the form of an erratum or to retract the paper. This strictly applies only to significant errors and not to minor corrections that do not affect the work substantially. If the editors or publisher learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error or inaccuracy, then it is the authors' obligation to promptly correct or retract the paper or provide evidence to the journal editors of the correctness of the paper.