

Guidelines for safeguarding good academic practice regarding contributions to the BRGÖ

A changing approach to ethical principles in society and some incidents in scientific practice unfortunately compel us to spell out things that one would think should be self-evident. The following sections are addressed partly to the authors and partly to the reviewers; they are intended to serve as a guideline for them when writing their contributions or reviews.

§ 1. The editors of the BRGÖ will only accept original contributions that have not yet been published or accepted for print elsewhere.

§ 2. All submitted contributions must bear the name of the author(s) and contact addresses for all authors must be provided. If more than one author has contributed as regards content, those who have contributed a more substantial share shall be listed first; in the case of equal contributions, the authors shall be listed in alphabetical order. Translations must be acknowledged in a footnote at the outset of the text; any other support may be acknowledged there as well. The contribution must be submitted by the author who ranks first; he or she guarantees that all other authors agree with the way they are credited in the contribution.

§ 3. The work must be carried out in a methodologically flawless manner and be based on the latest state of research. It should not merely reflect the current state of research, however, but should develop it further on the basis of the authors' own ideas.

§ 4. Personal value judgements are permitted to a limited degree but must be clearly distinguished from scholarly assertions. Polemical statements must be avoided. All scholarly assertions must be verifiable. Usually, this shall be achieved by providing adequate evidence of the relevant sources.

§ 5. The term "source" is used here and in the following to refer to sources in the historiographical sense (archival, printed, material, audiovisual sources, etc.) as well as to scholarly secondary literature.

§ 6. Each academic work cited in the footnotes shall also be listed in the bibliography. Conversely, the bibliography will contain only those titles that have already been cited in the footnotes.

§ 7. Academic misconduct shall be deemed to have occurred especially if sources are deliberately omitted or an incorrect meaning is intentionally attributed to them.

§ 8. It is unethical to cite certain authors, including oneself, more often or less often for unobjective (personal) reasons than would be warranted by the subject matter of the contribution.

§ 9. Gender-sensitive language is encouraged, but not at the expense of grammar or when it would result in an unreasonable impediment to readability. Alibi references, for example in the form of a generalising footnote (“In all references to persons, the chosen form applies to both genders” or similar), are unwelcome.

§ 10. The reviewers shall assess whether the work has been done in a methodologically correct manner. It is not a criterion for the assessment that the author arrives at the same results or even the same individual views as the reviewers.

§ 11. Anyone submitting a contribution warrants that all relevant legal provisions (e.g. archival, copyright, criminal law provisions) have been observed and that he or she will indemnify the publisher and editorial staff in the event of an infringement of rights for which he or she is responsible or liable.

§ 12. Plagiarism is the deliberate and unlawful adoption of another’s intellectual property: the author uses, in whole or in part, works by others in his or her own work without acknowledging the source. It is irrelevant whether the other person’s work has been taken over verbatim or slightly altered. The following cases in particular are considered plagiarism:

1. if another person’s work is passed off as one’s own with or without the consent of the actual author (ghostwriting or complete plagiarism)
2. if a portion of another’s work is taken over without an adequate reference to the source (citation without reference)
3. if a foreign-language work is translated and reproduced without appropriate reference to the source (translation plagiarism)

§ 13. Using special software, each contribution is checked to see if any plagiarism has occurred. If plagiarism is detected through this or any other means, this leads to the immediate rejection of the contribution; the editorial board reserves the right to impose further sanctions (e.g. blocking the submission of further contributions) in particularly serious cases.

§ 14. All submitted contributions are assigned to two members of the editorial board, who will carry out a preliminary assessment as to whether the contribution should be rejected immediately or subjected to peer review; in the latter case, they nominate two members of the International Scientific Advisory Board of the BRGÖ as reviewers.

§ 15. The editors will ensure that only peers who are not biased, e.g. on the basis of a work or family relationship with one of the peer-reviewed authors, are engaged. The authors are entitled and obliged to point out conflicts of interest of which they are aware in one or more members of the advisory board. Likewise, each member of the advisory board is entitled and obliged to refuse to accept an assignment if there is a conflict of interest.

§ 16. The peer review is 'double blind': the peers receive the contributions only in anonymised form, and the author will also not know the names of the reviewers. If both reviews are positive, the contribution will be accepted for print. If they are both negative, it will be rejected and the author will receive an anonymised copy of the reviews. If one review is negative and the other positive, a third peer will be asked to provide a review, which will then be decisive. If the contribution is accepted for print but suggestions for improvement are made, these will also be sent to the author in anonymised form and he or she will be given the opportunity to rewrite the contribution accordingly. All reviews will be archived in the BRGÖ's editorial office for internal documentation purposes.

§ 17. In the future, it should be possible for authors to see directly on the BRGÖ homepage at what stage of editing their submitted contribution is.

§ 18. §§ 1–16 shall apply to all contributions appearing from 2013 onwards.

Vienna, 15 April 2013

The editors of the BRGÖ