

Jaarboek voor Munt- en Penningkunde

Policy on publication ethics

2017

The Editorial Committee of *Jaarboek voor Munt- en Penningkunde* (JMP) acknowledges that all parties involved in the act of publishing (authors, the members of the editorial committee, the peer reviewers, and the Koninklijk Nederlands Genootschap voor Munt- en Penningkunde) should comply with standards of expected ethical behaviour. Our policy is informed by the guidelines of Committee On Publication Ethics (COPE; see <http://publicationethics.org/about>).

Authors

Originality, plagiarism and referencing

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works. The paper may not have been published before, nor submitted elsewhere pending the review of JMP. Work and/or words of others should be appropriately cited or quoted, so that proper acknowledgement of others' efforts is guaranteed.

Reporting standards

Authors reporting original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to verify the line of argument. All JMP articles comprise a list of references, formatted as prescribed in the JMP author guidelines.

Authorship of the paper

Authorship should be constrained to those who have made a substantive contribution to the conception, design, execution, and/or interpretation of the reported study. The corresponding author should ensure that all co-authors have approved the final version and agreed to its submission.

Editorial Committee

Publication decisions

The Editorial Committee decides which submissions will be published. The Committee's Chair assigns a Handling Editor who takes care of the reviewing process. The Handling Editor is guided by the journal's publication policies.

Confidentiality

Members of the Editorial Committee may not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, and potential reviewers.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Unpublished materials in a submitted manuscript may not be used by anyone involved in the reviewing process, unless the author(s) consent(s) explicitly in writing.

Reviewers

Contribution to editorial decisions

Peer review assists the Handling Editor in making editorial decisions. Through the editorial communications with the authors reviewers' comments may assist the authors in improving their manuscripts.

Promptness

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the Handling Editor and excuse himself from the review process.

Confidentiality

Manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential. No information about or from the paper may be disclosed or discussed with others except when authorized by the Handling Editor.

Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees 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 argument, observation or derivation, had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. Reviewers should also call to the Handling Editor's attention any overlap or substantial similarity between the submitted manuscript and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

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