

## **Ethical Guidelines for Editors, Authors and Reviewers – Psychotherapy Research**

### **The ethical obligations of Editors of Psychotherapy Research**

- Editors shall give unbiased consideration to all manuscripts, judging its merits without regard to the race, religion, nationality, sex, sexual orientation, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the Author.
- Editors shall make their best efforts to process manuscripts with speed efficiency.
- Editors shall take sole responsibility for acceptance or rejection of a manuscript. Although the Editor may seek guidance via peer review, may reject a manuscript without review if considered inappropriate for journal.
- Editors shall make their best effort to keep the peer review process confidential.
- Editors shall make their best effort to avoid conflicts of interest.
- If an Editor is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance a published article is erroneous, the Editor shall publish an appropriate correction, or in the extreme, withdraw the article.

### **The ethical obligations of Authors who publish in Psychotherapy Research**

- Authors shall strive to present an accurate account of the research performed, and offer an objective discussion of its significance.
- To the extent possible, the article should contain sufficient detail about procedures to permit the Author's peers to replicate the work.
- Authors shall cite relevant references.
- Authors shall identify significant risks that arose in conducting the research.
- Authors shall attempt to avoid conflicts of interest.
- Authors shall avoid fragmented or piecemeal publication (i.e., the separation of a single article into a series of articles that overlap substantially in content).
- Authors are themselves responsible for ensuring that the form in which their manuscript is submitted shall render it anonymous during the process of peer review.
- Authors must not submit the same or similar manuscripts to any other Journal or publication medium while they are under review with Psychotherapy Research.
- Although an experimental or theoretical study may sometimes justify criticism of the work of another scientist, personal criticism is inappropriate.
- A “co-Author” is defined as any person who has made a significant scientific contribution to the work reported, and who shares responsibility and accountability for the results.
- Authorship and order of authorship is assigned such that it accurately reflects the relative scientific or professional contributions of each of the co-authors, regardless of their relative status. Mere possession of an institutional position (e.g., department chair) does not justify authorship credit. Minor contributions to articles (e.g., data collection, data entry) should be acknowledged appropriately in author notes.
- In the case of a multiple-authored article based on a student's doctoral dissertation, the student should listed as the first author, except in extraordinary circumstances.

### **The ethical obligations of Reviewers in Psychotherapy Research**

- Reviewers are expected to give unbiased consideration to all manuscripts, judging each on its merits without regard to the possible race, religion, nationality, sex, sexual orientation, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).
- Reviewers shall make their best effort to process manuscripts with reasonable speed and efficiency.
- Reviewers shall judge the quality of the manuscript, its experimental and theoretical work, its interpretations, and its exposition as objectively as possible, with due regard to the maintenance of high scientific and literary standards.
- Reviewers shall keep the manuscripts and the review process confidential.
- Reviewers shall respect the proprietary rights of the Authors of manuscripts they review.
- Reviewers inform Editors about conflicts of interest.
- Reviewers should explain and support their judgments; any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported must be accompanied by the relevant citation, and unsupported assertions must be avoided. While the review of a manuscript may justify criticism, even severe criticism, under no circumstances is personal or malicious criticism of the author appropriate or acceptable.

### **Appeal Process**

- Authors who wish to lodge an Appeal about a decision generated by the peer review process may appeal to the Executive Committee of the Society for Psychotherapy Research.
- Readers who wish to raise a concern about a Published Article may appeal to the Executive Committee of the Society for Psychotherapy Research.
- The Executive Committee of the Society for Psychotherapy Research shall consider any Appeal or Concern at its own discretion, and its decisions shall be final.

**Additional Ethical Guidelines and Laws:** In addition, Editors, Authors, and Reviewers are expected to conform to the ethical guidelines of their professional bodies and the laws of their country in relation to data protection and any other pertinent issues that the research and publication may create.

**Another Reference:** As an example of well-defined ethical codes, we refer Editors, Authors, and Reviewers to the Ethical Standards for the Reporting and Publishing of Scientific Information published in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (2001).