

Ethics Statement

Written by Camila Zorrilla Tessler and the editorial board

The *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies* (JCAS) holds the ethical responsibilities of all parties involved in publication to the highest standard. In the spirit of this standard, as well as for the sake of transparency, this ethics statement highlights the expectations of editors, peer reviewers, and authors. These ethical expectations align with the Society of American Archivists [Core Values and Code of Ethics](#).

Editor responsibilities

Editors have a responsibility to uphold the ethical standards of JCAS and should be cognizant of the responsibilities of all parties involved in the publishing of new scholarship. This includes the following:

Editors should expand theoretical and practical scholarship. To this end, editors should be aware of current trends in archival science and advise authors about new professional literature and emerging methodologies.

Editors will work with the authors on revisions when the article has been accepted with major or minor revisions. Authors should take the feedback from the peer reviewers' into account and will collaborate with the editor to review and revise the article. If the author does not agree on suggested changes, the editor has the right to rescind the article.

Editors should follow professional standards that promote transparency. This includes being critical of submissions (including data and methodology) to ensure originality, lack of bias, and proper citation and acknowledgement.

Editors should also be cognizant of potential harmful or discriminatory content in submissions. This includes racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, religious intolerance, cultural erasure, ageism, and other forms of marginalization. If an editor is concerned about potentially harmful or discriminatory content in a submission, they should consult the managing editor.

Editors should be transparent about potential conflicts of interest and bias in evaluation submissions. . This can include but not be limited to: a close professional or personal relationship with an author, research conflict and overlap, or participation in the research and writing of a submission. Editors should disclose any potential conflicts of interest to the managing editor and recuse themselves from editing submissions for which there is a conflict of interest.

Editors should keep an eye out for AI generated content. We do not accept articles written by AI. If the editor suspects that there is AI written content in an article, they should consult the managing editor.

Peer reviewer responsibilities

Peer reviewers should be thoughtful when providing feedback and approach peer reviewing in the spirit of furthering knowledge and scholarship in the field. Peer reviewer comments should be professional and constructive, even if the peer reviewer recommends major revisions or rejecting a submission.

Peer reviewers are empowered to decline a peer review invitation for any reason, such as a submission falling outside their area of expertise or not having sufficient time to complete a thorough review.

Peer reviewers should not intentionally seek out the identity of the author, either publicly or privately. If a peer reviewer becomes aware of the identity of the author, they should report it to the editor as soon as possible. Peer reviewers are also required to disclose any potential conflicts of interest to the editor before accepting a peer review, including knowing or suspecting they have a close professional or personal relationship with the author(s) and knowing or suspecting they were involved in the research and writing process.

Peer reviewers should not use AI in their feedback, comments, and suggestions for the authors. All peer reviewers' work should be their own. Peer reviewers should not feed submissions they have been asked to review into AI tools due to possible copyright violations.

Author responsibilities

Authors should be transparent about their research methodologies and potential gaps or biases in their work. Submissions should reflect work or research conducted by the authors. All sources should be cited, along with work completed by collaborators other than the authors. JCAS does not accept plagiarised works.

Authors should work with the editors on the article. If the author does not comply with the standards outlined by the journal or does not want to make suggested changes on the article, the article may be taken off of JCAS's website.

Articles should be written by humans and not AI. We do not accept articles that were written by AI. For example, authors should not use ChatGTP to write content but the use of autocorrect in Microsoft Word is acceptable. Also, any translated articles should be translated by a human and not run through automated translation programs such as Google Translate.

The journal reserves the right to retract articles if they are discovered to be plagiarized, written by AI, or contain factual inaccuracies after publication. In the case of accidental factual inaccuracies, the editors may work with authors to revise the submission and contextualize the revisions for readers.

Authors should be cognizant of potential harmful or discriminatory content in their submissions.

Citations:

For more information on AI: <https://www2.archivists.org/american-archivist/AI-statement>