Publication ethics and malpractice policy

The activity of the Editorial Board of AIT conforms to the principles of independent science, objectivity, professionalism, impartiality and opposes any forms of unethical behaviour and plagiarism. The series follows the ethical norms and international standards established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and documented in the adopted code (http://publicationethics.org).

Everyone involved in the preparation of materials for publication in the series, namely: authors, reviewers, members of the editorial board, must follow the principles of publication ethics stated below.

Basic principles for authors

1. The author(s) guarantee(s) that the work they submit is original. Any use of materials and ideas from other authors should be properly acknowledged, cited or quoted. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable. Any indication of plagiarism results in a refusal to publish the manuscript.

2. Authorship is limited to those who have made significant contributions to the submitted manuscript, its concept(s), illustration(s), documentation of material(s), analysis and interpretation.

3. All authors must agree to the publication.

4. Author(s) should inform the editors if the manuscript submitted or a similar version has been submitted elsewhere for consideration in parallel or has already been published previously (including in other languages).

5. In polemical contributions (e.g. reviews), containing criticism of colleagues, the norms of academic ethics and scientific correctitude must be observed. No abusive or discriminatory language is accepted.

6. The editorial board reserves the right to reject any manuscript without needing to justify this.

Basic principles of the Editor-in-chief and the members of the editorial board

1. The Editor-in-chief is the director of the Eurasia Department of the German Archaeological Institute (Eurasien-Abteilung des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts). Members of the editorial board are invited from the international scientific community for a period of five years, which may be renewed.

2. The chief editor and the members of the board may not pass on or use information about submitted manuscripts to anyone except for the author(s) and internal reviewers. Materials not published may not be used by members of the board, editors or reviewers in any way, including personal purposes. The editors strictly adhere to the rule of anonymity of reviewers.
3. The criteria for evaluating articles submitted for consideration by the board and in taking decisions on their acceptance or rejection are their compliance with the subject of the series, scientific value, originality, clarity of presentation and compliance with the requirements of scientific ethics. The selection process for publication in AIT is not influenced by political, ethnic, racial, gender, commercial or other external factors.

4. The final text of the contribution(s) must be agreed to by the author(s). In this scope usually a publication contract is signed by the author(s) and the publisher (DAI). The publication under the name of author(s) includes the copyright, ceded to the monograph series for this particular volume (including digital versions), but the author(s) do not cede their right to (re)use the original material otherwise. The publication of any work not agreed to by the author(s), as well as the introduction of unauthorized persons among the co-authors, is not permitted.

5. If necessary, the author(s) of published contributions and/or reviews, as well as the authors of reviewed books, are given the opportunity to answer to criticism and other claims in the series.

**Basic principles for reviewers**

1. Manuscripts submitted for review should be evaluated objectively according to scientific standards, and in a timely manner.

2. Reviewers must keep confidentiality concerning the materials and contributions under review, strictly observing the author(s) rights and not disclosing any information before its publication.

3. In the event of a conflict of interests, the reviewer must notify the editor. If it is not possible to avoid or overcome the conflict of interest, the reviewer must refuse to review.