

Journal of Tourism, Leisure and Hospitality (TOLEHO) follows the COPE [Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors](#). The basic values are presented below. COPE principles will be adopted in matters that arise outside of the following situations.

## **1. Responsibilities of Editors**

### *1.1. Fair Play*

The manuscripts submitted to the Journal of TOLEHO are evaluated for their scientific value, academic merit and intellectual content without considering the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, citizenship, religious belief, political philosophy or institutional affiliation.

### *1.2. Editorial Independence*

Decisions of rejection or acceptance are not determined by the political atmosphere, the policies of the government or any other parties out of the Journal's Editorial Board. The Editor-in-Chief has full authority over the journal.

### *1.3. Confidentiality, Privacy and Disclosure*

Editor-in-Chief and all editorial staff must not disclose any information about any submitted manuscript to anyone other than corresponding authors, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as it is inappropriate. Editors, editorial board members and editorial staff must not use any unpublished content from a submitted manuscript for other purposes or their advantage.

### *1.4. Conflicts of Interest*

Editors must decline any submitted manuscript in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships/connections with any of the authors, companies or institutions connected to the manuscripts, and they should ask another member of the editorial board to handle the manuscript.

## **2. Responsibilities of Reviewers**

### *2.1. Contribution*

Peer review process assists the Editor-in-Chief in making editorial decisions and also assists authors in improving the quality of their submitted manuscript.

### *2.2. Promptness*

Any invited reviewer who feels unqualified or uncomfortable to review the submitted manuscript or knows that it is hard to review due to time limitations, should immediately notify the handling editor and withdraw from the reviewing process.

### *2.3. Objectivity*

Reviews should be objective, and observations should be formulated clearly with supporting arguments so that authors can use them to improve the quality of the manuscript. Criticisms which personally aim authors are considered inappropriate.

#### *2.4. Confidentiality, Privacy and Disclosure*

Reviewers must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone. Reviewers must not use the unpublished content from a submitted manuscript for their personal advantage or other purposes.

#### *2.5. Conflicts of Interest*

Reviewers must withdraw from reviewing the submitted manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships/connections with any of the authors, companies, countries, communities, institutions etc. connected to the manuscripts. Reviewers can also withdraw from reviewing the manuscripts when any issue with potential harm to the double-blind review process, arises.

#### *2.6. Acknowledgements*

Reviewers should detect any published study that has not been cited in the manuscript. Any statement that is an observation, derivation or argument that has been reported in previous publications should be cited. A reviewer should also notify the editors about any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other study (published or unpublished) of which they have personal knowledge.

### **3. Responsibilities of Authors**

#### *3.1. Reporting*

Authors should present an accurate account of the study with their results, then an objective discussion of the significance of the study should follow. Manuscripts should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Review articles should be accurate, objective and comprehensive, while editorial 'opinion' or perspective pieces should be identified. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour, and such situations are considered unacceptable.

#### *3.2. Novelty*

Authors should ensure that they have written and submitted fully original papers and they have cited any study and/or words of others in the manuscript appropriately. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the study reported in the manuscript should also be cited.

#### *3.3. Plagiarism*

Plagiarism takes many forms, from "passing off" another's paper as the author's own, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without citation), to claiming results from the studies conducted by other parties. Plagiarism in all forms is regarded as unethical behaviour and is unacceptable at all.

#### *3.4. Multiple, duplicate, redundant or concurrent publication and "salami-slicing"*

Papers describing essentially the same research findings should not be published as more than an article or a primary publication. Hence, authors should not submit for consideration a manuscript that has already been published in another journal. Parallel submissions of the same manuscript to more than one journal at the same time is unethical and unacceptable. Unlike duplicate publication, 'salami-slicing' involves breaking up or segmenting a large study into two or more publications. As a general understanding, as long as the 'slices' of a study share the same hypotheses, population, and methods, "slicing" is not an acceptable practice.

### *3.5. Authorship*

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the submitted study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. When there are others who make contributions in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be named in the “Acknowledgement” section. This is one of the primary responsibilities of the corresponding author.

### *3.6. Disadvantaged groups, children, animals as subjects*

If any submitted work involves the use of animals, children or disadvantaged participants, authors should ensure that all procedures were performed in compliance with relevant laws and institutional guidelines and that the appropriate institutional ethical committee(s) has/have approved them; the manuscript should contain a statement about this. The privacy and security rights of all participants must always be considered.

### *3.7. Disclosure and conflicts of interest*

All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflicts of interest that might be construed to influence the results or their interpretation in the manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed and these should be named in the “Acknowledgement” section.

### *3.8. Fundamental errors in published works*

When authors discover a significant error or inaccuracy in their published work, it is the authors’ obligation to promptly notify the journal’s Editor-in-Chief and cooperate with them to either retract the paper or to publish an appropriate erratum.

### *3.9. Responsibilities of Publisher*

In the cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism, the publisher will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question, in close collaboration with the Editors-in-Chief. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum or, in the most severe cases, the complete retraction of the affected work.

The Publisher and the Journal do not discriminate based on age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, gender, genetic predisposition or carrier status, or sexual orientation in its publishing programs, services and activities.