



Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement
TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism (ISSN 1089-7747)

This publication statement adheres to the guidelines published in the Committee on Publication Ethics' *Code of Conduct and Best-Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors* (https://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf).

TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism is a peer-reviewed electronic journal dedicated to study of the Jewish and Christian biblical texts. *TC* publishes full-length scholarly articles, shorter notes, project reports, and reviews of works in the field of biblical textual criticism. Articles on any aspect of the textual criticism of the Jewish and Christian scriptures (including extracanonical and related literature) are welcome, and contributions that transcend the traditional boundary between Hebrew Bible and New Testament textual criticism are especially encouraged. *TC* also invites articles discussing the relationship between textual criticism and other disciplines.

In such a narrow field of study as biblical textual criticism, it is frequently the case that scholars are fully aware of others' specific research interests and ongoing projects. As a result, a qualified peer reviewer of any given article will often know who authored the article. In such cases, *TC* practices single-blind peer review, with the reviewer aware of the identity of the author but the author never informed of the identity of the reviewer. Whenever practical, however, *TC* practices double-blind peer review, with neither author nor reviewer knowing the other's identity.

1. Editor Responsibilities

1.1. Publication Decisions

The general editor is responsible for deciding the fate of each article submitted to the journal: publish, publish after revision, decline. The editor will evaluate manuscripts without regard to an author's race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy. The decision will be based on the paper's relevance to the journal's field of study, importance, originality, validity, and clarity. Current legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism should also be considered. The general editor shall create a file for each article submitted recording the decision made and including any supporting documentation relevant to that decision (e.g., reviewer reports, editorial board discussion).

1.2. Peer-Review Assignment

The general editor shall assign each article that is relevant to the journal's field of study and that meets minimum standards of scholarship as determined by the general editor to two qualified peer reviewers. These peer reviewers may but are not required to be members of the editorial board.

1.3. Confidentiality

The general editor and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a proposed article to anyone other than the corresponding author, assigned reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and SBL Press staff, as appropriate.

1.4. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a proposed article must not be used in any way by the editor or the members of the editorial board for their own research or publication purposes without the author's explicit written consent.

2. Reviewer Responsibilities

2.1. Contribution to Editorial Decisions

The peer-review process assists the editor and the editorial board in making editorial decisions and may also serve the author in improving the paper.

2.2. Competence and Promptness

Any selected reviewer who feels unqualified to review the specific topic of a proposed article or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and ask to be excused from the review process. The reviewer is encouraged to suggest to the general editor the names of those better able to complete a competent, timely review.

2.3. Confidentiality

Any manuscript received for review must be treated as a confidential document. It must not be disclosed to or discussed with others, including members of the editorial board and SBL Press staff, except as authorized by the general editor.

2.4. Standards of Objectivity

Reviews should be conducted with as much objectivity as is possible. The reviewer's evaluation should be grounded in the statements of the article and based on accepted scholarly evidence; personal criticism of the author is never acceptable. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

2.5. Acknowledgement of Prior Scholarship and Sources

Reviewers should identify instances in which relevant published work referred to in the paper has not been properly cited. They should also indicate when observations or arguments derived from other publications are not accompanied by the respective source. Reviewers are to notify the editor of any substantial similarity or overlap between a manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

2.6. Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. 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, companies, or institutions associated with the papers.

3. Author Duties and Responsibilities

3.1. Reporting Standards

Authors of original research reports 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 replicate the work.

3.2. Data Access and Retention

Authors of original research may be asked to provide the raw data of a study together with the paper for editorial review and should be prepared to make the data available to other scholars when practicable. To that end, authors should retain in perpetuity the raw data that underlie a study so that the study may be replicated or reevaluated.

3.3. Originality, Plagiarism, and Acknowledgement of Sources

Authors will submit only entirely original works and will appropriately cite or quote the work and/or words of others. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work should also be referenced.

3.4. Multiple, Redundant or Concurrent Publication

In general, papers describing essentially the same research should not be published in more than one journal. Further, it is a breach of academic ethics to submit the same paper to more than one journal, and manuscripts that have been published as copyrighted material elsewhere cannot be submitted. In addition, a manuscript under review by *TC* should not be made available online or submitted to some other copyrighted publication.

3.5. Authorship of the Paper

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the execution or writing of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as coauthors. The corresponding author is to ensure that all contributing coauthors and no uninvolved persons are included in the author list. The corresponding author will also verify that all coauthors have approved the final version of the article and have agreed to its submission for publication.

3.6. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

All authors should include a statement disclosing any financial or other substantive conflicts of interest that may be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

3.7. Fundamental Errors in Published Works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in the published work, it is the author's obligation to notify the journal editor or publisher of the error within ten days of that discovery and to cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper in form of an erratum.