The Human Question

PUBLICATION ETHICS

INTEGRITY, TRANSPARENCY AND THE SCHOLARLY RECORD

The Human Question

A Journal of Humanistic Inquiry

Version 1.0 · 8 November 2026

PURPOSE

Authors, reviewers and editors share responsibility for an accurate and trustworthy scholarly record. These policies apply to submissions, reviews, editorial decisions and published work. The journal assesses concerns on evidence, gives affected people a fair opportunity to respond and records the reasons for its decisions. Concerns may be raised confidentially at editor@thehumanquestionjournal.com.

CONTACT: editor@thehumanquestionjournal.com

President and Editor-in-Chief: Albert Tan Sin Hon

1. AUTHORSHIP AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Authorship requires a substantial intellectual contribution to the work, participation in drafting or substantive revision, approval of the final version and responsibility for the contribution and integrity of the paper. Agree author order before submission. Name other assistance in acknowledgements with the person's consent. Funding, status or routine supervision alone does not justify authorship. Gift, guest and ghost authorship are unacceptable.

All authors must agree to submission, revisions and publication. Changes to authorship require a reason and written agreement from all affected authors. If an authorship dispute cannot be resolved reliably, review or publication may pause while the relevant institution investigates. The journal does not invent a resolution to disputes beyond its evidence.

2. ORIGINALITY, RELATED WORK AND EVIDENCE

Submit original work that is not simultaneously under review by another journal. Disclose related manuscripts, prior publication and substantial overlap. A disclosed preprint, thesis or conference presentation does not automatically bar submission, provided rights permit publication and the relationship is explained. Cite reused material, including your own. Translation of an earlier publication requires disclosure, permission where necessary and editorial agreement.

Fabricated or falsified sources, data, quotations, results and images are prohibited. Preserve evidence sufficient to support the analysis, subject to consent, confidentiality and lawful restrictions. Acknowledge uncertainty and limits. Corrections to images may clarify presentation only if they do not misrepresent the underlying evidence and are disclosed where material. Do not manipulate citations to inflate metrics.

3. RESEARCH ETHICS, CONSENT AND PERMISSIONS

Authors must identify applicable ethics approval or exemption for research involving people and explain consent, confidentiality and risk management. Where formal review is unavailable or unnecessary, give a reasoned account of the relevant safeguards. Protect vulnerable participants and avoid publishing identifying details without a lawful basis and appropriate consent. For archival, cultural, Indigenous and community materials, consider restrictions, provenance, community interests and relevant permissions.

Secure rights to reproduce third-party material and to publish it on the intended open-access terms. Identify material excluded from the article licence with a clear credit line. Public availability alone does not establish a right to reproduce. Supply permission evidence to the editor privately where required.

4. FUNDING, INTERESTS AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Declare funding and the funder's role, and any financial, professional, institutional or personal interest that a reasonable reader could consider relevant. A declared interest does not itself prevent publication. Editors and reviewers disclose conflicts and recuse themselves where independence is compromised. Corrections to incomplete declarations may be published.

Artificial-intelligence systems cannot be authors. Authors must disclose substantive generative assistance in drafting, rewriting, translation, analysis, coding or images, naming the tool, version where available, purpose and extent, and the checks performed. Routine non-generative spelling or reference-format checks do not need separate disclosure. Human authors must verify the sources, accuracy, originality, permissions and fitness of all output. Generated material must never be represented as observed primary evidence.

Reviewers and editors must not upload confidential manuscripts, reports, identities or unpublished data to external artificial-intelligence services without appropriate authority and safeguards. They remain responsible for their judgement. Automated detection scores, similarity percentages and stylistic impressions are not by themselves proof of misconduct. Concerns require examination of the actual evidence and an opportunity to respond.

5. HANDLING INTEGRITY CONCERNS

A report should identify the article or submission, the specific concern and supporting material. Anonymous reports are considered on their evidence. The editor assesses credibility, secures relevant records, manages conflicts and seeks a response from the affected author or reviewer. Information is shared only as needed for fair assessment, institutional investigation or the protection of the scholarly record.

Possible outcomes include clarification, revision, rejection, correction, referral to an institution, an expression of concern or retraction. Responses must be proportionate to the findings. The journal does not promise absolute confidentiality where disclosure is necessary or legally required. Allegations about the founder or an editor require independent handling under the editorial policy.

6. CORRECTIONS, EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN AND RETRACTIONS

Correct material errors promptly through a dated notice linked to the article. Preserve the original record and identify the changed version. A minor typographical correction may be recorded in a version note; a change affecting interpretation requires a substantive correction notice. An expression of concern may alert readers to a serious unresolved issue while a fair inquiry proceeds.

Retraction is appropriate where findings are unreliable, substantial plagiarism or redundant publication is established, or a serious ethical breach compromises the work. A notice identifies the affected article, who is retracting it, the reason and date. It remains freely accessible and linked to the marked article. Retraction is not used merely to punish disagreement. Removal of the underlying text is exceptional, for example where required by law or necessary to prevent serious harm; a bibliographic record and explanatory notice should remain where lawful.

Authors and readers may appeal or complain through editor@thehumanquestionjournal.com. An uninvolved person assesses procedural concerns independently. A correction request need not establish misconduct: an honest error still requires an accurate record.

7. REFERENCE BASIS

Oxford University Press, publication ethics
https://academic.oup.com/pages/for-authors/journals/preparing-and-submitting-your-manuscript/ethics

Oxford University Press, author policy on AI use and disclosure
https://academic.oup.com/pages/for-authors/journals/preparing-and-submitting-your-manuscript/ai-principles-for-oxford-journals/policy-on-ai-use-and-disclosure-for-oxford-journals-authors

COPE, Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers
https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.9