

EDITORIAL POLICIES

Peer Review Process

In order to ensure that articles are of a high quality, all submissions are reviewed by at least two subject matter experts. The review process is anonymous and confidential (double blind peer review).

Open Access Policy

The General Staff of the Hungarian Defence Force grants permission to institutions of higher learning to deposit in their repositories scholarly articles authored or co-authored by their researchers and published in *Defence Review*, provided that the final publisher's version is archived and its layout is kept intact, and

- a. The link to the original publication is provided;
- b. The publication details are included as part of the metadata;
- c. The publisher (*Defence Review*) is indicated.

Articles published in *Defence Review* may also be reproduced electronically or in print as instruction materials in professional courses for military and civilian specialists, provided that full bibliographic information and a link to the original publication are provided to the readers. The Editors request that they be informed when material published in the journal is used as instruction material.

The authors of articles published in *Defence Review* are authorized to make their work accessible to the public through their websites, provided the above conditions are met.

Ethical Guidelines

Defence Review is committed to the dissemination of high-quality research through its articles according to the set norms and ethics of the social scientific community. Conformance with the standards of ethical behaviour and norms of research of all involved in the process, namely the editors, the editorial advisory board, peer reviewers, publisher(s) and contributors to the publication is important in order to maintain a cutting-edge journal worthy of international academic citizenship. In particular, the following is required of the stakeholders:

Editorial Advisory Board – The Editorial Advisory Board consists of recognised and well-known academics, theorists and expert practitioners in their subject area. The Editorial Advisory Board members act as an example and subscribe to the norms and ethical standards of the international scientific community and the ethical guidelines of this journal. While the members' task is mainly advisory in nature, they also provide advice and serve as a source of experience during the review and publication process as set out in the instructions to authors and the particular ethical guidelines for the journal set out here.

Editors – Editors evaluate manuscripts only in terms of their academic merit and suitability in terms of the focus of the journal. Editors take care that peer reviewers that are selected are academics in good standing and with suitable knowledge and expertise in the particular field of the article submitted. Editors will take responsible and reasonable responsive measures with regard to ethical complaints received. Complaints of ethical transgressions will be investigated and reasonable steps taken as per the circumstances of a particular case.

Authors – Authors should ensure that their submissions are their own original work, sufficient in detail, well-argued and according to a proper reference system (consult the *Defence Review* guidelines for authors). Where the work of other authors are used proper and full referencing is required. No paraphrasing or indirect paraphrasing is acceptable without attribution. All sources will be properly acknowledged. Plagiarism in any of its forms, whether construed as unconscious or naïve plagiarism, direct or indirect plagiarism, is unacceptable and will lead to immediate rejection of articles including the blacklisting of the person involved. Submitting an article or review article to more than one journal is not acceptable. Where co-authorship is at stake the person responsible for submission will ensure that the co-author(s) concur on the submission in that particular version both in terms of contents, argument and format.

Reviewers – *Defence Review* uses a double blind peer-review process. All articles/submissions are treated as strictly confidential. All information obtained through the peer-review process, including research data are not for use by the reviewers or anyone associated with the reviewer either privately or for purposes of dissemination. Peer reviewers strive to conduct their reviews in an unbiased way and observations and comments (including constructive criticism or the identification of shortcomings in articles) are to be formulated clearly and with supporting arguments. Any peer reviewer that feel unqualified or not interested for any reason in reviewing a particular submission should notify the editors and kindly excuse himself from the process. Reviewers should under no circumstances review articles in which they observe and/or are aware of a conflict of interests, be it due to personal, collaborative or competitive relationships, connections or networks during the process from the start of the initial article to the publication of the output. Reviewers should respond according to the set requirements and feedback period in good time as requested by the editors to the benefit of the authors and the journal.