《马来西亚华人研究学刊》
出版伦理与出版不当行为声明

《马来西亚华人研究学刊》（以下简称"本刊"）致力于维护最高标准的出版伦理，并采取一切可能的措施防止出版不当行为。本刊的伦理声明基于出版伦理委员会（COPE）的期刊编辑最佳实践指南以及 Scopus 的收录要求制定。本刊实行双盲同侪审查制度，确保作者和审查者在审查过程中均保持匿名。所有参与出版过程的各方（包括编辑、作者、审查者和出版方）均需同意并遵守以下的伦理行为标准。

1. 编辑义务

- **出版决定。** 执行编辑/主编负责决定提交给本刊的哪些文章应予发表。该决定基于作品的学术效度、其对研究人员和读者的重要性以及审查者的意见。编辑可能会遵循本刊编委会的政策，并受关于诽谤、版权侵权和剽窃等现行法律要求的约束。
- **公平原则。** 编辑在评估稿件时，仅基于其学术内容，而不考虑作者的种族、性别、性取向、宗教信仰、族裔出身、国籍或政治哲学。
- **保密原则。** 编辑及任何编辑部成员不得向通讯作者、审查者、潜在审查者、其他编辑顾问和出版方以外的任何人透露有关已提交稿件的任何信息。
- **利益冲突声明。** 未经作者明确书面同意，编辑不得将已提交稿件中披露的未发表材料用于自己的研究。通过同侪审查获得的机密资讯或观点必须保密，不得用于个人利益。如果编辑与稿件的任何作者、公司或机构存在竞争、合作或其他关系而导致利益冲突，编辑应回避处理该稿件。

2. 审查者义务

- **对编辑决策的贡献。** 同侪审查协助编辑做出编辑决策，并通过与作者交流编辑意见，可能协助作者改进论文。本刊坚持双盲同侪审查政策；审查者必须对稿件及其审查意见严格保密。
- **审查能力。** 凡受邀担任审稿的审查者，如自觉不具备审阅该稿所需的专业资格，或预知无法在规定时限内完成审稿，应立即通知编辑，并自请退出该审稿程序。
- **保密原则与人工智能的使用。** 所有送审稿件必须被视为保密文件。除非经编辑授权，审查者不得向他人展示或与他人讨论其内容。审查者亦不得将稿件上传至生成式人工智能工具或服务，以免违反作者的保密义务及其专有权利。
- **客观标准。** 审查应客观进行，禁止对作者进行人身攻击。审查人应清楚表达其意见，并提出相应之论证与依据。
- **资料来源确认。** 审查者应指出作者尚未引用的相关已发表研究。凡是涉及某项观察、推导或论点已被先前报道的情况，均须附上相应的文献引用。
- **公开原则与利益冲突。** 通过同侪审查获得的非公开资料或观点必须保密，不得用于个人利益。审查者不应审阅任何与其存在利益冲突的稿件。

3. 作者义务

- **论文标准。** 原创研究报告的作者应准确呈现所进行的工作，并客观讨论研究的重要性。论文中必须如实呈现基础数据。任何捏造或明知不实的陈述皆属不当行为，且不可接受。

<div align="center">

《马来西亚华人研究学刊》
出版伦理与出版不当行为声明

</div>

- **资料使用与保留。** 作者应在论文发表后的一段时间内保留与论文相关的原始资料。倘若编辑部要求审查，须能够提供相应资料。
- **原创性与剽窃。** 作者应确保整篇论文均为原创，若有使用其他作者之作品和/或文字，须明确引注。任何形式的剽窃均构成不当的出版行为，是不可接受的。
- **一稿多投、重复发表或并发发表。** 同时向多家期刊提交同一份稿件将构成不当的出版行为，是不可接受的。
- **论文署名。** 署名应仅限于对论文的构思、设计、执行或诠释做出重大贡献的人员。（关于 AI 工具的使用请见第 5 节）。
- **公开原则与利益冲突。** 所有作者需在稿件中公开表明任何财务或其他实质性利益冲突。
- **已发表内容之根本性错误。** 当作者发现自己已发表的作品中存在重大错误或不准确之处时，作者有义务立即通知期刊编辑或出版商，并配合编辑撤回或更正论文。

4. 出版单位职责

- **处理不当出版行为。** 在涉嫌或被证实存在学术不端、欺诈性发表或剽窃行为，出版单位将与编辑密切合作，采取一切适当措施以厘清事态并修正相关文章。相关措施包括及时发布勘误或澄清声明；若情节严重，将对涉事作品予以撤稿。

5. 关于使用生成式人工智能（Generative AI）及 AI 辅助技术的规范

- **作者须知。** 本刊严格遵循"署名即负责"的原则。生成式 AI 工具（如 ChatGPT、大语言模型等）不得被列为论文作者，因为它们无法对作品承担责任，无法同意发表，也无法持有版权。作者可以在写作过程中使用 AI 及 AI 辅助技术来提高作品的可读性和语言质量，但不得用其替代关键的研究任务，如产生学术见解、分析和诠释数据或得出学术结论。如果作者使用了 AI 工具，必须明确说明。稿件中应包含一项声明（例如在"方法"或"致谢"部分），说明所使用的工具、版本及其使用目的。作者对 AI 工具生成的任何内容的准确性承担全部责任。
- **审查者与编辑须知。** 审查者和编辑不得泄露稿件相关资讯。严禁将已提交的稿件或其任何部分上传至生成式 AI 工具（例如用于生成摘要 或 审查意见），因为这构成了对保密原则与资料隐私权的侵犯。AI工具可能会使用输入的资料进行训练，从而泄露作者未发表的作品。

Journal of Malaysian Chinese Studies
Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

The *Journal of Malaysian Chinese Studies* (hereinafter referred to as "the Journal") is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and takes all possible measures against publication malpractice. Our ethic statements are based on COPE's Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors and the requirements set forth by Scopus. The Journal employs a double-blind peer review process, ensuring that the identities of both the reviewers and the authors are kept confidential from each other throughout the review process. All parties involved in the act of publishing (editors, authors, reviewers, and the publisher) are expected to agree upon standards of expected ethical behavior.

1. Duties of Editors

- **Publication Decisions.** The Executive Editor/Editor-in-Chief is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the Journal should be published. This decision is based on the validation of the work in question, its importance to researchers and readers, and the reviewers' comments. The Editor may be guided by the policies of the Journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism.
- **Fair Play.** The Editor evaluates manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.
- **Confidentiality.** The Editor and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.
- **Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest.** Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Editors should recuse themselves from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers.

2. Duties of Reviewers

- **Contribution to Editorial Decisions.** Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper. The Journal adheres to a double-blind peer review policy; reviewers must treat the manuscript and their review strictly confidentially.
- **Reviewers' Competence.** Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself/herself from the review process.
- **Confidentiality and AI Use.** Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor. Reviewers must not upload the manuscript to generative AI tools or services, as this may violate the confidentiality and proprietary rights of the authors.
- **Standards of Objectivity.** Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

- **Acknowledgement of Sources.** Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation.
- **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.

3. Duties of Authors

- **Reporting Standards.** Authors of reports of original research 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. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.
- **Data Access and Retention.** Authors may be asked to provide the raw data in connection with a paper for editorial review, and should be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.
- **Originality and Plagiarism.** The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others, that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.
- **Multiple, Redundant or Concurrent Publication.** Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.
- **Authorship of the Paper.** Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. (See Section 5 regarding AI tools).
- **Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest.** All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest.
- **Fundamental Errors in Published Works.** When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

4. Duties of the Publisher

- **Handling of Unethical Publishing Behavior.** In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication, or plagiarism, the publisher, in close collaboration with the editors, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum, clarification, or, in the most severe case, the retraction of the affected work.

5. Policy on Generative AI and AI-assisted Technologies

- **For Authors.** The Journal strictly adheres to the principle that authorship implies accountability. Generative AI tools (such as ChatGPT, Large Language Models, etc.) cannot be listed as authors of a paper because they cannot take responsibility for the work, cannot consent to publication, and cannot hold copyright. Authors may use AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process to improve the readability and language of the

work, but not to replace key researcher tasks such as producing scientific insights, analyzing and interpreting data, or drawing scientific conclusions. If authors use AI tools, they must disclose this use transparently. A statement should be included in the manuscript (e.g., in the Methods or Acknowledgements section) specifying the tool used, the version, and the purpose of its use. Authors are fully responsible for the accuracy of any content generated by AI tools.

- **For Reviewers and Editors.** Reviewers and Editors must maintain the confidentiality of the manuscript. Uploading a submitted manuscript or any part of it into a generative AI tool (e.g., for summary or review generation) is strictly prohibited, as this constitutes a breach of confidentiality and data privacy rights. The AI tool may use the input data for training, potentially leaking the author's unpublished work.