

JOURNAL GOVERNANCE

Editorial Policy Documents

Version 1.0 | Prepared 18 October 2026 | Pre-launch framework

Operational principles for editorial independence, fair review, research integrity and the preservation of a reliable scholarly record.

These documents accompany the public *Editorial Policies* of the *Journal of Institutional Architecture and Continuity*, published by Invisible Architecture Press. They explain how the Journal intends to give practical effect to its editorial commitments without representing procedures, appointments or technical infrastructure as operational before they exist.

Editorial authority exists to protect the integrity of the scholarly record, not the interests of the publisher, authors, reviewers or editors.

Status and application

The Journal is in preparation. This document establishes the pre-launch policy framework. A process is described as operational only when the responsible editorial authority, required safeguards and supporting arrangements are in place. No manuscript may be represented as independently peer reviewed unless that review has actually occurred.

These provisions apply, as relevant, to authors, editors, reviewers, contributors, and persons acting on behalf of the Journal or publisher. If a procedure is not yet available, the Journal must say so rather than imply that an established service exists.

Policy sequence

Editorial independence; peer review; conflicts of interest; research integrity; authorship; corrections and retractions; complaints and appeals; artificial intelligence; data and sources; policy governance. A final section addresses open access, publication identifiers and preservation.

01 Editorial independence and authority

Scholarly assessment and decisions concerning individual manuscripts must be protected from commercial, political, institutional and personal influence. Invisible Architecture Press provides publishing functions; those functions do not confer authority to determine the scholarly outcome of a submission.

Decision responsibility

- Each manuscript entering formal assessment must have an identified handling editor or other designated editorial authority with responsibility for the integrity of that process.
- The handling authority considers relevance, originality, scholarly merit, methodological rigour, research integrity and reviewer reports. Reviewer advice informs but does not replace editorial judgement.
- Editorial decisions, reasons for material departures from recommendations and relevant recusals must be documented in a confidential editorial record.

Publisher-related manuscripts

An author affiliated with the publisher or Journal must not choose reviewers, supervise review, influence the handling editor or participate in the decision on that author's manuscript. An appropriately independent decision-maker must be appointed before the manuscript proceeds; otherwise the submission must wait.

Limits of authority

No financial contribution, institutional status, professional relationship or willingness to pay publication charges may confer preferential treatment. Commercial functions must not override a scholarly rejection or suppress a justified correction or retraction.

02 Peer review and manuscript decisions

Substantive scholarly research is subject to independent review suitable for the manuscript's nature. The Journal must specify the applicable review route and relevant confidentiality arrangements before manuscripts enter that process. The presence of a review policy does not establish that reviewers or editors have already been appointed.

Stages of editorial handling

- **Initial assessment:** screen for fit with the Journal's intellectual mandate, completeness, relevant ethical disclosures and material integrity concerns.
- **Reviewer selection:** identify expertise relevant to the manuscript and assess independence, availability and possible conflicts before inviting reviewers.
- **Scholarly assessment:** invite evidence-based evaluation of the argument, methods, sources, originality, limitations and contribution; distinguish substantive weaknesses from differences in scholarly opinion.
- **Decision and revision:** communicate a reasoned outcome, the principal issues requiring attention and, where relevant, expectations for a documented response to reviewer comments.

- **Final checks:** confirm that material integrity, authorship, rights, disclosures and publication metadata issues have been addressed before publication.

Review standards and records

Reviewers must handle manuscripts as confidential scholarly material, avoid using unpublished content for personal advantage and disclose material conflicts promptly. A handling editor remains responsible for evaluating reports, inconsistent recommendations and the adequacy of revisions. The Journal must not label editorial screening as independent peer review.

Where an item is published without external peer review, its status must be clearly identified; commentary, editorial notes and similar content must not be presented as peer-reviewed research by implication.

03 Conflicts of interest

Authors, reviewers and editors must disclose interests that could reasonably compromise, or appear to compromise, impartial assessment. Interests may be financial, professional, institutional, personal, supervisory or intellectual where their effect is material to the manuscript.

Disclosure and mitigation

- Authors disclose relevant funding, affiliations, relationships and other competing interests at submission and update material changes during consideration.
- Reviewers disclose a conflict before accepting an invitation and must decline or withdraw when independence cannot be maintained.
- Editors with a material conflict recuse themselves from reviewer selection, handling and decision-making. An independent substitute must take responsibility for the case.
- Disclosures and mitigation measures are recorded confidentially. Disclosures relevant to interpreting the published work should be stated with the article where legally and ethically appropriate.

A disclosed conflict does not by itself establish wrongdoing. The editorial question is whether the risk can be managed without compromising a fair decision.

04 Research integrity and misconduct

All contributions must represent evidence, methods, source provenance and limitations accurately. Fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, misrepresentation of data, undisclosed duplicate publication and manipulative citation practices are incompatible with the Journal's standards.

Assessment of concerns

- Concerns may arise during assessment or after publication. The Journal records the allegation, available evidence, persons responsible for handling it and the steps taken.

- Initial review distinguishes possible misconduct from honest error, disputed interpretation and legitimate methodological disagreement.
- Where practicable and appropriate, affected authors are given an opportunity to respond before a material adverse editorial determination.
- The Journal may seek independent expertise or notify a relevant institution where necessary and lawful; it must protect confidentiality and avoid premature findings.

Outcomes must be proportionate to the evidence. A credible unresolved concern may justify a pause in editorial consideration, an expression of concern or another transparent notice. Findings are not implied merely because an allegation exists.

05 Authorship, contributions and acknowledgements

Authorship reflects substantial intellectual responsibility for the work. All named authors must approve the version submitted for assessment, accept responsibility for their contributions and cooperate with legitimate editorial questions about the integrity of the work.

Attribution and changes

- Authors identify their contributions and disclose relevant financial or institutional support as requested by the submission procedure.
- Contributors who do not meet authorship standards are acknowledged where appropriate and with their consent when necessary.
- Material changes to the author list require a reasoned explanation and confirmation from affected authors before publication; unresolved disputes may delay handling.
- No automated system, including a generative AI system, qualifies as an author or assumes responsibility for published content.

Authorship or contributor disputes should be considered on their merits without assuming that a job title, institutional affiliation or position within the publisher resolves the matter.

06 Corrections, concerns and retractions

Publication creates an ongoing responsibility to maintain the accuracy and intelligibility of the scholarly record. The Journal distinguishes errors that warrant correction from issues that undermine confidence in findings or the integrity of the article as a whole.

Post-publication actions

- **Correction:** a clearly dated notice identifies a material error and the part of the record affected while preserving the article's publication history.
- **Expression of concern:** a transparent notice may be appropriate where serious questions remain unresolved and readers need to understand the uncertainty.

- **Retraction:** where a published contribution is materially unreliable or affected by sufficiently serious integrity concerns, the Journal may retract it, explaining the basis for the decision.
- **Editorial or publisher notice:** administrative or contextual changes may be recorded without mischaracterising them as scholarly corrections.

Record preservation

Each material action must be permanently linked to the original article record and dated. Retraction is not silent deletion: the scholarly record must remain traceable except where overriding legal, safety or privacy obligations require a narrower form of public access.

07 Complaints and appeals

Authors, reviewers and other affected parties may raise concerns about editorial procedure, conflicts, integrity or publication records. An appeal is appropriate where there is a reasoned claim that material evidence, applicable policy or due process has been overlooked. It is not an automatic second assessment of scholarly preference.

Fair handling

- A complaint or appeal should identify the decision or process challenged, the specific grounds and any material supporting information.
- A person implicated in the matter must not act as the sole decision-maker on the complaint or appeal.
- The Journal must acknowledge the matter, record how it is assigned and communicate a reasoned outcome through its published contact channel.
- Where an independent reviewer of the appeal cannot be appointed, the Journal must disclose that limitation and defer the determination rather than simulate an independent procedure.

Complaints may result in confirmation of the original decision, procedural reconsideration, correction of the record or another appropriate action. A successful procedural appeal does not guarantee acceptance of a manuscript.

08 Artificial intelligence and computational tools

Human authors and editors remain responsible for research claims, reasoning, evidence and editorial decisions, including where computational systems materially assist the work. AI output is not a substitute for verifiable sources, independent scholarly assessment or legitimate editorial authority.

Author disclosure

- Authors must disclose material AI or computational assistance when it affects research design, evidence handling, analysis, substantive drafting or reproducibility.
- Disclosures should identify the relevant role of the tool and the safeguards used to verify outputs; a tool-generated claim must not be presented as an independently verified fact.

- The absence of an AI disclosure must not be treated as proof of non-use; editors assess material omissions based on relevant evidence, not stylistic suspicion alone.

Editorial confidentiality

Editors and reviewers must not upload unpublished manuscripts, confidential reviewer reports, identifiable participant material or proprietary research information to external AI systems without explicit authorisation and appropriate confidentiality protections. Any approved computational assistance must remain under human supervision and must not become the sole basis for acceptance or rejection.

09 Data, sources and research materials

Research must describe its evidential basis sufficiently for readers and reviewers to evaluate the relationship between sources, methods and conclusions. Requirements depend on the discipline and the legitimate constraints attached to the materials.

Transparency proportionate to the work

- Authors describe source provenance, research design, methodological limitations and any material transformations of data or records.
- Where appropriate, a data or materials availability statement identifies what can be accessed, under which conditions and what cannot be shared.
- Confidentiality, personal data protection, security, contractual restrictions and legitimate institutional obligations may justify restricted access; restrictions should be explained without disclosing protected information.
- Evidence should not be described as independently verified, preserved or reproducible unless the relevant checks or infrastructure actually exist.

Editors may request additional methodological explanation or supporting material under suitable safeguards. Unavailability of open data does not automatically disqualify a contribution when a credible and transparent justification exists.

10 Policy governance and revision

Editorial policies are part of the Journal's own institutional architecture. Material revisions must identify the version, date and nature of the change, while preserving the ability to understand which rules applied to a manuscript or publication at the relevant time.

Change control

- Substantive amendments are dated, documented and made publicly accessible in a policy history.
- Policies governing a manuscript should not be altered retroactively to secure a preferred editorial outcome; exceptional corrections to defective procedures require explicit reasons and fair notice.
- Editorial authority, delegated responsibilities and recusal arrangements must be recorded before those roles are exercised.

- The published policy and the operational practice must remain aligned. When a promised safeguard is not yet implemented, the limitation is stated openly.

Supporting commitments: access and the publication record

Open access and author charges

The Journal is designed for free reader access. Its preferred publication model does not charge authors publication fees. Any binding fee policy, waiver arrangements or change in the financial model must be stated clearly before an author is asked to commit to publication; no charge should be introduced retrospectively for an already agreed submission.

Rights, identifiers and preservation

Before publishing its first articles, the Journal must make the applicable copyright and reuse terms available to authors and readers. Each published contribution should have a dedicated article page with accurate bibliographic information, a version history where relevant, and a downloadable PDF where rights permit.

DOIs or other persistent identifiers are included only when validly registered or assigned. Preservation, repository deposit, indexing and long-term availability arrangements must be described according to actual implementation rather than anticipated capabilities.

Editorial launch conditions

Before describing its peer-review service as operational, the Journal must identify the handling authority, workable independent review arrangements, conflict-management and appeal paths, a secure manuscript contact route, and author-facing terms for rights and publication. Until then, these documents describe a framework in preparation.

The credibility of a scholarly record depends on what can be verified about the decision, not merely on what the publisher promises about the process.

Document control

Document: Editorial Policy Documents | **Version:** 1.0 | **Prepared:** 18 October 2026 | **Status:** Pre-launch framework

Issued as a procedural companion to the Journal's public Editorial Policies. Adoption, named editorial appointments and implementation of individual procedures are to be recorded separately as they occur.

invisiblearchitecturepress.com/journal/