

# Las Torres de Lucca

International Journal of Political Philosophy

## PUBLICATION ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

### Content

|   |   |
|---|---|
| PUBLICATION ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE STATEMENT .....            | 2 |
| 1.- Editorial Board.....                                      | 2 |
| 1.1 Impartiality .....  | 2 |
| 1.2 Confidentiality .....                                     | 2 |
| 1.3 Review of submissions.....                                | 2 |
| 1.4 Acceptance or rejection of manuscripts .....              | 3 |
| 1.5 De-authorization and notification of irregularity.....    | 3 |
| 1.6 Application of the rules of the Editorial Board .....     | 4 |
| 1.7 Authoring Rules.....                                      | 4 |
| 1.8 Conflict of interests.....                                | 4 |
| 2.- About the authorship of the articles .....                | 4 |
| 2.1 Publication rules .....                                   | 4 |
| 2.2 Originality and plagiarism.....                           | 5 |
| 2.3 Authorship of work.....                                   | 5 |
| 2.4 Sources of information.....                               | 6 |
| 2.5 Significant errors in published work.....                 | 6 |
| 2.6 Conflict of interests.....                                | 6 |
| 3.- Evaluation of papers in scientific journals .....         | 6 |
| 3.1 Confidentiality .....                                     | 6 |
| 3.2 Objectivity.....  | 7 |
| 3.3 Responsiveness.....                                       | 7 |
| 3.4 Recognition of sources of information .....               | 7 |
| 3.5 Conflict of interests.....                                | 7 |
| 4. Additional measures of transparency and best practice..... | 8 |
| 4.1 Copyright and Access .....                                | 8 |
| 4.2 Archiving.....  | 8 |
| 4.3 Ownership and management .....                            | 8 |
| 4.4 Web site.....   | 8 |
| 4.5 Publishing schedule .....                                 | 8 |
| 4.6 Name of journal.....                                      | 8 |

## **PUBLICATION ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE STATEMENT**

### **1.- Editorial Board**

Las Torres de Lucca has an editorial board whose members are experts in the field. Their full names and affiliations are provided on the journal's Web site.

Las Torres de Lucca provides contact information on the journal's Web site.

The Editorial Board of the Journal, together with the Director and the Secretary, are responsible for the published contents, and are committed to ensuring its scientific quality, avoiding malpractices in publishing and managing the edition of the submissions in a reasonable time. This responsibility implies observing the following principles:

#### **1.1 Impartiality**

The Editorial Board will be impartial in managing the proposed works for publication and must respect the intellectual independence of authors, whose right to reply must be recognized if they have been evaluated negatively. Submissions which present negative results from a research will not be excluded.

#### **1.2 Confidentiality**

The members of the Editorial Board have the obligation to keep confidential the texts received and their content until they have been accepted for publication. Only then can they spread title and authorship. Likewise, no member of the Editorial Board may use for his own research data, arguments or interpretations contained in unpublished works, unless expressly consented in writing by the authors.

#### **1.3 Review of submissions**

The Editorial Board shall ensure that the published research papers have been evaluated by at least two specialists in the field and that the review process has been fair and impartial.

The method used in the peer review will be the double-blind procedure (anonymity of those who have done the work and the evaluation). When one of the two evaluations is negative, a third report will be requested.

Individuals who submit a work to evaluation may propose the names of up to three specialists to evaluate their work. The Editorial Board reserves the right to accept this proposal and is not obliged to communicate this decision.

The Editorial Board will value and appreciate the contribution of those who have collaborated in the evaluations of the papers sent to the journal. It will also encourage academic authorities to recognize peer review activities as part of the scientific process and should dispense with those who perform poor quality, incorrect, disrespectful or overdue assessments.

In case there were any fees or charges required for manuscript processing and/or publishing materials in the journal these will be clearly stated before authors begin preparing their manuscript for submission.

#### 1.4 Acceptance or rejection of manuscripts

The responsibility for accepting or rejecting a work for publication belongs to the Editorial Board, based on the reports sent by the reviewers.

These reports should be based on the quality, relevance, originality and clarity of the articles.

The Editorial Board can directly (or at any stage of the process) reject the papers received, without resorting to an external consultation process, if they consider them inappropriate for the journal due to the lack of quality or the inadaptation to the scientific objectives of the journal, or if there are evidences of scientific fraud.

#### 1.5 De-authorization and notification of irregularity

The Editorial Board reserves the right to revoke those works that have already been published, which are later determined to be unreliable because of inadvertent errors or fraud or misconduct: fabrication, manipulation or copying of data, plagiarism of texts and redundant or duplicate publication, omission of references to sources consulted, use of contents without permission or without justification, etc. The objective that guides this unauthorization is to correct the already published scientific production, ensuring its integrity.

The conflict of duplicity, caused by the simultaneous publication of an article in two journals, must be resolved by determining the date of receipt of the work in each of them.

If only a part of the article contains an error, it can be corrected later by means of an editorial note or an erratum.

In case of conflict, the journal will ask the author or authors for explanations and relevant evidence to clarify it, and make a final decision based on these.

The journal will publish in all its versions (printed and electronic) the news about the unauthorization of a text and it should mention the reasons for such a measure, in order to distinguish malpractice from involuntary error. The journal will also notify the authors of the institution of the author or authors of the article. The decision to de-authorize a text must be adopted as soon as possible, so that such erroneous work is not mentioned in its field of research.

Unauthorized articles will be kept in the electronic edition of the magazines, clearly and unequivocally warning that it is an unauthorized article, to distinguish it from other corrections or comments. In the printed edition, the unauthorization will be recorded as soon as possible through a publisher or communication, in the same terms as it has been done in the electronic version.

As a preliminary step to the final disavowal, the magazine may issue a notice of irregularity, providing the necessary information in the same terms as in the case of an unauthorization. The notice of irregularity will be kept for the minimum time necessary, and will conclude with its withdrawal or with the formal disavowal of the article.

### 1.6 Application of the rules of the Editorial Board

The person(s) in charge of the journal is responsible for the correct application of the rules governing the operation of the Editorial Board and for ensuring that its members know about them. These are: to promote and represent the magazine in the different forums; Suggest and support possible improvements; To seek the collaboration of specialists of reference in the matter; Review, in a first evaluation, the works that are received; Write for the magazine editorials, reviews, news, reviews, etc.; Attend the meetings of the Editorial Board.

### 1.7 Authoring Rules

The norms of presentation of originals of each magazine (referring to the extension of the abstract and of the article, the preparation of the images, the system for bibliographical references, etc.) should be public.

### 1.8 Conflict of interests

The conflict of interest arises when a work received in the journal is signed by a person who is part of the Editorial Board, by whom he has a direct personal or professional relationship, or is closely related to the past or present research of the person who is part of it. Whoever is affected by any of these cases should refrain from intervening in the evaluation process of the proposed article.

## 2.- About the authorship of the articles

### 2.1 Publication rules

The texts presented for publication must be the result of original and unpublished research. They must include the data obtained and used, as well as an objective discussion of their results. Sufficient information must be provided so that any specialist can repeat the investigations carried out and confirm or refute the interpretations defended in the work.

The authors and authors should adequately mention the origin of the ideas or verbatim phrases taken from other works already published in the manner indicated in the regulations of the journal. When images are included as part of the research, it should be adequately explained how they were created or obtained, as long as it is necessary for their understanding. In case of use of graphic material (figures, photos, maps, etc.) reproduced partially in other publications, the authors must cite their origin, providing the pertinent reproduction permissions if necessary.

Unnecessary fragmentation of articles should be avoided. If it is a very extensive work, it can be published in several parts, so that each one develops a certain aspect of the

general study. The various related works must be published in the same journal to facilitate their interpretation by the readers.

Las Torres de Lucca shall take reasonable steps to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred.

If the editor is made aware of any allegation of research misconduct, they shall deal with allegations appropriately following the guidelines for retracting or correcting articles when needed.

Las Torres de Lucca shall always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

## 2.2 Originality and plagiarism

Authors must ensure that the data and results presented in the work are original and have not been copied, invented, distorted or manipulated.

Plagiarism in all its forms, multiple or redundant publication, as well as the invention or manipulation of data constitute serious misconduct and are considered scientific fraud.

The authors will not send original to LAS TORRES DE LUCCA which are previously under consideration in another magazine, nor will they send that original to another magazine until it receives notification of its rejection or voluntarily withdraws it. However, it is permissible to publish a paper that enlarges another already appeared as a brief note, communication or summary in the proceedings of a congress, provided that the text on which it is based is properly cited and that the modifications involve a substantial modification of the already published.

Secondary publications are also acceptable if they are addressed to totally different readers; For example, if the article is published in different languages or if there is one version for specialists versus another for the public. These circumstances should be specified and the original publication properly cited.

## 2.3 Authorship of work

In case of multiple authorship, whoever is responsible for the article before the journal, must guarantee the recognition of those who have contributed significantly in the conception, planning, design, execution, obtaining of data, interpretation and discussion of the results of the work; In any case, all the people who sign it share responsibility for the work presented. Also, who acts as a contact person must ensure that those who sign the work have reviewed and approved the final version of the work and give their approval for possible publication.

The authorship of the contact must ensure that none of the signatures responsible for the work have been omitted and thus satisfies the aforementioned criteria of co-authorship, thereby avoiding fictitious or gifted authorship, which constitutes a bad scientific practice.

Likewise, the contribution of other collaborations that do not appear as signatories or as responsible for the final version of the work should be recognized in a thank-you note in the article.

If the journal or the signatories of the article so request, the published version will describe in a simple way the individual contribution of each member of the signatory group to the collective work.

#### 2.4 Sources of information

In the text of the paper, the publications that have influenced the research should be recognized, so that the original sources on which the information contained in their work is based is identified and cited in the bibliography. It should not, however, include quotations irrelevant to its work or refer to similar examples, and should not abuse references to research already based on the corpus of scientific knowledge.

The author or author should not use the information obtained privately through conversations, correspondence or from any discussion with colleagues in the matter, unless he has explicit permission, in writing, of his source of information and that information is received in a context of scientific advice.

#### 2.5 Significant errors in published work

When an author discovers a serious error in his work he has the obligation to communicate it to the journal as soon as possible, to modify his article, to withdraw it, to retract it or to publish a correction or erratum.

If the possible error is detected by any of the members of the Drafting Committee, the author or author is obliged to prove that their work is correct.

The process of resolution of these conflicts is described in section 1.5.

#### 2.6 Conflict of interests

The text of the article must be accompanied by a statement, stating the existence of any commercial, financial or personal link that may affect the results and conclusions of its work. Likewise, all sources of funding granted for the study must be indicated. This information will be included in the published version of the article.

### 3.- Evaluation of papers in scientific journals

The people who participate in the evaluation process play an essential role to guarantee the quality of the publication. They assist the journal bodies in making editorial decisions and helping to improve articles.

#### 3.1 Confidentiality

Anyone who carries out an evaluation should consider the work to be reviewed as a confidential document until it is published, both during and after the review process. In no case should it disseminate or use the information, details, arguments or

interpretations contained in the text under review for its own benefit or that of other persons, nor to harm third parties. Only in special cases can they seek the advice of other specialists in the matter, a circumstance of which they must inform the Director of the journal.

### 3.2 Objectivity

Anyone who performs an evaluation must objectively judge the quality of the complete work, including the information on which the working hypothesis is based, the theoretical and experimental data and their interpretation, without neglecting the presentation and writing of the text.

They must present their criticism, and be objective and constructive in their comments. They must present their judgments adequately, without adopting hostile positions and respecting the intellectual independence of the one who has elaborated the work.

Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate.

Anyone who carries out an evaluation should inform the Director of any substantial similarity between the work under evaluation and another article already published or in the process of being evaluated in another journal (redundant or duplicate publication). They should also draw attention to plagiarized, falsified, fabricated or manipulated texts or data.

### 3.3 Responsiveness

Those who carry out an evaluation must act quickly and must deliver their report in the agreed time, notifying the editors in case of possible delays. Likewise, they must communicate the editors as soon as possible if they do not consider themselves capable of judging the work entrusted or in case they cannot fulfill the task in the agreed terms.

### 3.4 Recognition of sources of information

Those who carry out an evaluation should check that the relevant papers already published on the subject are cited. With this aim, they will review the bibliography collected in the text, suggesting the elimination of redundant or superfluous references, or the incorporation of others not mentioned.

### 3.5 Conflict of interests

Whoever conducts an evaluation should refuse to review a work when it maintains a professional or personal relationship with any of the persons that have intervened in its authorship that may affect its judgment on that work. Conflicts of interest may also arise when the work to be evaluated is closely related to the work being carried out at the time or with which it has already been published. In these cases, in the face of doubt, they must renounce the task entrusted and return the work to the Journal, indicating the reasons for such a decision.

## 4. Additional measures of transparency and best practice

### 4.1 Copyright and Access

Copyright and licensing information shall be clearly described on the journal's Web site.

The way(s) in which the journal and individual articles are available to readers and whether there are associated subscriptions, or fees shall be stated.

### 4.2 Archiving

The journal's plan for electronic backup and preservation of access to the journal content in the event the journal is no longer published shall be clearly indicated.

### 4.3 Ownership and management

Information about the ownership and/or management of a journal shall be clearly indicated on the journal's Web site.

Publishers shall not use organizational names that would mislead potential authors and editors about the nature of the journal's owner.

### 4.4 Web site

A journal's Web site, including the text that it contains, shall demonstrate that care has been taken to ensure high ethical and professional standards.

### 4.5 Publishing schedule

The periodicity at which the journal publishes will be clearly indicated.

### 4.6 Name of journal

The Journal name, Las Torres de Lucca, shall be unique and cannot be easily confused with another journal or that might mislead potential authors and readers about the Journal's origin or association with other journals

NOTE.- This document reproduces almost literally in points 1-3 the code of conduct of the Guide to good practice prepared by the CSIC for the publication of its journals (see: [http://revistas.csic.es/public/guia\\_buenas\\_practicas\\_CSIC.pdf](http://revistas.csic.es/public/guia_buenas_practicas_CSIC.pdf)).