

## CODE OF ETHICS

The present Code of Ethics complies with the *Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors* issued by COPE – Committee on Publication Ethics. It is necessary for all parties involved – authors, publishers, editors and reviewers – to agree upon the following ethical requirements.

### DUTIES OF EDITORS

#### **Decisions on publication**

The Editor is responsible for the preliminary selection of the contributions received and for deciding on their publication, ensuring that they comply with the journal's quality criteria and editorial line. The Editor may rely on the Scientific Board, other editors or referees, and is constrained by the requirements of current laws regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism.

#### **Integrity**

The editorial board ensure the fairness of the procedures for the evaluation, acceptance or rejection of proposed articles. They guarantee that manuscripts are evaluated for their content, in the absence of any conflict of interest and without discrimination on the basis of race, gender, sexual or political orientation, religion, ethnic origin, or citizenship of the authors. They also ensure that the evaluation process is carried out according to the so-called 'double blind peer review' system, preserving the mutual anonymity of reviewers and authors.

#### **Confidentiality**

The Editor and the editorial staff shall refrain from disclosing any information about the submitted manuscripts to anyone other than the corresponding author, the referee or potential referees, the editorial advisor and the publisher.

#### **Disclosure**

Unpublished material contained in the submitted manuscripts must not be used in the research of the editor or a member of the editorial board without the author's explicit written consent.

## **DUTIES OF REVIEWERS**

### **Contribution to editorial decisions**

The reviewer assists the Editor in the evaluation process and contributes through the peer review procedure to editorial decisions.

### **Promptness**

The reviewer is committed to the Editor to respect the deadline assigned for evaluation. If the reviewer feels unqualified to assess the proposed manuscript, or knows that he/she will not be able to carry out the evaluation within the required timeframe, he/she must promptly notify the Editor and renounce participation in the review process.

### **Confidentiality**

The reviewer must consider any manuscript assigned for evaluation as confidential. The content of manuscripts shall therefore not be discussed with others without explicit permission from the Editor.

### **Objectivity standards**

Reviewers must undertake the peer review objectively, refraining from making any personal judgements about the author. They are also required to give adequate reasons for their judgements, clearly justifying any negative evaluations.

### **Indication of references**

The evaluation aims, whenever possible, at enabling the author to improve his/her article. The reviewer is therefore committed to indicating precise bibliographical references of fundamental works that the author may have overlooked. Reviewers are also asked to inform the Editor of any similarities or overlaps between the submitted manuscript and other published works.

### **Disclosure and Conflict of Interest**

The reviewer refrains from evaluating manuscripts for which there is a conflict of interest due to previous collaboration or competition with the author and/or his/her institution. Confidential information or other indications obtained during the peer review process must be considered confidential and cannot be used for personal purposes.

## **DUTIES OF AUTHORS**

### **Originality and plagiarism**

Authors who submit a contribution for evaluation must guarantee the originality of the text proposed. If the work and/or words of other authors have been used, this must be indicated accordingly. Authors must also cite all publications that have determined or influenced the content of the proposed article.

### **Acknowledgment of Sources**

Authors are required to always provide correct indication of the sources and contributions mentioned in the article.

### **Multiple, Redundant or Concurrent Publication**

Authors must refrain from publishing articles reporting on the same research in more than one journal and from submitting the same contribution to other journals during the evaluation phase.

### **Authorship**

All those who made a substantial contribution to the article should be mentioned accordingly. Co-authors should be indicated if they have made a significant contribution to the conception, realisation and revision of the research on which the article is based. If others have participated substantially in some stages of the research, their contribution should be explicitly acknowledged. In the case of multi-authored articles, the corresponding author must ensure that the names of all co-authors are listed in the manuscript and that all co-authors have approved the final version of the article and have agreed to its publication in the journal.

### **Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest**

Authors must always disclose any funding bodies for the research. Any financial or other conflicts of interest that might influence the results or interpretation of the work should also be indicated.

### **Editorial guidelines, deadlines and revision**

Authors shall edit the text according to journal's editorial guidelines and meet the deadline for the paper submission. They also commit to make corrections and additions requested by the anonymous reviewers.

### **Errors in published works**

If, after publication, the author detects any errors or significant inaccuracies, which do not consist of mere typos, he/she must promptly notify the Editor and cooperate with the Editor and/or the editorial staff to withdraw or correct the text.