

COMPRENDRE

(Revista catalana de filosofia)

Ethics Code Guide for Publication

This *Ethics Guide* pretends to be a code of conduct aimed at the Editorial Team, authors and assessors of the works published in the journal *COMPRENDRE (Catalan Journal of Philosophy)*.

1. Editorial Board.

The Editorial Board, together with the Director and the Secretary, are responsible for the published contents. It is up to them to ensure scientific quality, avoid bad practices in the publication of research results and manage the publication of the manuscripts received in a reasonable time.

This responsibility is based on compliance with the following principles:

1.1. Impartiality.

The Editorial Board must be impartial when managing the manuscripts submitted for publication and must respect the intellectual independence of the authors, who will have the right to reply in case of negative evaluation.

1.2. Confidentiality.

The people who are part of the Editorial Board have the obligation to maintain the confidentiality of the texts received and their content until they have been accepted for publication. Only then can the title and author be disseminated.

Likewise, no member of the Editorial Board may use the data, arguments or interpretations contained in the unpublished works for their research, unless expressly authorized by the author.

1.3. Review of the works.

The Editorial Board must ensure that the published research papers have been evaluated by at least one specialist in the field, and that the aforementioned review process has been fair and impartial.

In the Journal's Publication Rules, the review method used must be made public. In the case of *COMPRENDRE*, the *double-blind* procedure is used (anonymity of the person who has carried out the work and the evaluation).

People who submit a work for evaluation may propose the names of two specialists for the evaluation of their work. The Editorial Board reserves the right to accept or not accept this proposal, without the obligation to communicate its decision.

The Editorial Board will require that the originality of the works is taken into account in the evaluation process and that plagiarism and redundant publications are detected. It will be clearly indicated which sections of the journal subject its contents to external review.

The Editorial Board will assess and thank the contribution of the assessors of the works sent to the journal. However, it will dispense with those who carry out evaluations of low quality, incorrect, disrespectful or delivered after the deadline.

1.4. Acceptance or rejection of works.

The Editorial Board is responsible for accepting or rejecting a manuscript, which will be based on the reports received on it, assessing its relevance, originality and clarity of presentation.

The Editorial Board may directly reject the papers received, without initiating an external review process, if it considers them inappropriate due to lack of the required scientific level, for not adapting to the scientific objectives of the journal, or for presenting evidence of scientific fraud.

1.5. Disavowal and notification of irregularity.

The Editorial Board reserves the right to disavow those works already published that may be determined to be unreliable as a result of both involuntary errors and fraud or scientific malpractice. If only part of the article contains an error, it can be rectified later by means of an editorial note or a faith of errata. The aim is to ensure the integrity of the scientific production already published.

The conflict of duplication, 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. The journal will ask the author for explanations and evidence to clarify the situation, and will make a final decision based on them.

The journal will publish, in the print and electronic versions, the news about the disavowal of a certain text mentioning the reasons for this measure, in order to distinguish bad practice from involuntary error. In the electronic edition it will be stated that it is an unauthorized article. The same notification will be published in the printed edition as soon as possible.

1.6. Application of the rules of the Editorial Board.

The person exercising management functions is responsible for correctly applying the rules governing the operation of the Editorial Board and must ensure that its members are aware of them. These functions are: to promote and represent the journal; suggest and support possible improvements; attract collaborations from leading specialists in the

field; review, in a first evaluation, the work received; writing for the magazine editorials, reviews, news, etc.; attend editorial board meetings.

1.7. Conflict of interest.

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

1.8. Rules of authorship.

The rules for submitting originals must be public.

2. Authorship of the articles.

2.1. Publication rules.

The texts submitted for publication must be original and unpublished.

Authors must properly mention the origin of the ideas or phrases taken literally, in accordance with the journal's rules.

If images are included, it must be explained how they were created or obtained. If graphic material (figures, photos, etc.) is used, reproduced in other publications, the origin must be said and, the copy's documents too.

Unnecessary fragmentation of articles should be avoided. If the work is very extensive, it can be published in parts, which have an autonomous entity, in different numbers in order to facilitate the interpretation to readers.

2.2. Originality and plagiarism.

Authors must ensure the originality of their works, which cannot be the result of copying, invention, distortion, or falseness. Plagiarism in all its variants, as well as the manipulation or invention of data, are serious ethical faults and are considered a scientific fraud.

Authors will not send an article that is subject to consideration in another journal, nor they will send it to another journal until they receive any notification of its rejection, or they voluntarily withdraw it. It is permitted to publish a work that extends another previously appeared as a short note, communication or summary in the minutes of a congress, provided that the base text is adequately mentioned and that the modifications are substantial.

2.3. Authorship of the work.

In the case of multiple authorship, the person responsible for the article must guarantee the recognition of those who have contributed significantly to the conception, planning, data collection and interpretation of the results. All signatories share responsibility for this. Likewise, those who act as a contact person must ensure that those who have signed the article have reviewed and approved the final version and that they give their approval to publish it. The contact authorship must ensure that none of the signatures of those responsible for the work have been omitted and that the co-authorship criteria have been satisfied. *Fictional or gifted* authorship is scientific malpractice.

A note to the article must acknowledge, where appropriate, by way of gratitude, the contribution of other contributors who are not listed as signatories or responsible for the final version of the article.

The published version may be recorded, at the request of the signatories, the individual contribution to collective work.

2.4. Bibliography.

In the text of the article, the original sources, on which the information is contained and is based, must be identified, and cited. Irrelevant citations should not be included, nor should citations from well-known research in the scientific field be abused.

The author must not use the information obtained privately through conversations, correspondence, or debate with colleagues in the field if he/she does not have the explicit written permission of his/her source of information. This information must also be scientifically proven.

2.5. Significant errors in published works.

When an author discovers a serious error in their work, they must notify the journal as soon as possible, to modify the article, remove it, retract it or publish a correction or faith of errors.

The author must prove that his/her work is correct if the possible error is detected by any member of the Editorial Board.

The dispute resolution process is described in 1.5.

2.6. Conflict of interest.

At the time of submitting the article, a declaration must be accompanied in the text stating the existence of any commercial, financial or personal link that may affect the results and conclusions of the work. Likewise, all sources of funding granted for the preparation of the work must be stated. This information will appear in the published version.

3. Evaluation of the work.

The assessors play an essential role in the process of guaranteeing the quality of the publication. They advise the Editorial Board in making editorial decisions and help articles to improve.

3.1. Confidentiality.

Whoever evaluates a work must consider it a confidential document until its publication, both during and after the review process.

Under no circumstances this person may disseminate or use information, arguments or interpretations contained in the work for its own benefit either for that of other people, or to harm third persons.

3.2. Objectivity.

Whoever evaluates a work must objectively judge the quality of the complete work, including information on the originality and academic relevance of the thesis of the work, as well as on the structure, methodology and writing of the text.

Those who evaluate a work must argue their criticisms of the work in an objective and impartial tone, respecting the intellectual independence of the author and not being moved by hostile criteria.

The person who is evaluating the work must inform the Management of any similarity between the work under review and another article already published or in the process of being evaluated in another journal (duplicate or redundant publication). You must also warn about plagiarized, falsified, invented, or manipulated texts or data.

3.3. Quick answer.

Whoever evaluates a work must submit their report within the indicated period, so they will notify the Management of any delay.

Likewise, if it is not considered suitable to evaluate the work entrusted to it or if it cannot complete its work within the agreed period, it will notify the Management as soon as possible.

3.4. Checking the sources of information.

The person evaluating a work must verify that the bibliography cited is relevant to the topic covered. For this reason, it will be reviewed, suggesting the removal of superfluous or redundant citations, or the incorporation of unmentioned works.

3.5. Conflict of interest.

The person who is evaluating a work must reject the review of a work when they have a professional or personal relationship with any of the authors of the work.

Conflicts of interest may also arise if the work to be evaluated is closely linked to the research developed at that time by the person conducting the evaluation. In this case, in case of any doubt, the task entrusted must be renounced and the work returned to the magazine, stating the reasons for this decision.

Sources Consulted:

COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics): <http://www.publicationethics.org>

Guidelines EASE (European Association of Science Editors): <http://www.ease.org.uk>

Ethical Guidelines for Journal Publication: <http://sjss.universia.net/codigo-etico.jsp>

Código de buenas prácticas científicas del CSIC CSIC, 2011.
http://revistas.csic.es/public/guia_buenas_practicas_CSIC.pdf.