



Best Practice and Ethical Guidelines for Journal Publication (*ETF VII*)

Espacio, Tiempo y Forma, Serie VII, Historia del Arte (ETF VII) endorses the *Best Practice Guidelines for Publications* developed by the CSIC (Spain), a document that intends to provide a code of conduct for the parties involved in the management and edition of academic outputs: Editorial Board, authors and reviewers.

I. EDITORIAL BOARD

The *ETF VII* Editorial Board is composed by the Director, Editors and Editorial Board members. The Editorial Board is responsible for the contents published in the journal, and therefore it should ensure its scientific quality, avoid bad practices in the publication of research outputs and manage the edition of materials received within a reasonable time lapse.

Such accountability implies the observation of the following principles:

1. Unbiased management

The Editorial Board should be unbiased when managing papers proposed for publication and should respect the intellectual independence of the authors, with the acknowledgement of their right to reply in case of a negative evaluation.

Material submissions with negative results in evaluations should not be excluded.

2. Confidentiality

The members of the Editorial Board must ensure the confidentiality on the submitted materials and their contents before their acceptance for publication. Only after this moment the title and the author may be disclosed.

In addition, no member of the Board or any other person involved in the evaluation process can use data, arguments or interpretations of such unpublished papers for his own research, unless there is a previous written consent of the author.

3. Article review

The Editorial Board has to ensure that all published research works have been reviewed, at least, by two qualified specialists and that such process has been fair and unbiased.

ETF VII is committed to the blind peer review procedure (anonymous reviewers and authors). In the event of one of the evaluations being negative while the other being positive, a third report may be provided upon the request of the Editorial Board.



The authors who submit a manuscript for evaluation could propose names of potential reviewers. The Editorial Board reserves the right to accept or disregard such proposals, not having to inform the authors of their decision.

The Editorial Board will monitor carefully the evaluation process in order to ensure that the originality of the articles would be observed and the disputed authorships and redundant publications, as well as any false or manipulated data, would be detected. The journal sections subjected to peer review would be also clearly identified in the publication.

4. Acceptance or rejection of submissions

The Editorial Board holds the responsibility to accept or reject articles, taking in consideration the reviewers' reports. Such reports should base their resolutions about the articles' quality on their relevance, originality and clarity.

The Editorial Board may reject submitted manuscripts without referring to external assessment when these manuscripts are considered inappropriate for the journal in terms of quality, non-conformance to the journal's scientific objectives, unadaptability to the journal's procedures or evidence of scientific fraud.

5. Unauthorized or irregular material notice

The Editorial Board reserves the right to unauthorize previously published articles when their lack of reliability is determined at a later stage as a result of either involuntary errors or frauds or academic misconduct: data production, manipulation or copy, text plagiarism and redundant or duplicate publication, omission of references to consulted sources, use of contents without permission or justification, etc. The objective of the unauthorization is to correct academic production already published and to ensure its integrity.

The conflict caused by the simultaneous publication of an article in two different journals should be solved by determining its date of reception at each of them. If it consists of an error pertaining to only a part of the article, it may be corrected at a later date by means of an editorial note or an errata list.

In the event of conflict, the journal will require from the author or authors relevant proofs and reasons for the clarification of the issue and will make a final decision based on these evidences.

The journal reserves the right to publish, in both printed and electronic versions, a notice regarding an unauthorized specific text, quoting the reasons for such decision in order to differentiate misconducts from involuntary errors. Likewise, the journal will inform of such unauthorized material to the institution responsible for the author or authors of the article. The decision to unauthorize a specific text should be adopted as soon as possible, in order to avoid any quote of such material within its field of research.



Unauthorized articles should be maintained in the electronic edition of the journals, with a clear and unmistakable warning that it refers to an unauthorized material, in order to differentiate it from other type of corrections or comments. In the printed editions, the unauthorized papers will be quoted briefly by means of an editorial note or communication, in the same terms expressed in the electronic editions.

As a previous step to the final decision of unauthorized material, the journal may issue a notice of irregularity. This notice should provide all relevant information in the same terms as in the case of a notice of unauthorized material. Such notice of irregularity would be maintained during the shortest possible time lapse until the the final decision on the article.

6. Editorial Board guidelines implementation

The individual holding the position of journal Director is responsible for the proper implementation of the guidelines that control the editorial process and must guarantee that every member of the Editorial Board is aware of them. The Editorial Board main tasks will be: promoting and representing the journal in different forums; suggesting and supporting potential improvements; requesting the cooperation of qualified specialists; reviewing, in a preliminary evaluation, the materials submitted; writing editorial articles, revisions, comments, news, reviews, etc.; as well as attending the Editorial Board meetings.

7. Authorship procedures

The rules for original material submissions for each issue (referring to abstract and article extension, preparation of illustrations, bibliographic references method, etc.) must be made public.

8. Conflicts of interest

Conflicts of interest arises when a) a manuscript received at the journal is authored by a member of the Editorial Board, b) by someone who has a close personal or professional relationship to the Editorial Board or is closely related to a past or present research involving members of the Editorial Board. Whoever is affected by any of the above mentioned cases, must refrain from participating in the evaluation process of the proposed article.

II PAPER AUTHORSHIP

1. Publication procedures

The texts submitted for publishing must be the output of an original and unpublished research. These texts should include the data obtained and used, as well as an objective discussion of the results. Enough information will be provided so that any other specialist would be able to duplicate such investigation and confirm or refuse the interpretation of the work.



The authors should mention properly the origin of the arguments or quotes taken from other published or unpublished sources, as it is expressed in the journal's guidelines.

When illustrations are included as part of the research, it will be necessary to explain how these illustrations were created or obtained, as long as it is adequate for its comprehension. In the event of the use of graphic material (figures, pictures, maps, etc.) that is totally or partially taken from other publications, the authors should quote its origin, together with reproduction copyrights if needed.

Unnecessary fragmentation of the articles should be avoided. If the extension of the material really justifies it, the article may be published in several sections focused on specific aspects of the whole study. In order to facilitate the readers' understanding, these different sections should be published in the same journal.

2. Originality and plagiarism

Authors must ensure that any data and results shown in the study are original, not having been copied, invented, distorted or manipulated.

Any kind of plagiarism, multiple or redundant publication, as well as the invention or manipulation of data are considered as major ethical faults and scientific frauds.

Authors must not submit to the journal original works which are being considered or reviewed in another journal, nor must they present such original works to another journal until they receive a notice of rejection or they withdraw them voluntarily. However, the extension of previous minor works (brief notes, conference proceedings) may be accepted for publication as long as the original text is properly quoted and the manuscript implies a substantial modification of the previous work.

In addition, secondary publications may be acceptable if they are addressed to totally different readers; for instance, if the work is published in different languages or if there is one version for specialists and another one for the general audience. Such circumstances should be clearly specified and the original publication should be adequately quoted.

3. Paper authorship

In case of multiple authorship, the person who appears as responsible before the journal should guarantee the identification of whoever has contributed significantly to the conception, planning, design, execution, data securing, interpretation and study results discussion; in any case, everyone who authors the work shares the responsibility of the submitted material. Also, whoever acts as contact person must ensure that everyone who authors the work has reviewed and approved the final version and agreed to its potential publication.

The contact author must ensure that none of the authors responsible for the study has been omitted and, therefore, complies with the established co-authorship criteria, thus avoiding a false or given authorship, which would mean a bad scientific practice.



In addition, other collaborators that do not appear as authors nor are considered responsible for the final version of the work, should be recognized in terms of gratitude in a note of the article.

If the journal or the authors of the article request it, the published version will briefly describe the individual contributions of each of the participants to the whole study.

4. Information sources

The article should acknowledge the publications which may have influenced the research, thus identifying and quoting in the bibliography any original source on which the information is based. However, the article should not include any irrelevant quote nor should it abuse of mentions to research already settled in the scientific knowledge corpus.

The author should not use the information obtained privately through conversations, correspondence or debates with other colleagues, unless he or she has a written and explicit permission from the information source as well as such information has been received within a scientific advice context.

5. Significant errors in published material

When an author finds a major error in the study, he or she is compelled to inform to the journal as soon as possible in order to modify the work, withdraw it, retract or issue a correction note or errata list.

If a potential error is detected by a member of the Editorial Board, the author is compelled to demonstrate that his or her work is correct.

The resolution process of these conflicts is described in point I.5.

6. Conflicts of interest

The text of the article should be accompanied by a declaration note which describes any commercial, finance or personal liaison that may affect the work's results and conclusions. Likewise, it is mandatory to indicate any financial resources awarded to such study. This information will appear on the article's published version.

III PAPER EVALUATION

The individuals participating in the evaluation process hold a main role in guaranteeing the quality of the publication. The reviewers support the journal editorial decision-making acts and contribute to the improvement of its materials.



1. Confidentiality

Whoever is responsible for an evaluation must consider the material to revise as a confidential document until its publication, both during the course of the revision process as well as after it has been finished.

He or she must never divulge nor use the information, details, arguments or interpretations of such text for his or her or someone else's benefit nor with the intention to harm a third party. Only in very special circumstances, the reviewer may require the advice of a qualified specialist, always under previous notification to the journal Editor.

2. Objectivity

The quality of a manuscript should be evaluated over the complete work, including any information on which the hypothesis of the study is based, as well as theoretical and experimental data and their interpretation, Attention to its presentation and wording should be also paid.

Any criticism should be accurate and any comment should be objective and constructive. Every judgement should be adequately grounded, without using hostile attitudes and respecting the intellectual independence of the author.

Whoever performs an evaluation should warn the Editor about any substantial similitude between the submitted material and other articles already published or in the process of evaluation in another publication (redundant or duplicate). Likewise, the reviewer should point out any text or data being forged, invented or manipulated.

3. Timely response

Every evaluation process must be performed without delay and completed within the established time lapse, informing the Editor about any potential delay.

In addition, the Editor should be informed as soon as possible if the reviewer considers that he or she is not able to decide on the work evaluation properly or in case he is not capable to comply with the established timing.

4. Information source identification

The reviewer should check that all relevant works already published on the same subject are duly quoted. With such purpose, the bibliography recorded in the text should be reviewed suggesting the elimination of any unnecessary or redundant references or the incorporation of any others not being referenced.



5. Conflicts of interest

Whoever performs an evaluation should reject such revision when there is a professional or personal relationship with other individuals who have taken part on its authorship if it affects the judgement on such material.

In addition, conflicts of interest may arise when the paper to be evaluated is closely linked to any other paper currently being developed or having been published recently. In such cases, if having any doubt, the reviewer should refuse the evaluation task and return the work to the journal together with the reasons for such decision.

References

- CSIC, *Guía de buenas prácticas para la publicación*: http://revistas.csic.es/public/guiabuenas_practicas_CSIC.pdf
- COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics): <http://www.publicationethics.org>
- Directrices EASE (European Association of Science Editors): <http://www.ease.org.uk>
- *Ethical Guidelines for Journal Publication*: <http://sjss.universia.net/codigo-etico.jsp>

Translation: Inmaculada VIVAS SAINZ