

Studi Junghiani

Publication ethics and publication malpractice statement.

- English version. -

This document has been largely inspired by what is currently the latest revision (march 2011) of the COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) code of conduct and best practice guidelines for journal editors. Any modification has been carried out to adapt the guidelines to our context, in which the members of the editorial committee act also as reviewers of the submitted material.

1. General duties and responsibilities of the members of the editorial committee.

- The members of the editorial committee will be accountable for everything published in their journal, this means that they will:
- Strive to meet the needs of readers and authors;
- Strive to constantly improve their journal;
- Have processes in place to assure the quality of the material they publish;
- Champion freedom of expression;
- Maintain the integrity of the academic record;
- Preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards;
- Always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies when needed;
- Actively seeking the views of authors, readers, and editorial committee members about ways of improving their journal's processes.

2. Relations with readers.

- Readers will be informed about who has funded research or other scholarly work and whether the funders had any role in the research and its publication and, if so, what this was;
- The members of the editorial committee will constantly strive to ensure that all published reports and reviews of research have been reviewed by suitably qualified reviewers;
- Non-peer-reviewed sections of *Studi Junghiani* are clearly identified;
- Readers are informed about steps taken to ensure that submissions from members of the journal's editorial committee receive an objective and unbiased evaluation.

3. Relations with authors.

- Editor's decision to accept or reject a paper for publication are based on the paper's importance, originality and clarity, and the study's validity and its relevance to the remit of the journal;
- New editors should not overturn decisions to publish submissions made by the previous editor unless serious problems are identified;
- A description of peer review processes should be published, and editors should be ready to justify any important deviation from the described processes;
- The editorial committee has published guidelines to authors on everything that is expected of them. This guidance should regularly updated and will refer to this code;
- The editorial committee will respect requests from authors that an individual should not review their submission, if these are well-reasoned and practicable.

4. Relations with members of the editorial committee.

- Editors will behave in order to protect the confidentiality of the submitted material;
- Editors will make sure that peer reviewers identities are protected;
- Editors will comment on the originality of submissions and will be alert to redundant publication and plagiarism;
- New editorial committee members will be informed on everything that is expected of them and should keep existing members updated on new policies and developments.
- Each member of the editorial committee is expected to:
 - Act as ambassador for *Studi junghiani*;
 - Support and promote *Studi Junghiani*;
 - Seek out the best authors and best work and will actively encourage submissions;
 - Accept commissions to write editorials, reviews and commentaries on papers in their specialist area;
 - Attend and contribute to editorial committee meetings.

5. Editorial, peer review and privacy-protecting processes.

- Editors will strive to ensure that peer review at their journal is fair, unbiased and timely;
- Editors should have systems to ensure that material submitted to their journal remains confidential while under review;
- Editors will obey the Italian laws on confidentiality and privacy. However they will always protect the confidentiality of individual information obtained in the course of research or professional interactions. It is therefore almost always necessary to obtain written informed consent for publication from people who might recognise themselves or be identified by others (e.g. from case reports or photographs). It may be possible to publish individual information without explicit consent if public interest considerations outweigh possible harms, it is impossible to obtain consent and a reasonable individual would be unlikely to object to publication.

- Editors should endeavour to ensure that research they publish was carried out according to the guidelines expressed in the latest version of the *Declaration of Helsinki* (currently the one issued in Seoul; 2008).

6. Dealing with possible misconduct.

- The members of the editorial committee have a duty to act if they suspect a misconduct or if an allegation of misconduct is brought to them. The duty extends to both published and unpublished papers.
- The members of the editorial committee should not simply reject papers that raise concerns about possible misconduct. They are ethically obliged to pursue alleged cases.
- The members of the editorial committee should first seek a response from these suspected of misconduct. If they are not satisfied with the response, they should ask the relevant employers, or institution, or some appropriate body to investigate.
- The members of the editorial committee should be alert to intellectual property issues and work with their publisher to handle potential breaches of intellectual property laws and conventions.

7. Encouraging debate.

- The members of the editorial committee should encourage and be willing to consider cogent criticisms of work published in their journal;
- Authors of criticized material should be given the opportunity to respond;
- Studies reporting negative results should not be excluded;
- The members of the editorial committee will be open to research that challenges previous work published in the journal.
- The members of the editorial committee will respond promptly to complaints and should ensure there is a way for dissatisfied complainants to take complaints further.