

STUDIA LULLIANA - ISSN 1132-130X, ISSN digital 2340-4752
Continuazione della rivista *Estudios Lulianos* (1957-1990)
Publication ethics and malpractice statement

Guidelines based on Elsevier policies and Cope's Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors

SL's publishing activity relies upon international publication ethics and publication malpractice statement using the Publishing ethics resource kit (PERK):

<<http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk>>

in compliance with the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE):

<<http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines>>

Professional and ethical considerations

The papers having political profile, or the papers including biased or incorrect evaluations of other scientific works and other specialists, are not accepted for publication. Our priorities are articles on the bases of their scientific novelty and applied importance for catalan studies.

Misleading Publication

The articles must be authentic and should not contain manipulated data or fraudulent information. This also applies to direct translation between different languages.

Articles should describe results as accurately as possible, and avoid using statements of opinions as facts. The manuscript should present the results in a direct way and avoid misleading the reader or causing misunderstandings. It is important to discuss the significance of the results; at the same time, it is crucial not to overinterpret the results. Excessive or biased interpretation will not contribute to scientific progress and will mislead readers.

Ethical guidelines for journal publication

Double blind peer-reviewed articles support and embody the scientific method. It is therefore important to agree upon standards of expected ethical behaviour for all parties involved in the act of publishing: the author, the journal editors, the peer reviewer, the publisher and the society.

Duties of authors

Reporting standards

Authors of reports of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient details and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

Data access and retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data in connection with a paper for editorial review, and should be prepared to provide public access to such data, if practicable, and should in any event be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

Originality and plagiarism

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Plagiarism takes many forms, from 'passing off' another's paper as the author's own paper, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), to claiming results from research conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

Plagiarism and Self-Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a significant violation of truthfulness and involves stealing intellectual property or taking credit for other individuals' work. The responsibility for plagiarism lies ultimately with the writer.

Recommendations for avoiding plagiarism:

- Use quotation marks around words taken verbatim from a source.
- Change no part of quotation within the context of the sentence.
- Use single marks for a quotation within a quotation.
- Use ellipses (a space and three periods) for a part of the quotation omitted.
- Use brackets around added words.
- Limit the use of direct quotes.

Attempt to paraphrase the information, or summarize the information derived from a variety of sources using own words.

Some authors have written several chapters for several different books that are changed only slightly. Each manuscript is copyrighted when published. Because the author no longer owns the rights to these words, one should not plagiarize them. Most editors and reviewers would argue that self-plagiarism is unethical. Thus, an author cannot copy one's own material for a new manuscript without permission of the copyright holder. Alternatives include using quotes around short phrases of own work and citing appropriate references.

Duplicate Publication

Articles submitted to *SL* must not contain any results that have been reported in any journals or books in any form. You should inform editors of any potential duplicate publications.

SL practices the principle of single submission: one submission of one manuscript to one journal at a time and no resubmission to another journal until a written rejection has been received. Editors must have exclusive rights to the manuscript. This principle does not eliminate consideration for publication of any paper previously rejected by another journal.

Criteria for authors to determine whether their material is considered "duplicate":

- Identical content to something previously published.
- Highly similar content to other materials with minimal changes.
- Several articles when one would be enough.
- Similar articles for various disciplines.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable. In general, an author should not submit for consideration in another journal a previously published paper. The authors and editors of the journals concerned must agree to the secondary publication, which must reflect the same data and interpretation of the primary document. The primary reference must be cited in the secondary publication.

Acknowledgement of sources

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, must not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, must not be used without the explicit written permission of the author of the work involved in these services.

Authorship of the paper

SL requires that submitted manuscripts are solely the author's own work and not the work of others, unless explicit permission has been granted. This includes text, figures and tables. All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for it. Authorship credit should be based only on substantial contributions to:

- a) conception, analysis and interpretation of data;
- b) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content;
- c) final approval of the version to be published.

It is the corresponding authors' responsibility to seek permission from each author to publish the materials and to get consensus on the authorship before submission to *SL*.

People who provide financial assistance and technical support or were committee members could be acknowledged but not recognized as authors. Examples of specific contributions that might warrant acknowledgement include sources of funding, provision of expert technical assistance, review and critique of a manuscript, assistance with statistical analysis and interpretation, or participation in the formulation of ideas or planning of a project.

Hazards and human or animal subjects

If the work involves chemicals, procedures or equipment that have any unusual hazards inherent in their use, the author must clearly identify these in the manuscript. If the work involves the use of animal or human subjects, the author should ensure that the manuscript contains a statement that all procedures were performed in compliance with relevant laws and institutional guidelines and that the appropriate institutional committee(s) has approved them. Authors should include a statement in the manuscript that informed consent was obtained for experimentation with human subjects. The privacy rights of human subjects must always be observed.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. Examples of potential conflicts of interest which should be disclosed include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. Potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed at the earliest stage possible.

Fundamental errors in published works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editors or publisher and cooperate with the editors to retract or correct the paper. If the editors or the publisher learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error, it is the obligation of the author to promptly retract or correct the paper or provide evidence to the editors of the correctness of the original paper.

Duties of the Editorial Board

Publication decisions

The editors of the double blind peer-reviewed journal *SL* are responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The validation of the work in question and its importance to researchers and readers must always drive such decisions. The editors may be guided by the policies of the journal's International advisory board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editors may confer with reviewers in making this decision.

Fair play

Editors will evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

Confidentiality

The editors must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through double

blind peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Editors should reclude themselves (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the International advisory board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers. Editors should require all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication. If needed, other appropriate action should be taken, such as the publication of a retraction or expression of concern.

Involvement and cooperation in investigations

Editors should take reasonably responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper, in conjunction with the publisher (or society). Such measures will generally include contacting the author of the manuscript or paper and giving due consideration of the respective complaint or claims made, but may also include further communications to the relevant institutions and research bodies, and if the complaint is upheld, the publication of a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or other note, as may be relevant. Every reported act of unethical publishing behaviour must be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication.

Duties of reviewers

Contribution to editorial decisions

Double blind peer review assists the editors in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper. Double blind peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication, and lies at the heart of the scientific method.

Promptness

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editors and excuse himself from the review process.

Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for double blind peer review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editors.

Standards of objectivity

Double blind peer reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editors' attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through double blind peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

Malpractice statement

Academic misconduct in any form will not be tolerated by *SL*. In cases of suspected misconduct (plagiarism, fraud, breached intellectual property rights, etc.) a panel will be formed to evaluate the substance of the claim. If the claim is supported by evidence, the paper in question will be rejected for consideration in *SL*.

and all authors and their affiliations will be informed. In cases where the paper has already been published before the misconduct was discovered, a retraction by authors or by the *SL* editors will have to take place and the case will be made public. Evident cases of misconduct may result in a three-year or longer ban from future submission to *SL*. All appeals regarding the panel's decisions have to go through the editors and should be submitted within 28 days of the decision date.