

REVISTA GENERAL DE DERECHO CONSTITUCIONAL

-PUBLICATION ETHICS AND PUBLICATION MALPRACTICE STATEMENT.

The Revista General de Derecho Constitucional is an academic journal that publishes scientific papers with a solid commitment to comply with the ethical standards and good practices that are typical of this type of publication.

Accordingly, the Editorial Board has adopted this Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement, based on the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\) Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors](#). All parties involved in the publication (authors, editors, reviewers...) must accept and respect the principles contained in this document.

1. Duties of Authors

1.1. Originality and plagiarism

Authors should ensure that they have written and that they submit only entirely original works, and if they have used the work and/or words of others, that this has been appropriately cited. Publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the work reported in the manuscript should also be cited. Plagiarism takes many forms, from "passing off" another's paper as the author's own, 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 behavior and is unacceptable.

1.2. Multiple, duplicate, redundant or concurrent submission/publication

Papers describing essentially the same research should not be published in more than one journal or primary publication. Hence, authors should not submit for consideration a manuscript that has already been published in another journal. Articles previously published in *Revista General de Derecho Constitucional* may be published elsewhere, as long as the author(s) acknowledge(s) that it was previously published in *Revista General de Derecho Constitucional*, providing issue and page numbers.

1.3. Peer review

Authors are obliged to participate in the peer review process and cooperate fully by responding promptly to editors' requests, clarifications, and other questions. In the case of a first decision of "revisions necessary," authors should respond to the reviewers'



comments systematically, point by point, and in a timely manner, revising and re-submitting their manuscript to the journal by the deadline given.

1.4. Fundamental errors in published papers

When authors discover significant errors or inaccuracies in their own published work, it is their obligation to promptly notify the journal's editors and cooperate with them to either correct the paper in the form of an erratum or to retract the paper. If the editors learn from a third party that a published work contains a significant error or inaccuracy, then it is the authors' obligation to promptly correct or retract the paper or provide evidence to the journal editors of the correctness of the paper.

1.5. Conflicts of Interest

All authors must declare any conflicts of interest that may affect the results obtained or the arguments sustained. In the event that the work submitted is the result of a research project, authors must indicate in the acknowledgements of the work, its code, as well as its funding agencies.

2. Duties of the Editorial Board

2.1. Confidentiality

Editorial Board will 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.

2.2. Editorial independence

Editors evaluate submitted manuscripts exclusively on the basis of their academic merit (importance, originality, clarity...) and its relevance to the journal's scope, without regard to the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, nationality, religious belief, political philosophy or institutional affiliation. The editors have full authority over the entire editorial content of the journal and the timing of publication of that content.

2.3. Gender equality and inclusive language

Editorial Board ensures respect for gender equality criteria and the use of inclusive language. In particular, Editorial Board will oversee the equal composition of the Advisory Board, the team of external evaluators and the Editorial Board itself.

2.4. Conflicts of interest

Editorial Board members will not use unpublished information disclosed in a submitted manuscript for their own research purposes.

Editors will recuse themselves from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships/connections with any of the authors or institutions connected to the papers; instead, they will ask another member of the Editorial Board to handle the manuscript.

2.5. Complaints and Appeals

Appeals to editor decisions need to provide strong evidence of new data or information in response to the reviewers' and/or editor's comments. Editors will consider one appeal per article and their decision will be final. Review and decisions on new submissions will take priority over appeals.

2.6. Post publication correction

After an article has been published it may be necessary to make a change. This will be done after careful consideration by the Editorial Board in accordance with guidance from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Any necessary changes will be accompanied with a post-publication notice which will be permanently linked to the original article, such as a "Correction notice". These changes are permanent and ensure the integrity of the research.

2.7. General duty of improvement

Editorial Board should actively seek the views of authors, readers, reviewers and Advisory Members about ways of improving the Revista General de Derecho Constitucional

3. Duties of Reviewers

3.1. Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review are confidential documents and must be treated as such; they must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the Editorial Board (who would only do so under exceptional and specific circumstances). This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

3.2. Collaboration principle

Peer review assists editors in making editorial decisions and can also help authors to improve their research. For these purposes the referees shall conduct their activities.

3.3. Conflicts of interest



Any reviewer who has conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors or institutions connected to the manuscript and the work described therein should immediately notify the editors to declare their conflicts of interest and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

3.4. Lack of qualification or availability

Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should immediately notify the editors and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

3.5. Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively and observations formulated clearly with supporting arguments so that authors can use them for improving the manuscript. Personal criticism of the authors is inappropriate.

3.6. Commitment to punctuality

Referees must observe the deadlines set by the Editorial Board for the evaluation of papers.