Code of Editorial Practice and Conduct – Antropologia Pubblica

"Antropologia Pubblica' is a peer reviewed international journal committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics. These guidelines are based on COPE's Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors. Complaints and issues related to aspects not considered in this Code will be addressed according to COPE' guidelines and resources.

1. Open Access and Submission Charge Policy

Antropologia Pubblica adheres to the principle that providing open access to research fosters wider global knowledge sharing. In alignment with this principle, authors are not required to pay any fees to publish, and all articles are freely accessible under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**.

2. Duties of Editors

Decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication are made solely based on the intellectual value of the submitted manuscript, assessing its significance, innovation, and clarity, as well as its pertinence to the journal's scope. These decisions are independent of the author's gender, religion, sexual orientation, nationality, ethnicity, or political ideology.

The Editorial Board has full capacity to determine which submitted articles will be sent for peer review and to make final publication decisions following the review process. However, they do not have the power to affect the decisions of the reviewers who conduct the blind reviews of the articles.

Editors are responsible for selecting suitable reviewers for submissions and should honour well-reasoned requests from authors to exclude certain individuals from the review process. It is crucial for editors to facilitate a peer review that is equitable, impartial, and prompt.

Editors should ask reviewers to reveal any potential conflicts of interest prior to accepting a review assignment. Generally, editors ought to prevent any conflicts of interest among staff, authors, reviewers, and board members.

Every stage of the review process should be conducted through the OJS platform. This ensures the integrity of the final decision and maintains the confidentiality of the materials submitted to the journal while under review. Additionally, it guarantees that a complete record of the review process is appropriately archived.

Significant deviations from the review processes outlined in the "Peer Review Process" section must be justified by the editors. Editors should not overturn decisions to accept submissions unless serious issues are discovered, including legal and ethical concerns related to libel, copyright infringement, plagiarism, breaches of research ethics, and conflicts of interest.

The publisher of the Journal must not influence the editorial decisions regarding article publication. However, submitted manuscripts must adhere to the research and ethnographic standards outlined in the Ethical Code of the Italian Association of Applied Anthropology (SIAA). Any complaints about violations of the SIAA Ethical Code will be jointly handled by the editors of *Antropologia Pubblica* and the SIAA Board, or through processes supported by the SIAA's Probi Viri e Probae Mulieres.

Authors wishing to contest editorial decisions may submit a letter or email to the Editor-In-Chief detailing their objections. The Editor-In-Chief, along with the Production Editor and the Section Editor responsible for the manuscript, will determine if the manuscript should

be re-evaluated by new reviewers. Additionally, editors should discontinue using reviewers who regularly provide discourteous, substandard, or delayed feedback.

Editors must be willing to consider cogent criticisms of work published in Antropologia Pubblica and be open to research that challenges previous work published in the Journal. They must always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions on the published journal based on COPE's guidelines, and to give possibility of expression on the website of Antropologia Pubblica, when needed. Authors will always have the opportunity to respond to criticism.

Editors should be open to well-founded critiques of work published in *Antropologia Pubblica* and welcome research that questions findings previously reported in the journal. They must also be prepared to publish corrections, clarifications, and retractions in accordance with COPE's guidelines, and provide opportunities for expression on the Antropologia Pubblica website when necessary. Authors will always be given the chance to respond to any criticism of their work.

In cases of suspected misconduct or contested authorship, editors are required to consult the [COPE flowcharts](#) and adhere to their directives. Challenging cases should be referred to COPE, particularly when issues arise that are not covered by the existing flowcharts or when new forms of publication misconduct are suspected.

Editors have the duty to keep the 'Author Guidelines' and 'Peer Review Process' sections of the journal's website regularly updated, and that information about the parts of the journal that undergo the peer review process is clearly provided. This ensures that the instructions and information provided to authors are up-to-date, and that organisations responsible for assessing research quality are well-informed about the journal's standards and procedures.

3. **Duties of Reviewers**

Reviewers should only accept manuscripts for review if they possess the necessary subject expertise to conduct a thorough assessment and can do so promptly. They are required to provide the Journal with personal and professional information that accurately reflects their expertise. Additionally, reviewers must uphold the confidentiality of the peer-review process and should not disclose any details of a manuscript or its review, during or after the process, except those released by the Journal. It is imperative that reviewers do not use information obtained during the peer-review process for personal gain, or to benefit any other person or organisation, nor should they use it to harm or discredit others.

Reviewers are obligated to declare all potential conflicts of interest and should consult with the editors if they are uncertain about what constitutes a relevant interest. If reviewers believe they cannot provide an unbiased review or if they have been involved in any way with the work or its reporting, they must refuse to review the manuscript. When suggesting alternative reviewers, choices should be based on qualifications and expertise without personal bias or intent to influence the manuscript's outcome, whether positively or negatively. Reviewers must also decline assignments to review manuscripts that closely resemble their own works currently in preparation or under review at another journal.

Reviewers must ensure that their evaluations are not influenced by the origins of a manuscript, including the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender, or other personal characteristics of the authors, nor by any commercial interests.

Reviewers should articulate their evaluations clearly, supporting their views with specific criticisms and evidence. When making general claims such as "this work has been done before," they must provide appropriate references to support their statements, aiding the editors in their

decision-making process and ensuring fairness to the authors. Reviewers are also responsible for identifying relevant published work not cited by the authors.

They should commit to responding within a reasonable time frame, especially if they are unable to conduct the review, and avoid any intentional delays. Reviewers should only accept a manuscript for review if they are confident they can complete the review within the specified or mutually agreed time frame. If an extension is needed, they must inform the journal promptly.

Reviewers should be aware that editors rely on them for their expertise, sound judgement, and a truthful, fair assessment of both the strengths and weaknesses of the submitted work. They must maintain objectivity and provide constructive feedback that aids authors in enhancing their manuscript. It is crucial for reviewers to avoid hostility, inflammatory remarks, libellous or derogatory personal comments, and baseless accusations. While it's important to respect the authors' style if it is fundamentally sound and clear, suggesting modifications that enhance clarity is valuable and encouraged.

Reviewers should clearly differentiate between additional investigations that are essential for supporting the claims made in the manuscript and those that would merely strengthen or extend the research. They must avoid suggesting that authors include citations to their own work or that of their associates solely to boost citation counts or enhance their own visibility. Any recommendations for additional citations must be grounded in valid academic reasons.

Reviewers should approach manuscripts they have previously assessed for other journals with a fresh perspective, acknowledging that the content may have been revised since the last submission. Additionally, it is important to consider that the criteria for evaluation and acceptance can vary between journals. Therefore, each review should be conducted as if it is the first, ensuring that all judgments are based solely on the manuscript's current merit and alignment with the new journal's specific standards.

Impersonating another person during the review process is classified as serious misconduct. Conversely, reviewers must not involve others in the review of a manuscript, including mentored junior researchers, without prior approval from the Journal. Should permission be granted, the names of all individuals who assisted with the review should be disclosed in the section of the review designated for confidential communication between the editor and reviewer. This ensures they are properly acknowledged in the Journal's records and receive appropriate credit for their contributions.

Reviewers are tasked with assessing the originality of submissions and must be vigilant against redundant publication and plagiarism. They are expected to check for plagiarism using all available resources, including those accessible online for free or through their affiliated institutions. In instances of suspected misconduct, reviewers should adhere to the [COPE flowchart](#) to guide their actions.

Additionally, reviewers should address ethical issues and potential misconduct related to research and publication that may arise from the submissions. This includes evaluating concerns such as unethical research designs, inadequate details regarding consent or the protection of research subjects, and inappropriate data manipulation and presentation. It is crucial for reviewers to provide detailed commentary on these aspects to uphold the integrity of the research process.

Reviewers have a duty to inform the journal promptly if they encounter any irregularities, have ethical concerns about the work, notice substantial similarities between the manuscript under review and another submission or published article, or suspect misconduct in the research, writing, or submission processes. It is essential for reviewers to maintain confidentiality regarding their concerns and refrain from conducting personal investigations unless specifically requested by the journal for additional information or advice. This protocol helps ensure that

issues are handled appropriately and through the proper channels, preserving the integrity of the review process.

Reviewers should strive for consistency between their comments to the editor and their report for the authors, ensuring that the majority of their feedback is included in the report intended for the authors. Confidential comments to the editor should be used responsibly; they are not a venue for disparagement or false accusations, especially considering these remarks are not visible to the authors. It's crucial that such communications are used constructively, focusing on providing additional context or highlighting concerns that require the editor's attention.

Reviewers have an ongoing obligation to maintain the confidentiality of manuscript details and the review process, even after the review is concluded. Should the journal reach out for further discussion regarding their review, reviewers are expected to respond promptly and provide any necessary information. Additionally, if reviewers become aware of any new information after submitting their review that could impact their original feedback and recommendations, they are required to promptly inform the journal. This ensures that the editorial decisions are made based on the most current and comprehensive information, maintaining the integrity of the publication process.

The exchange of information between editors and reviewers will be facilitated through the OJS platform. To ensure that reviewers are aware of the responsibilities outlined in this section, they will initially be prompted to acknowledge each responsibility by marking checkboxes. This step is intended to confirm that reviewers understand and accept their duties before proceeding with the review process.

4. **Duties of Authors**

The research presented must be rigorously conducted and ethically sound, adhering to all applicable laws. Researchers are expected to employ methodologies that comply with established anthropological ethical standards, including those specified in the Ethical Code of the Italian Association of Applied Anthropology.

Authors must collectively ensure the integrity and accuracy of their work and the content of their publications. They should meticulously review all elements of their publications, including data presentations, quotations, contemporary knowledge, style, and typescripts. It is crucial for authors to accurately cite and quote the work of others. Additionally, authors should only include references in their publications if they have personally read and assessed the cited works.

Researchers are required to present their findings honestly, without any fabrication, falsification, or improper manipulation of data. It is essential for researchers to describe their methods and present their results in a straightforward and unambiguous manner to ensure the integrity and reliability of their work.

The authorship of research publications should truthfully represent everyone's contributions to both the work and its reporting. It is vital that only those who have made significant contributions to the research be recognized as authors. Researchers must avoid including individuals who do not meet these criteria (known as guest or gift authorship) and ensure that no deserving contributors are left out (avoiding ghost authorship). Such practices are considered serious ethical violations in the academic community.

Authors must ensure that their submissions are original, not plagiarised in whole or part, and have not been previously published in any language. Concurrent submissions to multiple publications are not allowed unless there is an agreement for co-publication with the editors. Additionally, authors must verify that their articles do not simply republish their previous work

and that the data presented are authentic. Publications that stem from a single research project should be explicitly identified as such, and the primary publication should be cited.

It is essential to acknowledge and reference all pertinent prior work, whether by other researchers or by the authors themselves. Any data, text, figures, or ideas that originate from other researchers should be clearly acknowledged to avoid misrepresentation. Direct quotations from other researchers' work should be properly cited and placed within quotation marks.

New findings or interpretations ought to be contextualised within the framework of existing research. It is crucial for authors to fairly represent the work of others. Additionally, scholarly reviews and syntheses should be thorough and balanced, encompassing a range of findings and interpretations, including those that may not necessarily support the proposed hypotheses or interpretations. This approach ensures a comprehensive and objective overview of the subject matter.

Authors are responsible for promptly notifying the editor handling their submission if they identify any errors in their submitted, accepted, or published work. They should also collaborate with editors in issuing corrections or retractions as necessary.

Authors must disclose all sources of research funding, which includes direct and indirect financial support, as well as the provision of equipment or materials, and other forms of support such as specialised statistical or writing assistance. Furthermore, authors should transparently reveal any financial and non–financial interests and relationships that could potentially influence the interpretation of their findings or the hypotheses they propose.

Authors are responsible for ensuring that personal details, particularly where participants have not consented to their release or where disclosure could compromise their safety, are thoroughly anonymized. This applies to textual references as well as to images and any supplementary audio or visual materials. Additionally, authors must verify that all copyrighted material included in their article has the appropriate permissions for publication. They must also ensure that any material for which they do not hold copyright is not reproduced without obtaining the necessary permissions. This diligence is crucial for protecting participant privacy and respecting intellectual property rights.

Authors are expected to address reviewers' feedback in a professional and timely fashion. They should also engage constructively with comments made after publication. This includes responding to questions from readers and providing clarifications or additional information as needed.

Manuscripts will be submitted to the Journal through the OJS platform. The peer review process of manuscripts submitted to journal sections subject to double blind peer review will take place through the same platform to assure anonymisation.

Upon submission, authors will be required to mark a checkbox to confirm that they have reviewed and understood the responsibilities outlined in this section.