

Editorial Policy and Ethics

The Editorial Board is committed to promote and maintain the quality, originality and relevance of the journal in the legal and scientific landscape.

1. Editorial Board

The Editorial Board works and decides independently.

The Board shall cooperate with the Direction, without prejudice to the decision-making autonomy of each of these bodies in matters within their competence.

The members of the Editorial Board are the editors.

The Board is neither fixed nor closed, and the output, as the substitution or admission entry of new editors is possible.

The decision on admission of a new publisher shall take into account, in particular, the ability to attract authors and quality works for the journal, the ability to evaluate research papers according to scientific quality standards and the degree of commitment in the promotion and representation of the journal, and participation in discussions and decision-making on the general guidelines.

The Editorial Board meets periodically (at least once a year) with all members to assess the problems they have faced in their work and how they have been resolved, as well as the timeliness of the guidelines that guide their decisions in the face of future challenges.

2. Copyright issues

Papers presented or proposed for publication must be signed by all authors.

The proposal of a work for publication implies the assumption of the positions taken there by the authors.

The Editorial Board has the final decision on the publication of the proposed work.

The decision on the publication of a paper begins by following the report made by peer reviewers. It should be based above all on the originality, depth, clarity, and quality with which the theme is treated, as well as on the importance and currentness of the theme.

In case the Board's decision on the publication of the work differs from the guidance given in the peer reviewers' reports, that decision must state the reasons on which it is based. In particular, the reasons why the reasons given by the reviewers do not exist, or those which are more important than those reasons, should be explained.

In case the Board's decision on the publication of the work is in accordance with the guidance given in the peer reviewers' reports, that decision must state the reasons on which it is based, but the Commission may merely refer to the report.

Except in exceptional circumstances, the decision to publish a work must not be reversed, even in the case of a change of member or members of the Editorial Board.

The reversal of a publication decision must be justified, explaining that there are exceptional circumstances justifying the adoption of the measure. The reasoning is based mainly on the non-compliance with the requirements that guide the publication decision.

The editors may submit papers for publication in the journal. These works must be submitted to the same peer review process as the rest and their authors can not take part in the final publication decision.

Editors should, however, moderate the frequency of presentation of their works, and should preferably do so when strictly justified.

The review of the work will be done by a reviewer outside the journal and the author of the work will not be able to participate as an editor in the number in which the same work is published, an observation being made in this sense in the article itself. This rule may not be followed in special numbers, such as rounds of colloquiums and commemorative numbers.

If it is decided not to publish a work, the author can submit a substantiated complaint to the Editorial Board.

The complainant should base the complaint on the discussion of the points set out in the peer reviewer report and the Board's decision.

In reply to the complaint, the Board may reverse the previous decision and decide to job.

In the case of maintaining the decision not to publish, the reply must be based on the and refutation of the arguments presented in the author's complaint.

The authors are informed of the style to be used in the writing of the articles and the dates on which the authors can send their proposals.

3. Republishing

The magazine adopts a policy of originality.

In case the submitted work (or part thereof) has already been proposed for publication, the author must provide this information when submitting to the journal. If the content in question is only part of the work submitted, the author should specify which part is involved.

The duty to provide information is equally valid where the proposal for publication elsewhere is made after the work has been submitted to the journal, as long as the author does not receive a response from the Board with the decision to publish it.

The author must also inform the Board of any willingness to propose work for publication elsewhere after publication in the journal.

As a rule, the journal will not publish works that have already been published elsewhere or are in the process of being published.

Publication may take place, however, when exceptional circumstances so warrant.

Whenever it is decided to publish material already published or in the process of being published elsewhere, the work in question should contain an initial reference to the other publication.

4. Usurpation and Counterfeiting

The Editorial Boards commits itself to make every effort to avoid any involvement of the journal with usurping and counterfeiting practices, as defined and punished, respectively, in articles nrs. 195 and 199 of the Copyright and Related Rights Code.

Notwithstanding the duties of peer reviewers in this field – and even though their reports do not refer any indication in this regard –, the Board reserves the possibility to inspect all material submitted to it in order to avoid the publication of any content that has been the object of the referred practices.

Whenever one of these practices is detected, the Board contacts the author and gives the opportunity to clarify the situation. When the explanation is not satisfactory, the Board shall alert the competent authorities and inform the author of the procedure adopted.

If the detection takes place only after publication in the journal, in addition to that referred to in paragraph above, the Board shall ensure that the content in question is signalled at the due place and the necessary clarification. Alternatively - and depending on the extent of the object content of these practices - the work can be removed from the publication, explaining the reasons for removal.

5. Confidentiality

The material proposed for publication, communications with authors and peer reviewers' reports are considered and treated as confidential by the Editorial Board. In particular, the Commission commits itself not to disclose the information to third parties, or to publish them, without the express permission of the authors, regardless decision on the publication of the work.

Authors should follow the same procedure with regard to communications with the peer reviewers' reports and any other material declared as confidential. These elements cannot be published on any website nor appear in another publication without express authorization from the Editorial Board, regardless of whether the work proposed by the author comes to be published in the journal.

No editor will comment on those elements until publication occurs, except with the other members or with the reviewers involved.

Following publication, publishers may publicly comment on the content of the material, however being limited to their personal evaluation of it. In case of decision not to publish, editors will not publicly comment on rejected content.

Regardless of whether publication is approved or not, all communications with the author and peer reviewers' reports will remain confidential.