

**JUS. JOURNAL OF JURIDICAL SCIENCES**  
**CODE OF ETHICS – June 2022**

“Jus” is a scientific journal edited by Vita e Pensiero, on behalf of Law Faculty of the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart. Our ethic statements are based on COPE’s Core Practices (<https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>). It is necessary to agree upon standards of expected ethical behavior for all parties involved in the act of publishing: the author, the journal editor, the peer reviewer and the publisher.

**DUTIES OF EDITORS**

**Publication decisions**

The editor in chief of the journal (or another editor of a specific issues) is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. Their positive judgment will be expressed regarding the content of the article, its quality and scientific relevance. The editor in chief may refer to the editorial board of the journal and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism.

**Fair play**

The editor in chief at any time 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 editor in chief and any editorial staff 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Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author.

**DUTIES OF REVIEWERS**

**Contribution to Editorial Decisions**

Peer review assists the editor in chief in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.

**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 editor in chief and excuse himself from the review process.

**Confidentiality**

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor in chief.

## **Standards of Objectivity**

Reviews should be conducted objectively evaluating the scientific relevance of the article, the bibliographic richness, the understandability of the text, the absence of errors. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. 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 editor in chief's 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**

Privileged information or ideas obtained through 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.

## **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 detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

### **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.

### **Multiple, Redundant or Concurrent Publication**

The author must notify the editor in chief if their article has been proposed for publication to other journals. In absence of editor in chief's authorization (according to the publisher), the author cannot publish, in other journals, articles published in the journal or due to be published in the journal, or articles that describe the contents of the same research.

### **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.

### **Authorship of the Paper**

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the paper, and that

all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

### **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.

### **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 editor in chief or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

### **Content sharing – Open access policy**

><https://www.vitaepensiero.it/openaccesspolicy>

### **Author's fee**

The accepted articles in the journals are published, in print and electronic version, free of charges for the author or related institutions.

## **PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR**

Misconduct and unethical behavior may be identified and brought to the attention of the editor in chief and publisher at any time, by anyone. Whoever informs the editor in chief or publisher of such conduct should provide sufficient information and evidence in order for an investigation to be initiated. All allegations should be taken seriously and treated in the same way, until a successful decision or conclusion is reached. An initial decision should be taken by the editor in chief, who should consult with or seek advice from the editorial board, the scientific committee and the publisher, if appropriate. Evidence should be gathered, while not divulging any allegation beyond the parties directly involved. In any event, the author should be given the opportunity to respond to allegations. Where an improper behavior by a reviewer or an editor is ascertained, he/she will no longer be considered by the journal as a possible reviewer or editor. Where an improper behavior is discovered by an author, he / she will no longer be able to make a submission to the journal for a period commensurate with the seriousness of the violation committed. If necessary, a note with the description of irregular behaviors will be published in the number following the verification in order to inform the readers