



## **Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice**

*Ricerche di S/Confine* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and takes all possible measures against any publication malpractices. All authors submitting their works to *Ricerche di S/Confine* for publication as original articles attest that the submitted works represent their authors' contributions and have not been copied or plagiarized in whole or in part from other works. The authors acknowledge that they have disclosed all and any actual or potential conflicts of interest with their work or partial benefits associated with it. In the same manner, *Ricerche di S/Confine* is committed to objective and fair double-blind peer-review of the submitted for publication works and to prevent any actual or potential conflict of interests between the editorial and review personnel and the reviewed material. Any departures from the above-defined rules should be reported directly to the Editor-in-Chief, who is unequivocally committed to providing swift resolutions to any of such a type of problems.

## **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 (co-editor) of *Ricerche di S/Confine*.

## **Publication decisions**

The editor (co-editor) of *Ricerche di S/Confine* is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The editor (co-editor) of *Ricerche di S/Confine* may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editor (co-editor) may confer with other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

## **Contributions to the Editorial Decisions**

The editor is assisted in making editorial decisions by peer reviews and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.

## **Standards of Objectivity**

Reviews will 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 editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

## **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

## **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.

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