

General information

Note

This Code of Best Practice replicates, to a large extent, the Good Practice Guide of periodical and single publications from the Spanish National Research Council State Agency.

1. EDITORIAL TEAM

The Editorial Board of the *Revista de Trabajo y Seguridad Social. CEF*, along with the Management and Coordination are responsible for the content published, as such they undertake to ensure the scientific quality, prevent malpractice in the publication of results of research and manage the publishing of work received in a reasonable time.

Said responsibility implies observing the following principles:

1.1. Impartiality

The editorial team will be impartial when managing the work proposed for publication and it will respect the intellectual independence of the authors, who will be granted the right to reply should their work have been negatively evaluated.

Work that presents negative findings from research will not be excluded.

1.2. Confidentiality

The individuals that make up the editorial team have the obligation to maintain the confidentiality of the texts received and their content until they have been accepted for publication. Only then can they communicate their title and authorship.

Likewise, no member of the editorial team can use data, points or interpretations from unpublished work for their own research, except from with the express written consent from those that undertook the work.

1.3. Review of Work

The editorial team will ensure that the research work published has been evaluated by, at least, two specialists in the subject, and that said review process has been fair and impartial.

The method used for peer review will be double-blind (anonymity of those that have undertaken the work and the evaluation). If one of the two evaluations is negative, a third report will be requested.

The editorial team will value and thank those people that collaborate in the evaluations of the work submitted to the journal for their contribution. Likewise, it will encourage the academic authorities to recognise the peer review activities as part of the scientific process and it will disregard those who undertake low quality, incorrect and disrespectful evaluations and those that are submitted outside of the established time-frame.

1.4. Acceptance or Rejection of Work

The responsibility of accepting or rejecting work for its publication falls on the editorial team, who should base this decision on the reports received. These reports should reason their verdict on the quality of the work in terms of its relevance, originality and clarity of expression.

The editorial team can directly reject work received without seeking an external review process if it considers said work to be inappropriate due to it lacking the required level of quality, due to it not meeting the journal's scientific objectives or for presenting evidence of scientific fraud.

1.5. Retracting Papers and Notice of Irregularities

The editorial team reserves the right to retract those already published papers whose lack of credibility is determined later as a result of both involuntary errors or fraud and scientific malpractice: fabrication, manipulation or copying of data, plagiarism or self-plagiarism of texts and redundant or duplicated publication, omission of references to sources consulted, use of content without permission or justification, etc. The aim of the Guide on Retraction is to correct already published scientific productions, ensuring their integrity.

The conflict of duplicity, caused by the simultaneous publication of a paper in two journals, will be resolved by determining the date of receipt of the work of each of these.

If only part of the paper contains an error, this can be later rectified by means of an editorial note or erratum.

In the case of conflict, the journal will request explications and proof to clarify this from the author or authors, and the final decision will be taken based on these.

The journal will, without fail, publish in its printed and electronic versions, the news regarding the retraction of a determined text and in this it must mention the reasons for such measure, with the aim of distinguishing malpractice from involuntary error. Likewise, the journal will notify the coordinators from the institution that the paper's author or authors belong to of the retraction. The decision to retract a text should be adopted as soon as possible, with the aim that said erroneous work is not cited in its field of research.

Retracted papers will be kept in the electronic edition of the journals, clearly and unequivocally warning that it is a retracted paper, to distinguish it from other corrections or comments. The printed edition will clarify the retraction as soon as possible by means of a publication or communication, in the same terms as the electronic version.

As a previous stage to the definitive retraction of a paper, the journal will issue a notice of irregularity, providing the information necessary in the same terms as the case of a retraction. The notice of irregularity will be maintained for the minimum time necessary, and it will conclude with its withdrawal or with the formal retraction of the paper.

1.6. Application of the Regulating Standards

The individuals that undertake the management of the journal are responsible for the correct application of the standards that regulate the working of the editorial team and will guarantee that its members know said standards. Their functions are: to promote and represent the journal in different forums; to suggest and support possible improvements; to collect collaborations from leading subject specialists; to review and undertake a first evaluation of the work received; to write publications, reviews, comments, news and recensions, etc.; to attend editorial team meetings.

1.7. Author Standards

The publication standards of the original papers of each journal (regarding the characteristics of the work, the format, resolution of images, referencing system, etc.) will be public.

1.8. Conflicts of Interest

Conflicts of interest arise when work received by the journal is signed, among other possible situations, by a person that is part of the editorial team, someone who has a direct personal or professional relationship with the editorial team or by someone who is closely linked to the past and present research contained within the work. Anyone affected by any of these reasons will abstain from intervening in the evaluation process of the proposed paper.

2. PAPER AUTHORSHIP

The primary responsibility of the content of the texts sent to be published in the journal falls on the authors, they are thus obliged to apply an ethical standard designed to ensure the originality and due authorship attribution, among other aspects.

Inappropriate behaviour will give way to the retraction of published content, pursuant to that established in section 1.5 of this Code.

As well as its ethical evaluation, improper conduct will give way to the violation of individual or third party rights; as such the CEF Publishing House reserves the right to exercise the corresponding legal actions.

2.1. Publication Standards

The texts presented for publication will be the result of original, unpublished research. They will include the data obtained and used, as well as an objective discussion of its findings. Sufficient information will be provided so that any specialist could reproduce the research undertaken and confirm or refute the interpretations defended in the work.

The authors will suitably mention the origin of the ideas or literal phrases taken from other, already published, work in the format that the journal's standards indicate.

When images are included are part of the research, it will be conveniently explained how they were created or obtained, providing it is necessary for comprehension. In the situation that the graphic material (figures, photos, maps, etc.) is completely or partially published, the origin will be cited, providing reproduction consent if necessary.

2.2. Originality and Plagiarism

The authors will ensure that the data and findings set forth in the work are original and have not been copied, invented, distorted or manipulated.

Plagiarism in all its forms, self-plagiarism, multiple or redundant publication, as well as the inventing or manipulating of data constitute serious ethical misconduct and are considered as scientific fraud.

The authors will not send the journal original texts that are previously subject to consideration by another editor, nor will they send this original to another editor if they have not received notification of rejection or if they have not voluntarily withdrawn it. However, it is admissible to publish work that expands upon another work that has already appeared, as a brief note, communication or summary in conference proceedings, providing that the text upon which it is based is appropriately cited and that modifications involve a substantial modification of what had already been published.

Secondary publications are also acceptable if they are targeted at completely different readers; for example, if the work is published in different languages or if there is a specific version for specialists compared to another targeted at the general public. These circumstances will be specified and the original publication will be appropriately cited.

2.3. Authorship of the Work

In the case of multiple authorship, the individual responsible for the work will guarantee the recognition of all those that have significantly contributed to the concept, planning, design, execution, obtaining data, interpretation and discussion of the findings of the work; in any case, all persons that sign their name share the responsibility for the presented work. Likewise, whoever is responsible for the work and the contact person will ensure that those who sign their name have checked and approved the final version of the work and give their approval for its possible publication.

The person responsible for the work will ensure that none of the signatories responsible for the work have been omitted, and no others have been added, and that the cited co-authorship criterion have been satisfied, preventing fictitious or gifted authorship, which constitutes scientific malpractice.

Likewise, by means of acknowledgement, the contribution from other people that do not figure as signatories nor are they responsible for the final version of the work will be appropriately recognised.

If the editorial team considers it necessary, or the signatories of the work so request, in the published version the individual contribution of each signatory of the collective work will be described.

2.4. Sources of Information and Financing

In the text of the work, the publications that have influenced the research will be recognised, thus the original sources from which the information contained in the work is based will be identified and cited in the bibliography. However, irrelevant quotes or references to similar examples will not be included and mentions of now established research will not be abused in the body of scientific knowledge.

Authors will not use information obtained privately by means of conversations, correspondence or from any discussions with colleagues on the subject matter, unless with express, written permission of its source of information and that said information was received in a context of scientific advice.

It is compulsory for the publication to clearly and concisely indicate all the sources of financing granted for the study, mentioning the public or private entity responsible for said financing and the identifying code of said financing if there is one. This information will be stated in the published work.

2.5. Significant Errors in Published Work

When an author discovers a serious error in their work, they have the obligation to communicate this to those responsible for the journal as soon as possible in order to modify their work, withdraw it or publish a correction or erratum.

If the possible error is detected by any of the members of the editorial team, the authors are obliged to demonstrate that their work is correct.

The process of resolving these conflicts is described in section 1.5.

2.6. Conflicts of Interest

When there is any commercial, financial or personal link that may affect the findings and conclusions of their work, the text in the paper will be accompanied by a statement in which these circumstances are outlined, and this will figure in the published version of the paper.

3. EVALUATION OF PAPERS

The individuals that participate in the evaluation undertake an essential role in the process which guarantees the quality of the publication. The journal's editorial team aid with the making of editorial decisions, they help to improve the published work and they provide the guarantee of scientific accreditation.

3.1. Confidentiality

Whoever undertakes an evaluation will consider the work to be reviewed as a confidential document until its publication, both during the review process and afterwards.

In no case will they communicate or use information, details, points or interpretations contained in the text subject to review for their own benefit or the benefit of others, nor to harm third parties. Only in special cases can they solicit the guidance from other specialists in the subject, and the management of the journal will be informed of this situation.

3.2. Objectivity

Whoever undertakes an evaluation will objectively judge the quality of the complete work, in other words, including the information upon which the hypothesis of the work is based, the theoretic and experimental data and its interpretation, without overlooking the presentation and writing of the text.

Likewise, they will specify all their critiques and their comments will be objective and constructive. They will appropriately argue their judgements, without adopting hostile positions and respecting the intellectual independence of those who prepared the work.

Whoever undertakes an evaluation will warn whoever commissioned them with this of any relevant similarity between the work submitted for evaluation and any other published work or work in the process of evaluation in another publication that they are aware of. Likewise, they must draw attention to texts and data that are plagiarised from others or the same author or authors of the evaluated work, or regarding the suspicion or founded conviction that they are falsified, invented or manipulated.

3.3. Promptness of Response

Whoever undertakes an evaluation will act with speed and will submit their report within the agreed period and will inform the management of the journal of possible delays.

If whoever undertakes an evaluation does not consider that they are capable of judging the work in question, or they estimate that they cannot complete the task in the time period agreed, they must communicate this as soon as possible to the management of the journal.

3.4. Acknowledgment of the Sources of Information

Whoever undertakes an evaluation will check that the relevant works already published on the topic are cited. With this objective, they will review the text's bibliography, suggesting the elimination of superfluous or redundant references, or the incorporation of other, non-cited references.

3.5. Conflicts of Interest

Whoever undertakes an evaluation will reject the review of a work when they suspect or know that they are in one of the situations that may affect their judgement of said work.

Likewise, conflicts of interest may arise when the work to be evaluated is closely linked to that which the evaluator is developing at that moment or that they have already published. In these cases, if in doubt, they will reject the commissioned task and return the work to the editorial team, stating their reasons for said decision.