

## *Ethical Code of Studia graeco-arabica*

*Studia graeco-arabica* is a peer-reviewed scientific journal whose policy is inspired by the COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) Ethical Code. See the Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors <link to url <http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines>>

### **Publisher responsibilities**

The Publisher must provide the Journal with adequate resources and the guidance of experts (for example, as far as legal and graphic advice are concerned), in order to carry out its role in the most professional way, aiming at the highest quality standard.

The Publisher must have a written agreement that defines the relationship with the owner of the Journal and/or the Editor-in-Chief. The agreement must comply with the Code of Behavior for Publishers of Scientific Journals, as worked out by COPE.

The relationship among the Editor-in-Chief, the Editorial Board and the Publisher is based on the principle of publishing independence.

### **Editors responsibilities**

The Editor-in-Chief and the Editorial Board of *Studia graeco-arabica* are the only responsible for the decision to publish the articles submitted.

Submitted articles will be sent to at least two reviewers. Final acceptance presupposes implementation of possible modifications, as required by the reviewers and under the SGA Editors' supervision.

The SGA Editors and Editorial Board must evaluate each submitted paper in compliance with the Journal's policy, i.e. exclusively on the basis of its scientific content, without discrimination of race, sex, gender, creed, ethnic origin, citizenship, or the scientific, academic and political position of the Authors.

If the SGA Editors and Editorial Board notice (or receive notifications on) mistakes or inaccuracies, conflict of interest or plagiarism in a published article, they will immediately warn the Author and the Publisher and will undertake the necessary actions to clear up the matter. If necessary, they will withdraw the article or publish a recantation.

### **Authors responsibilities**

#### *Stylesheet*

Authors must follow the Guidelines for Authors to be downloaded from the SGA's web site.

#### *No multiple submissions*

Authors must explicitly state that their work is original in all its parts and that the submitted paper has not been previously published, nor submitted to other journals until the entire evaluation process is completed. Since no paper gets published without significant revision, earlier dissemination in conference proceedings or working papers does not preclude consideration for publication, but Authors are expected to fully disclose any strictly-related publications, so that the overlap can be evaluated by the SGA Editors.

#### *Authorship*

Authorship must be correctly attributed; all those who gave a substantial contribution to the design, organization, and accomplishment of the research the article is based on, must be indicated as Co-Authors. The respective roles of each should be described in a footnote. The statement that all authors have approved the final version should be included in the disclosure.

*Conflicts of interest and financing*

Authors, under their own responsibility, must avoid any conflict of interest affecting the results obtained or the interpretations suggested. Suggestions by Authors not to be evaluated by a specific scholar, due to possible conflict of interest, are taken into consideration by the SGA Editors. Authors should indicate any financing agency or the project the article stems from.

*Quotations*

Authors must see to it that all works consulted be properly quoted. If works or words of others are used, they have to be properly paraphrased or duly quoted. Citations between “double quotes” must reproduce the exact wording of the source; under their own responsibility, Authors should carefully refrain from disguising a restyling of the source’s wording, as though it was the original formulation.

*Ethical Committee*

Whenever required, the research protocols must be authorized in advance by the relevant Ethical Committee. The investigation must be carried out according to ethical rules specified in the Helsinki declaration.

*Emendations*

When Authors notice a mistake or an inaccuracy in their own article, they must immediately warn the SGA Editors, providing all the information needed to make the due adjustments.

### **Reviewers responsibilities**

*Goal*

By means of the peer-review procedure, Reviewers assist the SGA Editors and Editorial Board in taking decisions on the articles submitted. They are expected to suggest the Authors possible adjustments aimed at improving their contribution.

*Timing and conflicts of interest*

If a reviewer does not feel up to the task, or if she/he is unable to read the work within the agreed schedule, she/he should warn the SGA Editors. Reviewers must not accept articles for which there is a conflict of interest due to previous contributions or to competition with a disclosed author (or with an author they believe to have identified).

*Confidentiality*

The content of the reviewed work must be considered confidential and must not be used without explicit authorization by the author, to be contacted via the Editor-in-Chief. Any confidential information obtained during the peer-review process should not be used for other purposes.

*Collaborative attitude*

Reviewers should see themselves not as adversaries but as advocates for the field. Any comment must be done in a collaborative way and from an objective point of view. Reviewers should clearly motivate their comments, and keep in mind the Golden Rule of Reviewing: “Review for others as you would have others review for you”.

*Plagiarism*

Reviewers should report any similarity or overlapping of the work under analysis with other works known to them.