

Ethical Code

“Trópos. Rivista di Ermeneutica e Critica filosofica”

Trópos. Journal of Hermeneutics and Philosophical Criticism is a double blind peer-reviewed philosophical journal that observes an ethical code and best practices protocol inspired by the COPE (Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors):

1. Ethical code and obligations for chief editors, members of the editorial staff, members of the editorial committee, and editors of single volumes.

1.1 Selection of texts for publication

All members of the editorial staff on Trópos are involved in the decision whether to publish a text or not. The chief editor has the final responsibility of said decision. Taking this decision, the editorial staff must always consult either referees chosen among experts within a relevant field, the members of the scientific committee, or relevant external scholars.

1.2 Impartiality

The articles for publication are selected on the basis of content and without any discrimination in regard to the author’s race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, ethnicity, citizenship, political orientation, or academic position.

1.3 Confidentiality

Members of the editorial staff and other participants in the editorial process are obliged not to reveal any information about the articles except to the authors, the referees, and the editor in chief. In any case, the referees will not have any access to the identity of the author of the article assigned to him/her until after publication.

1.4 Conflicts of interests and dissemination

All members of the editorial staff commit themselves not to make use in their own research of the contents of any article that has been proposed for publication, unless in case of an explicit and written authorization by the author.

2. Ethical code and best practice for referees

2.1 Editorial guidelines

The double blind peer-review is a procedure aimed at aiding the members of the editorial staff to decide between the proposed articles and if need be to suggest possible corrections – also to the author - that would improve the manuscript for a possible publication.

2.2 Competence and timeliness

A referee that feels inadequately qualified to judge an article or knows he/she cannot meet the proposed deadline for the review is obliged to inform the editor(-s) of the relevant volume as quickly as possible.

2.3 Confidentiality

Any text consigned to a referee is confidential and should not be discussed with other people without the explicit authorization by the editor in chief or by one or more members of the editorial staff.

2.4 Objectivity and impartiality

The peer review should be conducted in the most objective manner possible. The referees are obliged to explain their judgments clearly and adequately and to use well-documented citations when considered necessary. The referee is under no circumstances entitled to offend the author personally.

2.5 Originality and plagiarism

The referee must inform the editor in chief or the editor(-s) of the relevant volume in case of significant similarities or overlaps between the refereed text and other texts that the referee is acquainted with.

2.6 Conflicts of interests and dissemination

Information received during the peer-review process is confidential and may not be used for private ends. The referee is required to decline reviewing a text that may conflict with his/her own interests such as in the case of competition, collaboration, or any other kind of relation to the author.

3. Ethical code and best practices for the authors

3.1 Originality and plagiarism

The author is obliged to guarantee the originality of all parts of his/her text and to indicate explicitly whenever having paraphrased and/or directly cited the work of another.

3.2 Multiple, repetitive and/or competing publications

The author is not to submit an article that has already been published by another journal or to submit the same article to two or more journals at the same time. This is considered an improper and unacceptable behavior. The author may republish an article in another publication, also in a different version or in a different language: in this case explicit reference must be made to its first publication in "Tropos" .

3.3 References to sources

The author must always make correct references to sources and to other contributions quoted in his/her text.

3.4 Authorship

The authorship must be correctly accredited and include coauthors that have contributed significantly to the idea, organization, realization, and re-elaboration of the research that is presented in the article. If the participation of other people has contributed significantly to parts of the research, then this must be explicitly indicated. In case of manuscripts written by more people, the author who submits the text must confirm that the names of all coauthors are correctly stated and that he/she has the coauthors' approval of the final version of the text as well as to its publication.

3.5 Errors in a published article

Whenever an author should discover an error or serious inaccuracy in his/her article, the author is obliged to contact the editorial staff of the journal immediately and indicate precisely, in form of an erratum, the corrections required. This information may be included in volumes succeeding the one in which the article in question is published.