Ethical Guidelines

The publication of scientific articles involves several actors, including the publisher, the editors in chief, the reviewers and the authors. It is expected that each of these agents have an ethical behaviour referred to ethical principles partially inspired in those provided by the [Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Best Practice Guidelines](#).

Publisher:

The publisher provides technical assistance and support to the journal editors in the use of the web platform, and maintains the software updated and able to facilitate the submission, evaluation and publication process of scientific works. The publisher also collaborates with the editors in chief indexing the papers, providing information about the databases requirements and, so, contributing to the Journal positioning in the usual rankings. Broadly, the publisher should helps to increase the editorial quality of the Journal, contributing to its visibility, internationalization and impact.

Editorial Team:

Editors in chief ensures that manuscripts submitted are evaluated based exclusively on its intellectual content, regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, political affiliation or philosophical trend of the authors. They guarantee the confidentiality of the work, not revealing the identity of the authors to other agents except to those authorized by the publisher, the potential reviewers, the actual reviewers or the editorial board of the journal. Editors can refuse a job if it not satisfy the formal requirements or approach a subject not belonging to the scope of the journal. Editors communicate within the deadlines, once they see the referees and heard the editorial board, the acceptance or rejection of the submitted papers.

The Editorial Team reserves the right to retract published articles which are subsequently determined to be unreliable due to unintentional error or scientific fraud or misconduct: data fabrication, manipulation or appropriation, text plagiarism, self-plagiarism and redundant or duplicate publication, omission of references to sources consulted, use of content without permission or without justification, etc. If the Editorial Team detects the potential error, the authors must thendemonstrate that their work is free from error. The decision to retract is based on the need to correct the scientific record of publication and thereby ensure its integrity. In case of a conflict regarding duplicate publication caused by the simultaneous publication of the same article in two different journals, the date the manuscript was received by each journal will be used to decide which of the two versions should be retracted. If an error affects only part of a published article, it can be subsequently corrected by publishing a note from the editor, a correction or an erratum notice.If any conflict arises, the journal will ask the author or authors to provide an explanation and relevant evidence for clarification, and will reach a decision based on this information.The journal must publish the retraction notice in both its print and electronic editions, and the notice must mention the reasons for the retraction, in order to differentiate between misconduct and unintentional error.

The journal will notify the responsible authorities at the authors' institution of the retraction. The decision to retract an article should be reached as soon as possible in order to prevent the misleading article from being cited by other researchers.

Notices of retraction should:

-Be linked to the retracted article wherever possible (ie, in all online versions)

-Clearly identify the retracted article (eg, by including the title and authors in the retraction heading or citing the retracted article)

-Be clearly identified as a retraction (ie, distinct from other types of correction or comment)

-Be published promptly to minimise harmful effects

-Be freely available to all readers (ie, not behind access barriers or available only to subscribers)

-State who is retracting the article

-State the reason(s) for retraction

- Be objective, factual and avoid inflammatory language.

Reviewers:

Reviewers should refuse to refer a paper if they do not feel qualified in the subject approached or if they can not take the evaluation within the deadline suggested by the Journal. Reviewers should reject referee papers if they show a conflict of interest, for example a past or present relationship with the paper's authors or the institutions they depend. Reviewers should treat manuscripts as confidential documents, and their contents is not used in their own works.

Experts who evaluate manuscripts must judge the quality of the whole report objectively, i.e., they must consider the background information used to formulate the hypothesis of the study, the theoretical and experimental data and their interpretation. Attention must also be given to the presentation and writing/reporting of the text. They must be specific with their criticisms and provide their comments in an objective, constructive manner. They must justify their judgments with reasoning, avoid hostility and respect the authors' intellectual independence. The referee report should be objective and written in a clearly and reasoned style. Reviewers should avoid *ad hominem* references and offensive or demeaning comments; their suggestions should focus mainly on the improvement work.

Peer reviewers must notify the person who requested the review of any substantial similarities between the manuscript under review and any other published work or manuscript they are aware of and that is undergoing review for another publication. In addition, reviewers must draw attention to any text or data that have been plagiarized from different authors or self-plagiarized or duplicated from other works by the authors

of the manuscript under review. Reviewers must also alert the person who requested the review if they suspect or are aware of any text or data that have been falsified, fabricated or manipulated.

Authors:

Authors should submit papers containing original research on a clearly identifiable and not previously published subject. They should not send articles including a substantial part of others papers or books already published. Papers should be written so that they can be understood or replicated by reviewers. If ideas of others are used, they should be clearly referenced; plagiarism is an unacceptable behaviour and its detection involves cancel the submission or remove it from the platform if it was already published. In case of co-authorship, all people that significantly contribute to the paper are considered its author; each author should be able to identify which parts of the work are own and which parts are from others authors, and must maintain confidentiality of the all contents until the article is published. Simultaneous paper sending to other Journals is a sufficient condition for archiving it. If in the process of the paper edition the authors find errors or improprieties, they should communicate to the editors in chief as soon as possible and cooperate in their correction. Authors should communicate the potential conflict of interest between the paper findings and the financial support.

When authors discover a serious error in their work, they mustreport this to the person responsible for the journal or seriesas soon as possible in order to modify the work, withdraw it, retract it, or publish a correction or erratum notice.

These guidelines are consistent with the ethical code of the University of Santiago de Compostela, institution to which this Journal belongs.

http://www.usc.es/valedor/codigoetico/CodigoEtico.html

Digital preservation policy

This journal develops various processes in order to preserve permanent access to digital objects hosted on its own servers:

- Backups.
- Monitoring of the technological environment to foresee possible migrations of obsolete formats or software.
- Digital preservation metadata.

The files published on this website are available in easily reproducible formats (PDF)

Interoperability protocols

Recursos Rurais provides an interface OAI-PMH (Open Archives Initiative – Protocol for Metadata Harvesting) that allows other websites and information services to harvest the published content metadata.