



Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A
– Ethics statement –

Contents

- 1. Operation of the editorial process**
- 2. General responsibilities: Conflict of interest**
- 3. Publication and authorship**
 - 3.1. Authorship**
 - 3.2. Plagiarism and Self-plagiarism**
 - 3.3. Data**
 - 3.4. References**
 - 3.5. Retraction and Emendation**
- 4. Peer review / responsibility for and commitments of the reviewers**
 - 4.1. Goal**
 - 4.2. Scientific standards**
 - 4.3. Objectivity**
 - 4.4. Promptness**
 - 4.5. Confidentiality**
- 5. Editorial responsibilities**
 - 5.1. Accountability**
 - 5.2. Responsibility on quality**
 - 5.3. Confidentiality**
 - 5.4. Feedback and improvement**
 - 5.5. Corrections and retractions**
- 6. Publishing ethics issues**
- 7. Unethical Behaviour**
- 8. Research Involving the Use of Animals and Plants – Public Charges**
- 9. Sex and Gender in Research**



1. Operation of the editorial process

For the editorial production process, the journal relies on three distinct bodies: the Editor in Chief, the Editorial Board, coordinated by the Editor Serie A, and the Scientific Committee.

The Editor in Chief is responsible for the correct execution of the entire editorial process and the transparency of the publication methods. He/she ensures that all the actors involved in the editorial process work in compliance with their obligations. The Editor Serie A is responsible for the initial evaluation of the proposals, which are judged on the basis of the completeness of the materials provided, the scientific integrity and the compatibility with the scientific objectives of the journal. Only the Editor Serie A can decide whether to start the review process, to skip it (in very rare cases, due to the exceptional prestige of the author) or to reject the proposal *ex officio*. He/she interfaces with the Editorial Board for the management of a transparent review process, the linguistic adequacy of the contributions and their compliance with the editorial standards of the journal. Members of the Editorial Board may not be involved in the peer review process as reviewers, except in rare cases where such members are considered the leading experts on a given topic. In such cases, which the Editor in Chief and the Editorial Board undertake to limit, the Editor Serie A will manage communication with the author, protecting his/her identity and that of the reviewer. The Scientific Committee has the sole function of guaranteeing the scientific prestige of the journal. Its members are never involved in the editorial production process of the issues. In the event that they are asked to act as anonymous reviewers, the editorial committee exercises its function as in other cases.

The journal aims to guarantee authors, readers, reviewers and all other parties involved maximum transparency and a correct policy in the management of the editorial process and any conflicts that may arise, based on the COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) guidelines (<https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>).

2. General responsibilities: Conflict of interest

Any actual or potential conflicts of interest from everyone involved in the publication process (Publisher, Editor-in-chief, Editor, Editorial Board members, Reviewers, Authors) must be disclosed – including any financial, personal, or other relationships with other people or organizations within three years of beginning the submitted work that could inappropriately influence their work. Examples of potential conflicts of interest include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. If there is no conflict of interest this should be stated. This should be listed at the end of the text, after any acknowledgments, and just before the Reference list, under the subheading “Conflict of interest statement”.

3. Publication and authorship

3.1. Authorship



All authors should make substantial contributions to all the following: (1) the conception and design of the study, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, (2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, (3) final approval of the version to be submitted. Authorship must be correctly attributed; all those who have given 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 co-author should be described in a footnote when requested by Authors. The statement that all authors have approved the final version should be included in the disclosure.

All published materials are released under a Creative Commons 4.0: CC-BY license. They can be shared and adapted provided appropriate credit is given for any purpose, even commercially. For all published articles, the Authors transfer copyright and publishing rights to the journal.

3.2. Plagiarism and self-plagiarism

Authors must clearly state that the submission has not been previously published, nor is it before another journal for consideration (or a thought explanation has been provided before the submission process). Since no proposal 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 publication/dissemination of the material in other closely related publications, so that the overlap can be evaluated by the reviewer.

A plagiarism detection software (Turnitin Originality Check) is also used by the Editorial Board to detect text-recycling and uncited sources.

3.3. Data

Authors shall provide access to data associated with their research, on reasonable request. Authors are requested to maintain records of the data and deposit them if allowed.

3.4. References

Authors shall provide references according to the guidelines reported in the “Manuscript preparation” section.

3.5. Retraction and Emendation

Authors will promptly notify the journal Editor of any mistake or error in their publication, both during the review process and after publication. A corrigendum or an addendum may be published in forthcoming issues. Authors acknowledge that the Publisher may retract the paper in case of unethical behaviors (plagiarism, self-plagiarism, fraudulent data, etc.).

4. Peer review: responsibility for and commitments of the reviewers

4.1. Operation of peer review procedure



By means of the peer-review procedure, reviewers assist the Editor-in-chief and the Scientific Committee in taking decisions on the papers submitted. They are expected to offer the Authors suggestions as to possible adjustments aimed at improving their submission.

The editor will invite at least two experts in the field to a single-blind peer-review of the manuscript. The outcome of the peer-reviewed process is binding. Should the reviewers' opinions be incompatible, the editor may decide whether to seek a third review or to reach a decision directly.

Upon receiving reviewer reports, the Editor decides whether to pursue publication of the manuscript further (either requesting the author revise and resubmit their manuscript, accepting, or rejecting it). The decision letter sent to the author will be accompanied by the expert reviewers' reports within 12 weeks from the submission date. The judgment of the reviewers is anonymous and unappealable. Articles cannot, for any reason, be submitted by third parties, but must be sent to the editorial office by the Corresponding Author. Each author, when submitting a contribution, agrees not to submit it to other journals before knowing the outcome of the review process. The rule also applies to articles not submitted to a double-blind peer-reviewed section (e.g. obituaries, news and book reviews, whose acceptance or rejection is decided solely by the editorial board). The editor may request contributions from reputable experts regarding a specific topic: such contributions are called "invited articles," and this eventuality will be clearly intelligible at the time of publication.

Obvious typos as such and minor nonconformities to editorial standards will be corrected by the editorial staff. Articles that do not comply with the citation system and bibliographic notes will be rejected.

4.2. Scientific standards

The reviewers are provided with guidelines by the Editor in collaboration with the Editorial Board. Particular attention must be paid to individuating unethical behavior, misuse or misinterpretation of sources or data, and other malpractices such as redundant publication and plagiarism. The reviewers must confidentially notify the Editor in chief of any substantial resemblance to other scientific papers (essay, submitted paper, chapter in a book, book, review article, etc...). In any case, reviewers are required to disclose any potential competing interests before agreeing to review a submission.

4.3. Objectivity

Reviewers are requested to provide an objective judgment. An evaluation grid is provided as a template to support them in the review, but they can integrate the form with any other information or suggestion that may be relevant. 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".

The journal Editor will give serious and careful consideration to suggestions of cases in which, due to possible conflict of interest, an Author's work should not be reviewed by a specific scholar.

In addition, they are requested to make explicit reference either to funding organization (s) or research programs.

4.4. Promptness



Reviewers should inform the Editor-in-chief if circumstances arise that prevent from submitting a timely review. Reviewers must not accept articles for which there is a conflict of interest due to previous contributions or to a competition with an author.

4.5. Confidentiality

Peer reviewers' identities are protected. On their turn, they are committed to handle submitted material in confidence. Any confidential information obtained during the peer review process should not be used for other purposes.

5. Editorial responsibilities

5.1. Accountability of the Editor

The Editor is aware to be accountable for everything published in “Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A”. Therefore, he/she has processes in place to assure the quality of the material to be published and he/she ensures that peer review of articles is fair, unbiased, and timely and that all papers have been reviewed by suitably qualified reviewers. However, he/she actively seeks the views of authors, readers, reviewers, and scientific and editorial board members about ways of improving peer review and publishing processes for “Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A”.

5.2. Responsibility on quality

The decision to accept or reject a paper for publication is based on the paper's importance, originality and clarity, and the study's validity and its relevance to the remit of “Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A”. In order to guarantee the quality of the published papers, the Editor always encourages reviewers to provide detailed comments to motivate their decisions. These comments are anonymously sent to the author of the paper. The comments will help in the decision of the outcome of the paper and will help justify this decision for the author. Moreover, if the paper is accepted, the comments should guide the author in making revisions for a final manuscript.

5.3. Confidentiality

In any case, all material submitted to “Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A” remains confidential while under review. Reviewers' identities will be protected and kept confidential as well. They may be made public in their entirety if requested by the reviewers themselves to comply with transparency requirements.

5.4. Feedback and improvement

The Editorial Board is consulted periodically to gauge his opinions about the running of “Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A”, informing it of any changes to the journal policies and identifying future challenges.



5.5. Corrections and retractions

The Editorial board will promote and support the publication of corrections and will adopt any reasonable measure to respond to ethical guidelines infringement. Plagiarism and self-plagiarism may lead to retraction.

Undisclosed conflict of interest may lead to retraction, expression of concern, or issue of correction, depending on how much the conflict of interest has altered the research and findings as well as the review process. In other cases, a change of authorship may be issued.

6. Publishing ethics issues

“Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A” is committed to protect intellectual property and copyright, and respect privacy and personal data (especially for authors and peer reviewers). “Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A” is alert to intellectual property issues and works with its Editor-in-chief to handle potential violations of intellectual property laws and conventions. Moreover, the Editor-in-chief, the Editor and Peer Reviewers work together to foster editorial independence, and to guarantee transparency and integrity in peer-review process, particularly with respect to conflicts of interest. “Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A” precludes business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards, and is willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies when needed.

7. Unethical Behaviour

Misconduct may be brought to the attention of the Editor-in-chief by anyone, at any time. Sufficient information or evidence must be provided in order to initiate and support investigation. Anonymous or vague allegations will not be considered. Confidential investigation may take place upon initial decision of the Editor-in-chief. If, in the light of a full documentary evidence, a fraudulent conduct is ascertained, the outcome may vary, depending on the severity of the violation: minor infringements and honest errors might have minor consequences (the author is informed of his/her misunderstanding of “Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A”’s Ethic Guidelines); serious breaches might be notified with more formal letters, with public expressions of concern (with or without details on misconduct), with retraction or withdrawal of the publication. An embargo on any form of participation to the journal may be issued. Particularly severe infringements (such as, but not limited to, fraudulence, calumny, forge) may be brought before the Italian law by the Editor-in-chief.

8. Research Involving the Use of Animals and Plants – Public Charges

The papers published in the “Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali – Serie A” do not involve living animals and plants.

9. Sex and Gender in Research

We encourage our authors to follow the [‘Sex and Gender Equity in Research – SAGER – guidelines’](#) and to include sex and gender considerations where relevant. Authors should use the terms sex (biological attribute) and gender (shaped by social and cultural circumstances) carefully in order to avoid confusing both terms. Article titles and/or abstracts should indicate clearly what sex(es) the



study applies to. Authors should also describe in the background, whether sex and/or gender differences may be expected; report how sex and/or gender were accounted for in the design of the study; provide disaggregated data by sex and/or gender, where appropriate; and discuss respective results. If a sex and/or gender analysis was not conducted, the rationale should be given in the Discussion. We suggest that our authors consult the full [guidelines](#) before submission.