



## **ERDAL Ethical Code**

The European Review of Digital Administration & Law is an international periodical publication based on the principle of peer review, which adopts the following

### **ETHICAL CODE**

#### **Art. 1**

##### **Decisions on the publication of articles and non-discrimination**

1. The editors after consulting, where appropriate, one or more members of the scientific committee, are responsible for the choice of the articles to be published following the positive outcome of the peer review, and base this choice exclusively on the basis of criteria of scientific relevance, methodological strictness, originality, clarity of presentation and consistency with the thematic areas of the Review.
2. The publication is open to anyone who wants to contribute. In any case, without exception, the choice of articles to be published is made without any discrimination based on ethnicity, gender, religious or philosophical conviction, citizenship, sexual orientation, age and political orientation of the authors.

#### **Art. 2**

##### **Relations between directors and authors**

1. When the editors receive articles proposed for publication from the authors, they are required to promptly provide feedback no later than the time necessary to carefully examine the papers. They have to provide promptly a response as to whether it was considered or not to publish the article, in any case subject to the positive outcome of the peer review process.



2. The editors may propose changes or corrections to the articles before they are subjected to the peer review process only if these changes are intended to ensure that the papers better approximate the criteria listed in Article 1.
3. After the peer review process the editors may require authors to make changes and corrections to their articles only according to what has been required by anonymous reviewers.
4. The editors may ask the authors for editorial changes to their articles which do not involve changes to their content at any stage of the publication process, only if they are consistent with the editorial criteria of the review, or they can make them directly.

### **Art. 3 Need for peer review**

1. The editors, after having viewed a contribution and having deemed it valid according to Article 1, will submit it to anonymous review, under blind review conditions, by one or more persons of proven scientific competence in the area of relevance of the article.
2. The entire peer review procedure is carried out according to the only criteria of the pursuit of quality and scientific interest of the papers in full guarantee of anonymity, confidentiality, impartiality and the absence of any conflict of interest on the part of all the people who participate in it for any reason.
3. The editors, following the anonymous review process, strictly adhere to it regardless of the outcome, and undertake to ensure that, in the event of a request for changes by the reviewers, the author creates a new draft of the article which shows that it has considered the suggestions that he received.
4. The entire anonymous review process must take place no later than the time necessary for the reviewers to properly examine the papers, taking into account their other concomitant commitments.



**Art. 4**  
**Duties of the Authors**

1. The author who submits an article to the Review guarantees, assuming all responsibility, that the contribution fully complies with the national and international regulations about copyright, and that all the bibliographic sources used for the publication have been cited correctly.
2. The author guarantees that the authorship of the work is entirely his own, it being understood that it is always possible to present a work with multiple authors, with the same guarantee of the authorship of the authors only.
3. The author must guarantee the possibility to publish their paper as unpublished, or that its publication in the Review does not conflict with commitments previously undertaken by them.
4. The author who submits an article implicitly declares that there is no type of conflict of interest that has affected the contents of that work.

**Art. 5**  
**Shared responsibility**

1. All those among the editors, the associated editors, the members of the scientific committee, the members of the editorial board and the reviewers, who read the article during the publication process, are required to report if they recognize in the paper any indication of violation of copyright, or an undeclared conflict of interest, or an element of the content in which is identified any kind of violation of civil and criminal law. In that case, the editors will cancel the publication of the article at any time during the editorial process.