



CODE OF ETHICS  
*Syzetesis – Rivista di filosofia*

EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES

1. Responsibility and Role of the Journal's Bodies

Articles are subjected to a double-blind peer review process after being evaluated by the Editors, who reject an article if they do not consider it adequate to the Journal's scientific standards (desk rejection). The Scientific Committee ensures the Journal's scientific direction. The Editorial Board supports the Editors in the editorial process. Reviewers, chosen by the Editors among renowned experts, including members of the Scientific Committee, are required to protect the confidentiality of the Authors' materials and formally declare any conflicts of interest regarding the article. The Editors consider substantiated misconduct accusations against Reviewers, inviting them to respond. If an undeclared conflict of interest or inappropriate conduct by the Reviewer is found, the review is cancelled. The Editors are not involved in decisions on contributions in which they have a conflict of interest.

2. Editorial Independence and Integrity

2.1 Independence of Editorial Decisions from Commercial Interests

The Journal's Editors are responsible for deciding whether or not to publish the proposed contributions. The Journal publishes all con-

tributions free of charge and in open access and has no commercial interests; therefore, editorial processes and decisions are independent of any commercial considerations.

## 2.2 Editors' Relationship with the Journal

The Editors work voluntarily. The Journal is published by [Syzetesis – Philosophical Association](#), which does not interfere with the Editors' freedom of choice and activities as long as they are consistent with the Journal's scientific mission.

## 3. Confidentiality

### 3.1 Authors' Materials

Reviewers are chosen by the Editors, who commit to protecting the confidentiality of the authors' materials and remind reviewers to do the same. Proposed contributions are never shared with editors of other journals. The Editors do not provide information on the proposal's status to anyone other than the author. Only in case of investigation into misconduct may it be necessary to make the material available to third parties (see below).

### 3.2 Reviewers

The Journal selects contributions for publication through a double-blind peer-review process. Therefore, the identity of reviewers is always kept hidden unless alleged or suspected misconduct forces the Journal to reveal the name to third parties (see below).

## GENERAL EDITORIAL POLICIES

## 4. Transparency and Publication Ethics

The Journal aims to ensure maximum transparency and complete

and honest reporting of its work to authors, readers, reviewers, and all other involved parties.

#### 4.1 Authorship and Responsibility

All authors of works published in the Journal take responsibility for their conduct and the validity of their research and writings. The Journal publishes articles that pass peer review free of charge and open access. The authors are informed and formally accept that all content published in the Journal is freely accessible, downloadable, and reproducible within the limits established by the [Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0](#) licence. If disputes arise over the authorship of a published work, these are resolved in appropriate institutional settings. The Editors then act accordingly based on the decisions of these institutions, for example, correcting the authorship of published works if the Author agrees to keep the work available in the Journal.

#### 4.2 Authors' Editorial Ethics

The Editors ensure that all published articles contribute innovatively to their field. They discourage “salami publications” (i.e., the publication of the minimum publishable portion of a study), avoid duplication of a publication, and encourage authors to place their contribution in the context of existing research (for example, to explain why this work was necessary, what it adds, or why replication of previous research was required).

### 5. Response to Criticism and Observations

The Journal welcomes and encourages criticism and debate.

#### 5.1 Integrity of Published Contributions – Suspected Misconduct

If readers, reviewers, or other parties raise serious doubts about an author's conduct regarding the ethical aspects of research practices, the Editors contact the authors and allow them to respond to these observations. If the response is deemed unsatisfactory, the Editors, who are also using anti-plagiarism control systems, may decide to

withdraw the article and announce it both in the next issue of the Journal and on the Journal's website. Suppose that a case of misconduct by an author is found to be so severe as to constitute a criminal offence (e.g., copyright infringement). In that case, the Editors bring the case to appropriate institutional settings.

## 5.2 Scientific Debate and Error Correction

Syzetesis welcomes readers' criticisms of published works and considers their publication to promote scientific debate, subjecting them to the normal peer review editorial process. Authors of criticised works will be allowed to respond to further promote debate, constantly subjecting the reply to the normal peer review process. Suppose errors or inaccuracies emerge that require corrections to published articles, the Journal promptly announces them on the Journal's website, publishing an "errata corrige" file on the page where the article was initially published.

## 6. Ensuring a Fair and Adequate Peer Review Process

The Editors organise and use peer review. The peer review processes are clearly explained on the information page for authors on the Journal's website, where it is also indicated which parts of the Journal are subject to peer review.

### 6.1 Review Decisions

The Editors may reject an article without peer review if it is deemed poor quality or unsuitable for the Journal's readers (desk rejection). This decision is made fairly and impartially, and the criteria are explicit to the author. The decision not to accept a document is based solely on its content.

### 6.2 Interaction with Reviewers

The Editors use appropriate reviewers for contributions considered interesting for publication, selecting knowledgeable individuals and avoiding those with conflicts of interest. The Editors ensure that reviews are received promptly. Reviewers are informed of what is ex-

pected of them and are notified of any changes in editorial policies. Reviewers are asked to consider the ethical aspects of research and publication (i.e., whether they believe the research was conducted ethically or if they have suspicions of plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, or redundant publication). The Editors require reviewers to formally declare conflicts of interest and ask for information as soon as possible about such conflicts to decide on the possibility of an impartial review. The presence of conflicts of interest can disqualify a peer review.

The Editors emphasise the confidentiality of the material for reviewers.

### 6.3 Reviewer Misconduct

The Editors consider substantiated misconduct accusations against Reviewers and invite them to respond. If the response is deemed unsatisfactory and inappropriate conduct by the Reviewer is found, such as a violation of confidentiality, failure to declare conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial), inappropriate use of confidential material, or delay in review for competitive advantage, the review is cancelled. Accusations of serious misconduct by reviewers, such as plagiarism, are brought to appropriate institutional settings.

### 6.4 Interaction with Authors

The Journal's Editors clarify to the authors that the reviewer's role is to provide recommendations on acceptance or rejection. The Editors' correspondence is usually with the corresponding author, who is responsible for involving co-authors at all stages. The Editors communicate with all authors during the proposal submission and final acceptance phase to ensure that all authors are aware of the submission and have approved the publication. Typically, the Editors transmit all the comments of the reviewers in their entirety. However, in exceptional cases, excluding parts of a review may be necessary if, for example, it contains defamatory or offensive remarks.

The Editors ensure that such editorial discretion is not misused to suppress uncomfortable comments. If there are good reasons to involve additional reviewers late in the process, this is communicated to the authors. The final editorial decision and its reasons are communicated to authors and reviewers. If an article is rejected, the Editors may accept the authors' requests for reconsideration. However, the Editors are not obliged to change their decision.

## 7. Editorial Decision-Making Process

The Editors ensure that publication decisions are as fair and impartial as possible.

### 7.1 Editorial Processes

All editorial processes are outlined in the information for authors on the Journal's website. It indicates what is expected of authors, what types of articles are published, and how the Journal manages them. All Editors are familiar with the Journal's policies, vision, and scope. The final responsibility for all decisions rests with the Editors.

### 7.2 Editorial Conflicts of Interest

The Editors are not involved in decisions on contributions in which they have a conflict of interest.

[This code of ethics is inspired by and conforms to the guidelines developed by [COPE – Committee on Publication Ethics](#)].