

Good editorial practice guidelines for the *Boletín del Museo del Prado**

These *Good publication practice guidelines* are intended to serve as a code of conduct for all stakeholders in the academic management and publication of research results in the *Boletín del Museo del Prado*.

1 Editorial Teams

The Editor in Chief, Editorial Assistant and Editorial Board are responsible for the content that is published, and must therefore ensure its scientific quality, avoid misconduct in the publication of research results, and ensure that submitted manuscripts are published within a reasonable period.

In light of these responsibilities, the following principles should be observed:

1.1 Impartiality

The Editorial Team must handle all submitted manuscripts in an impartial manner, and must respect the intellectual independence of all authors, who must be given the right of reply if they receive a negative review. Manuscripts that report negative research results should not be excluded from consideration.

1.2 Confidentiality

Members of the Editorial Team are required to ensure the confidentiality of all manuscripts received and of their content until they have been accepted for publication. Only then may the title and authors of the article be communicated. In addition, no member of an Editorial Team may use data, lines of reasoning or interpretations in unpublished manuscripts for his or her own research, except with the authors' express written consent.

1.3 Manuscript review

The Editorial Team must ensure that all published research articles have been evaluated by at least two subject specialists, and that the review process has been fair and impartial.

The method of peer review will be the *double blind* (in which both authors and reviewers are anonymous, as described in the instructions for the presentation of texts). When one of the two reviews is negative, a third review will be requested.

The Editorial Team must ensure that all submitted manuscripts are original and unpublished, and that during the peer review process due precautions are taken to verify originality and to detect plagiarism, self-plagiarism and redundant publication defined as the complete copy, partial copy or altered copy of work published by the same author in such a way as to make the work appear different. Editorial Team must also take appropriate measures to detect data falsification or manipulation. In addition, contents that have undergone peer review must be clearly identified.

The Editorial Teams must recognize the value of and acknowledge the input of all those involved in the review of manuscripts submitted to the journal or series.

1.4 Manuscript acceptance or rejection

Responsibility for accepting or rejecting manuscripts for publication rests with the Editorial Teams, which should base their decision on the reports received about the manuscript. The reviewers should base their decision on the quality of the manuscript in terms of its relevance, novelty and clarity of writing and reporting.

The Editorial Team may reject a submitted manuscript without external review if the members believe it to be unsuitable for the journal because it does not reach an acceptable level of quality, is outside the scientific aims and scope of the journal or series, or contains evidence of scientific fraud.

1.5 Journal article retraction and expression of concern

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. 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 *Boletín* 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 *Boletín* 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.

Retracted articles will remain available in the electronic edition of the *Boletín*, and will be identified clearly and unambiguously as retracted in order to distinguish retractions from other corrections or commentaries. In the print edition, retractions will be reported as promptly as possible as an editorial or note from the editor with the same wording as in the electronic edition.

Prior to final retraction, the *Boletín* may issue an expression of concern in which the necessary information is provided with the same wording as used for a retraction. The expression of concern will be used for as brief a period as possible and will be withdrawn or superseded, if appropriate, by formal retraction of the article.

1.6 Guidelines for authors

The instructions for manuscript preparation for the *Boletín* (text length, figure preparation, reference formats, etc.) must be publicly available.

1.7 Conflict of interest

Among other situations, conflict of interest arises when an author of a manuscript submitted to the *Boletín* is a member of the Editorial Team, has a direct personal or professional relationship, or is closely related with previous or current research carried out by a member of the Editorial Team. Specifically, members of the Editorial Team should recuse themselves from participation in handling the manuscript when they are involved in any of the situations or similar situations described below, in relation with an author of the manuscript:

- Family relationship
- Manifest personal friendship or animosity
- Belonging to the same research group
- Serving presently or having served as PhD degree advisor or co-advisor within the previous 10 years
- Obtaining a PhD degree with an author as advisor or co-advisor within the previous 10 years
- Collaborating presently or within the previous 5 years in publications or patents
- Collaborating in other economic or scientific-technological activities
- Having a contractual relationship or sharing national or international research funding from public or private entities or any other type of entity within the previous 3 years

The Editorial Team must also refrain from choosing reviewers who are or who may be involved in any of these situations.

2 Authorship

The authors of works submitted for publication are primarily responsible for the content, and are thus obligated to follow ethical guidelines intended to ensure, among other considerations, that the work is original and that authorship has been attributed appropriately. Inappropriate behavior may lead to the retraction of published

2.1 Submission guidelines

- Text in a document in double-spaced Word format (Times New Roman 12), with numbered pages and footnotes. The text must be preceded exclusively by the title in the original language and in English.
- Word document with information about the author: title of the work, name of the author or authors, email, institutional affiliation, a short curriculum (80-100 words) and the date of mailing to the journal. The author's email address and resume will be published along with the article. To guarantee the author's anonymity and the blind peer review process, his name (or mention that allows him to be identified) can not appear anywhere else (neither in the text, nor in the notes, nor in the summary).
- Word document with a summary in the language of the text and in English (from 100-120 words for articles and 60-80 words for notes) and the key words (from 3 to 6 approx.) In Spanish and English.
- Word document with a list of illustrative images with their photo captions, correctly numbered.
- Low resolution images in jpg or tiff format correctly numbered and identified following the order of the illustrative list.
- If the article or the news is based on the publication and transcription of unpublished documents, the origin of said documents must be specified and,

whenever possible, provide photocopies of the originals of adequate quality to facilitate the editing work.

2.2 Originality and plagiarism

The texts can be presented throughout the year and will be unpublished and original. They must not have been submitted, even partially, to the approval of another publication neither in Spanish nor in any other foreign language. There is an Authorship Declaration form that must be completed and signed by all authors.

2.3 Authorship of manuscripts

If the manuscript has more than one author, the author responsible for the work must ensure appropriate recognition of all persons who contributed significantly to the conception, planning, design and performance of the study, to obtaining the data, and to the interpretation and discussion of the results. All persons named as authors share responsibility for the work reported in the manuscript. Likewise, the person responsible for the work must ensure that all persons named as authors have reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript and have agreed to its possible publication.

The person responsible for the work must ensure that no person responsible for the manuscript and who meets the criteria noted above for scientific authorship has been omitted from the list of authors. This will avoid *ghost authorship* and *gift authorship*, which constitute scientific misconduct.

In addition, an acknowledgment must be included in the article to note the contributions of other collaborators who are not authors and are not responsible for the final version of the manuscript.

2.4 Sources of information and funding

All publications that have influenced the research should be acknowledged in the manuscript; accordingly, all original sources upon which information in the manuscript is based should be identified and cited in the reference list. However, references that are not relevant to the research or that refer to similar examples should not be included, and overreliance on references to research that forms part of the common body of scientific knowledge should be avoided.

Authors should not use information obtained privately through conversations, correspondence or informal discussions with colleagues, unless they have obtained explicit written permission from the source of the information, and the information was provided in the context of a scientific consultation.

The published work must indicate, clearly and concisely, all sources of funding awarded for the study, and must note the public or private entity that provided the funding, and the code number assigned to each source of funding, if appropriate. This information will appear in the published work.

2.5 Significant errors in published works

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

If the Editorial Team detects the potential error, the authors must then demonstrate that their work is free from error.

2.6 Conflict of interest

If any commercial, financial or personal relationship exists that might influence the results and conclusions of the work, a declaration explaining these circumstances must be provided at the time of submission.

3 Reviewers

External experts who participate in manuscript review play an essential role in the process that guarantees the quality of published material. They assist the Editorial Team in making their decisions, help to improve the submitted works, and provide a warranty of scientific merit.

3.1 Confidentiality

Peer reviewers must consider all manuscripts as confidential documents both during and after the peer review process, until after they are published.

Under no circumstances should the reviewer divulge or use any information, details, lines of reasoning or interpretations in the material to be reviewed for his or her own benefit or that of any other persons, or with the intent to harm any third parties. Only under exceptional circumstances may the reviewer obtain advice from other specialists in the subject of the manuscript, and the reviewer must inform the Editorial Assistant of the *Boletín* of this measure.

3.2 Objectivity

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.

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.

3.3 Timely response

Peer reviewers must act promptly and provide their report by the agreed deadline, and must notify the Editor's office of possible delays.

In addition, they must notify the Editorial Assistant as soon as possible if they do not feel qualified to evaluate the manuscript or if they are unable to complete their review by the agreed deadline.

3.4 Acknowledgment of sources of information

Peer reviewers must verify that previously published studies relevant to the topic have been cited. To do so they must review the literature cited in the manuscript with a view to suggesting the removal of superfluous or redundant references, or the addition of references that were not cited.

3.5 Conflict of interest

Peer reviewers must decline to review when they suspect or are aware that they may be influenced by any of the situations potentially able to affect their judgment of the work, as described above in section 1.7 of these Guidelines.

Conflict of interest may also arise when the manuscript is closely related with work the reviewer is currently performing or has previously published. In such cases, and if in doubt, the reviewer should decline to review the manuscript and return it to the Editorial Team, with an explanation of the reasons for his or her decision.

* This guide is based on the *Guide of good practices of the periodic and unitary publications of the State Agency Superior Council of Scientific Investigations (CSIC)*