PUCP
REVISTA DE PSICOLOGÍA
ISSN: 0254-9247, e-ISSN: 2223-3733

REVISTA DE PSICOLOGÍA

PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DEL PERÚ

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES FOR PUBLISHING

Lima, 2014

Table of Contents

1. Institutional Approval

If your institution requires you to submit a proposal to the IRB, you must submit evidence that you received approval prior to conducting research. The approved research protocol should be strictly followed.

2. Informed Consent

Researchers are required to explicitly state whether or not they have received written consent from any participants involved in the research.

a. To Research

i. Participants should be informed about (1) the purpose, duration, and procedures involved in the research; (2) their right to decline to participate and withdraw from the research; (3) possible consequences of declining to participate or withdrawing from the research; (4) factors that may influence their participation such as risks involved, discomfort, or negative side effects; (5) benefits of participating in the research and incentives; (6) limits of confidentiality; and (7) contact information for the person responsible for answering questions about the research. Participants should be given the opportunity to ask questions before providing consent.

ii. Participants in experimental treatments must be informed at the beginning regarding: (a) the experimental nature, (b) services available or not for participants in the control group, (c) the process by which participants are assigned to the groups, (d) alternative treatments available to the participant if he or she wishes to withdraw, and (e) compensation costs involved in participation.

b. For recording Voices and Images in Research

Prior to recording voices or images, researchers must obtain informed consent from participants. Non-essential identifying details should be omitted. Informed consent can be waived only if: (i) the research takes place in a public place and is considered a naturalistic observation that will not reveal anyone´s identify or cause harm or (ii) deception is used in the research design, thus consent is obtained during the debriefing (See 5. Deception in Research.)

c. Dispensing the informed consent for research

Researchers may opt not to use informed consent when (i) the research is not expected to create any type of harm or distress in the study of practices or methods used in the educational setting; anonymous questionnaires, naturalistic observations, or archival research where the information collected does not place participants at

any type of risk; the study of factors related to job or organization effectiveness where there is no risk to participants; or (ii) if law or institutional regulations permit.

3. Client/Patient, Student, and Subordinate Research Participants

Researchers must take the necessary steps to protect participants who are clients/patients, students, or subordinates from negative consequences involved in declining to participate or withdrawing from research. When research participation is a course requirement or extra credit, there must be an alternative option.

4. Offering inducement for research participation

a. Researchers should avoid offering excessive or inappropriate inducements for research participation when this is likely to influence their participation.
b. When professional services are offered as an inducement, researchers should clarify the nature of the services, risks, obligations, and limitations.

5. Deception in research

a. Researchers only use deception when it is justified by expected scientific, educational, or practical value and non-deceptive techniques are not feasible.
b. Researchers do not use deception when physical pain or severe emotional distress is expected.
c. Researchers explain the elements of deception involved as early as possible, preferably after their involvement, but no later than at the end of data collection, and allow participants to withdraw their participation in the research.

6. Debriefing

a. Researchers provide participants with access to information regarding the nature, results, and conclusions of the study, and they take necessary steps to correct misconceptions that become apparent.
b. When scientific or humane values justify the delay or withholding of this information, researchers take necessary steps to reduce harm.
c. When researchers recognize that research procedures have caused harm, they take steps to minimize the harm.

7. Research ethics in journal articles

a. Human rights, privacy, and confidentiality: When necessary, authors should specify that they are adhering to recognized standards that minimize harm to participants, avoid coercion or exploitation, and protect confidentiality such as the *Declaration of Helsinki, US Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Rights*, and *European Medicines Agency Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice*. When appropriate, researchers must openly communicate any information that might influence a participant´s willingness to participate; for example, sponsorship,

purpose and anticipated outcomes of the study, and possible consequences of the publication of the research.

b. Cultures and heritage: Authors should not include any images of objects that might have cultural significance or cause offence, such as religious texts or historical events. Authors should also take care to not include names or photographs of deceased persons when it is contraindicated in the culture.
c. Registering clinical trials: Clinical trials should be registered in a publicly accessible database before participants are enrolled according to the World Health Organization and Declaration of Helsinki. Clinical trial registration numbers should be provided at the end of the abstract. If the trial is not registered, or was registered retrospectively, an explanation should be provided.
d. Animals in research: Research involving animals should adhere to *Replacement*, the use of non-animal methods; *Reduction*, methods which reduce the number of animals used; and *Refinement*, methods which improve animal welfare. Authors must report the study design and statistical analysis, experimental procedures, experimental animals, and housing and husbandry. In addition, they should describe how discomfort and pain were avoided and minimized, and confirm that animals did not suffer unnecessarily at any point. Evidence of ethical and legal approval obtained prior to the study should be included with the manuscript. Authors should state whether experiments were performed in accordance with relevant institutional and national guidelines and regulations. Authors in the US should cite compliance with the US National Research Council´s ¨Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals¨ the US Public Health Service´s ¨Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals,¨ and ¨Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals.¨ UK authors should cite compliance to the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 Amendment Regulations (S1 2012/3039). European authors should cite Directive 2010/63/EU.
e. Biosecurity: Authors should indicate whether the study is considered ¨dual use research, ¨ that is whether it has potential for both benevolent and malevolent application. Authors should conform to the National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity (NSABB) guidelines for Dual Use Life Sciences Research.
f. Reporting guidelines: Authors should follow the APA style to accurately report findings, allowing readers to appraise it, replicate it, and use it.

8. Reporting research results

a. Researchers do not fabricate data.
b. If researchers discover significant errors in published data, they take the necessary steps to publicly correct the error.

9. Research Integrity

a. Misconduct: Research misconduct is the ¨fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting, or in reporting

research results¨, as defined by the US Federal Policy on Research Misconduct. If authors are suspected of misconduct, the editorial board will ask the research institution, employer, funder, or relevant national body to assume an investigation.

b. Whistle Blowing: Anonymous or whistle-blower allegations that provide detailed evidence will be investigated.
c. Fabrication/falsification and image manipulation: At times it is necessary to edit images to reveal certain features, but inappropriate image manipulation creates misleading results. Authors should report when images are edited. Authors should adhere to the following recommendations:
    i. Specific features should not be altered.
    ii. Original unedited images should also be submitted when any alteration is made to the image intended for publication.
    iii. Adjustments to brightness or contrasts may only be used when they are applied equally to the entire image and do not misrepresent the image.
    iv. Excessive editing to emphasize one size of the image is inappropriate.
    v. Deleting any portion of recording or nonlinear adjustments must be indicated in a figure legend.
    vi. Figures should not be constructed from different component parts and if the author deems it necessary then this should be clearly indicated by dividing lines in the figure and describing this in the legend.
d. Plagiarism: Plagiarism is the theft or misuse of intellectual property and the copying of another person´s work. Manuscripts are screened for plagiarism.
e. Duplicate and redundant publication: Authors must avoid reproducing verbatim content from their other publications. Any previously published results (e.g. numerical information, figures, and images) should include information regarding where they were previously reported. The following prior publications are not considered a duplicate publication: abstracts and posters from conferences, results presented at meetings, results in databases and clinical trial registries that have not been interpreted, and dissertations and theses in university archives.
    i. **Text recycling:** Partial results from a prior publication that is currently targeted to a different audience is permitted when the discussion and conclusion is different.
    ii. **Duplicate submission:** Authors may not submit a manuscript to more than one journal simultaneously. If the editorial board becomes aware of such a situation, the manuscript will no longer be considered for publication.
    iii. **Duplicate information published in translations:** Translations of already published manuscripts will not be considered for publication.
f. Sanctions: Sanctions will be applied consistently after careful consideration. First, a retraction will be issued. In more serious circumstances, the author´s institution will be notified, and the *Revista de Psicología* will refuse to review the future work of authors involved.

10. Editorial Standards and processes

a. Authorship: The authors listed as well as the order of authors should reflect the contribution to the manuscript. All contributing authors should sign a release form as well as a brief description of how they contributed to the work. Contributions from anyone who does not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an acknowledgements section with permission from the contributor. All appropriate administrative requirements (e.g. IRB approval and clinical registration documentation) are completed. Copies of all correspondence will be sent to all contributing authors.

b. Authorship disputes: If the editorial board suspects authorship problems, the corresponding author will be contacted for further information. If further information is needed, other authors will be contacted to collect further information.

c. Funding: All funding sources as well as the specific role of the funder should be listed in the Acknowledgements section; if there is no funding source, this should be explicitly stated. Other sources of funding, such as for writing or editorial assistance, should also be stated.

d. Peer Review: The journal uses a double-blinded review for submissions. Only the following sections are not peer reviewed: editorial, in memoriam, book review, and tribute. All manuscripts will be treated with confidentiality. Peer reviewers will disclose any conflict of interest when they respond to an invitation to review a manuscript and when they submit the review. In instances such as where the peer reviewer has recently collaborated with the author, works at the same institution, is in direct competition with the author, and has a personal conflict, the reviewers will not review the manuscript.

e. Timing of publication: The journal strives to ensure a timely peer review with unnecessary delays in the publication process.

f. Editors and journal staff as authors: The editor and editorial board are not involved in any decisions about their own submissions to the journal. A short summary statement will be provided detailing the process used to make the editorial decision when the editor or members of the editorial board are authors of a publication.

g. Conflicts of interest: Editors, authors, and peer reviewers should disclose any conflict of interest that might affect their ability to present or review a manuscript objectively. Conflicts of interest include but are not limited to financial, personal, political, or religious interests. Authors should describe relevant funding including the purpose, as well as any relevant patents, stocks, and shares that they own.

h. Libel and defamation: The editorial committee monitors both manuscripts and peer review reports for language that could be considered defamation or a negligent misstatement, and could consequently lead to legal action. Such language should not be used; however, the author of such language assumes full responsibility.

i. Editorial independence and commercial issues: The *Fondo Editorial of the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú* publishes the journal, but does not influence editorial decisions.

j. Academic Debate: The *Revista de Psicología* encourages correspondence and constructive criticism of published work. When a correspondence discusses a specific article, the author will be invited to respond before the correspondence is published. When possible, the correspondence and the author´s response will be published together. Authors may indicate if they judge a correspondence to be unconstructive, but they do not have the right to veto comments.

k. Appeals: Authors who disagree with the editorial feedback may wish to submit an appeal with the journal. Appeals will override earlier decisions only when new information becomes available. Reversals of decisions will not be made without new evidence. The editorial board may seek comments from additional peer reviewers in order to make a decision.

l. Corrections: Readers and authors should notify the *Revista de Psicología* if there are errors in a publication, especially errors that could affect the interpretation of data. Corrections will be published, and when important errors that invalidate the work are found, a retraction will be considered.

m. Retractions and expressions of concern: Retractions are published when errors could affect the interpretation of data or information, when work is fraudulent, or in cases of serious ethical misconduct. Expressions of concern will be published when the editorial board has serious concerns or suspicions that should be communicated with readers.

n. Withdrawal of articles: Removal, deletion, or obscuring of an article is only allowed when there is a case involving legal infringements, defamation, or other legal limitations; or there is false or inaccurate data. A retraction statement must be published.

o. Data protection legislation: The *Revista de Psicología* complies with data protection legislation.

11. Copyright and intellectual property

a. The author must sign a copyright agreement before publication.

b. Intellectual property protection
Exclusive License Agreement: The original author retains copyright in their article, but the journal retains the commercial publishing and journal compilation rights.

12. Sharing research data for verification

a. Researchers must share their data with other competent professionals who seek to verify their claims after publication of the data provided that participant confidentiality is protected and legal rights do not prevent the release of data. The owner of this data may require costs for the provision of such information.

b. When researchers request data to reanalyze, they may only use this shared data for the declared purpose. Researchers must receive agreement in writing from the author for use in any other purposes.

13. Reviewers

Psychologists who review materials submitted for presentation, publication, grant, or research proposals respect the confidentiality and ownership rights of the authors.

References

Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. (2002). *American Psychologist*, 57, 1060-1073.

Wiley, J. (2014). Best Practice Guidelines on Publishing Ethics: A Publisher´s Perspective. Second Edition. Recovered from http://exchanges.wiley.com/medialibrary/2014/03/17/8440af20/Best%20Practice%20Guidelines%20on%20Publishing%20Ethics%202ed.pdf