

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

Aniki: Portuguese Journal of the Moving Image is a peer-reviewed journal committed to the highest ethical standards. The editors are responsible for the journal's publishing decisions, in keeping with the principles of independence and scientific autonomy. *Aniki* endorses the Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), available at <https://publicationethics.org>. The present publication ethics and malpractice statement aims at promoting the trust, accountability and mutual respect between editors, authors and peer reviewers and guarantee the scientific integrity of our papers.

Anyone who believes that research published by *Aniki: Portuguese Journal of the Moving Image* has failed to follow any of the principles stated below should contact us at: aniki@aim.org.pt. Concerns will be considered and handled by following, where possible, COPE guidelines, or by designating members from our Advisory Board or external advisers to carry out confidential and independent investigations.

1. Duties of the editors

1.1. Independence and scientific autonomy

1.1.1. Editors are expected to take full responsibility for the decision-making process and abstain from censorship caused by personal, professional, institutional, or governmental pressures.

1.1.2. Members of the editorial board are drawn from the journal's field of expertise. They are expected to base their editorial decisions on principles of scientific autonomy.

1.2. Openness

1.2.1. Editors are expected to be open to contributions from scholars outside their network. Manuscripts submitted for publication will be considered based on their content and quality, not on the author's identity (or any identity marker) or the editors' familiarity with the authors.

1.3. Promptness

1.3.1. Editors are expected to provide prompt answers and see to it that reviewers, authors and themselves meet the deadlines and that no significant delays occur.

1.4. Information

1.4.1. The names and affiliations of the members of the editorial board are provided on the journal's website.

1.4.2. Editors are expected to make sure the information on the journal's website is clear, accurate and up to date. This includes general information about the journal, instructions for authors, description of the peer-review process, the journal's contact, its policies regarding access, call for papers, and other relevant information.

1.5. Confidentiality and peer review integrity

1.5.1. Editors are expected to handle manuscripts with care. They will not share them with anyone outside the editorial board, except peer-reviewers and (occasionally) other advisors. Everyone is bound by confidentiality.

1.5.2. In the case of *Aniki's* essays, which undergo double-blind peer review, editors are expected to choose qualified external reviewers and protect their anonymity and the authors'. Reviewers will be chosen based on their expertise and without any intention of the manuscript receiving a specific outcome (either positive or negative).

1.5.3. Editors are expected to provide reviewers with clear instructions about the peer-review process and the report's requirements, referring them to COPE's Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers. Editors are responsible for endorsing and facilitating a consistent, fair, courteous, unbiased, justifiable, and timely peer-review.

1.5.4. Editors are expected to base their decisions to reject or accept a manuscript exclusively on its importance, originality, clarity, and relevance to the journal's scope and aims.

1.5.5. When a manuscript is rejected, editors are expected to abstain from using its (unpublished) content for their own research. Permission to do so will be first obtained from the author and then duly acknowledged.

1.6. Ethics, authorship, competing interests, and misconduct

1.6.1. Editors are expected to maintain ethical oversight of published research. When applied, they will ask for confirmation on informed consent, verify the appropriate handling of confidential data (e.g., use of pseudonyms), and guarantee the acknowledgment of unpublished work (e.g., personal communications).

1.6.2. Editors are expected to encourage appropriate authorship attribution and discourage guest and ghost authorships by confirming that all listed authors have contributed to the manuscript. They will include all authors in communications, not just the corresponding author.

1.6.3. When faced with the possibility of a conflict of interests (their own, the reviewer's or the author's), editors are expected to make them known. Our rule is: if in doubt, disclose. If need be, they will obtain signed statements of conflicts of interest from authors and reviewers before publication.

1.6.4. Editors are expected to take reasonable steps to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred (see procedures in 4.); in no event will editors encourage such misconduct or knowingly allow it to take place.

1.6.5. In the event that editors are made aware of an allegation of research misconduct they are expected to deal with it appropriately, following, as much as possible, COPE's guidelines. After careful consideration, they may find it necessary to issue a correction notice, an expression of concern, a retraction, or even, in rare circumstances, a removal (see 4.).

2. Duties of the reviewers

2.1. Integrity and confidentiality

2.1.1. Reviewers are expected to inform the journal editors if they believe they lack the relevant expertise to review the paper or will not be able to meet the proposed or mutually agreed time frame.

2.1.2. Reviewers are expected to respect the confidential nature of the review process. They will refrain from revealing details of the manuscript during or after peer review, unless they obtain permission from the journal.

2.1.3. Reviewers are expected to assist the authors by suggesting improvements to their contributions. They should judge a paper by its content (originality, relevance, accuracy, clarity of arguments, writing) and refrain from expressing unreasonable, unfounded or personal criticisms.

2.1.4. Reviewers are expected to make suggestions for changes that will improve the paper's clarity, and these should be phrased with due respect. However, they are not expected to rewrite the paper to their own preferred style.

2.1.5. Reviewers are expected to suggest additional analyses if these can clarify or strengthen any aspect of the paper. Yet, it is not their job to extend the work beyond its current scope.

2.1.6. Reviewers are expected to point out relevant published work that has not been cited by the author. However, they should refrain from suggesting that authors include citations to their (or an associate's) work merely to increase citation counts or to enhance the visibility of their or their associate's work. Suggestions must be based on valid academic reasons.

2.1.7. Reviewers are expected to assist the editors in their decision to publish. Their final recommendation (accept/ revise/ reject) should be congruent with the comments provided in the report.

2.1.8. Reviewers are expected to abstain from intentionally prolonging the review process.

2.1.9. Reviewers are expected to abstain from using the content of reviewed papers in their own research without the author's prior consent and without due credit.

2.1.10. Reviewers who wish to involve their students or junior researchers in peer review are expected to request permission from the editor. In cases where a student performs the review under the guidance of the supervisor, that should be noted, so that the student can be acknowledged in the journal's records.

2.1.11. Reviewers whose performance or conduct is not acceptable will be removed from the journal's database.

2.2. Disclosing conflicts of interest and misconduct

2.2.1. Reviewers are expected to disclose any suspected conflicts of interests (their own, the author's or the editors') resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships, including connections with companies, entities or institutions involved in the research. They will refrain from reviewing the manuscript until the problem is solved.

2.2.2. Reviewers are expected to inform editors of any (suspected or confirmed) research misconduct (i.e., fabrication, falsification, plagiarism) they have come across during the peer-review process.

2.2.3. Reviewers will support the ombudsperson and panel in investigating any suspected cases of misconduct.

3. Duties of the authors

3.1. Information and cooperation

3.1.1. Authors are expected to have read through the 'Instructions to Authors' and other submission guidelines prior to submitting their paper.

3.1.2. Authors are expected to keep their co-authors informed at all stages of the submission process.

3.1.3. Authors are expected to provide funding information and declare competing interests.

3.1.4. Authors are expected to inform editors on any changes in authorship, affiliation or the state of their contributions. They are also expected to inform editors on any significant errors or inaccuracies in their paper, even after it has been accepted for publication or published.

3.1.5. Authors are expected to participate in the peer-review, respect reviewers and editors and accept the journal's decisions. Abusive behaviour or correspondence towards editors and others acting on *Aniki*'s behalf will not be tolerated and may lead to the manuscript's withdrawal.

3.1.6. Authors are expected to cooperate in investigations concerning the ethics, accuracy, or integrity of any part of their work and to take action to solve any problems that come to light.

3.2. Authorship, contributorship and affiliations

3.2.1. Authors are expected to list as authors anyone who has made significant contributions to the research and the manuscript (and only those); they are not expected to include authors who have not contributed sufficiently to merit authorship.

3.2.2. By significant contribution we mean the author's participation in any of the following: the conception or design of the work; the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data; the drafting or revising of the manuscript.

3.2.3. Authorship entails the authors' agreement to become accountable for all aspects of the work, before and after publication.

3.2.4. *Aniki* encourages authors to add an 'Acknowledgments' section in their manuscript to list (with permission) anyone who does not meet the criteria for authorship but has provided research or writing assistance.

3.2.5. Affiliations should represent the institution(s) with which each author is currently affiliated. In the event of research conducted at and/or supported by another institution, this should also be acknowledged.

3.3. Academic standards, ethics, integrity, and copyright

3.3.1. Authors are expected to present original work that meets the academic standards in the field and that has not been published before or is in press.

3.3.2. Authors are expected to abstain from submitting the same manuscript to several journals at the same time.

3.3.3. When applicable, authors are expected to have obtained the required ethical approval for their research.

3.3.4. Authors are expected to accurately report their contributions, methods and findings, even if the latter weaken or contradict their theories or hypotheses.

3.3.5. Authors are expected to provide the sources and cite the works they have used and drawn upon. They are expected to cite relevant publications, even if these may contradict their own beliefs, theories, hypotheses, methods or findings.

3.3.6. All listed authors and co-authors are expected to have seen and approved the final manuscript.

3.3.7. Authors are expected to obtain permission for use of copyrighted material from other sources. Before publication, they will sign a declaration confirming that they have been granted that permission by the copyright's holder.

4. Dealing with misconduct

4.1. *Aniki* follows international understandings of misconduct and inappropriate behaviour in publication. This can include, among others, allegations of plagiarism, duplicate/redundant or overlapping publication, simultaneous submission, data fabrication or falsification, citation manipulation, fraudulent or disputed authorship, omission of sources, image manipulation, and competing interests.

4.2. Information on misconduct ought to be reported to: aniki@aim.org.pt

4.3. Allegations of misconduct (including anonymous ones) will be analysed and investigated. *Aniki* will act politely, fairly but firmly at all times.

4.4. Procedures for handling allegations of research, publication, and review misconduct is as follows (with variations, depending on each case): (1) editors will designate a person (ombudsperson) or panel from among the members of the Advisory Board or another journal's editorial board to review allegations and initiate an impartial and confidential investigation; (2) the ombudsperson or panel will contact the authors or reviewers asking for an explanation; (3) in more complex cases, the ombudsperson or panel may request external expert or legal advice, which *Aniki* will support; (4) the ombudsperson or panel will write a report with a set of recommendations for editors and/or authors to follow.

4.5. During the investigation, the ombudsperson or panel will have access to the manuscript, peer-review reports, and other relevant documents in confidence and strictly for investigation purposes. All parties will be heard.

4.6. Based on the ombudsperson or panel's report, *Aniki*'s editorial board will issue an expression of concern, a correction, a retraction, a removal, or any other action, in line with COPE's guidelines. It is for editors to decide what action to take.

4.7. Should editors find convincing evidence of serious misconduct, they may wish to pass this on to the authors' institutions, notifying the authors that they are doing so. *Aniki* may judge it unnecessary to involve employers in less serious cases of misconduct, such as redundant publication, deception over authorship, or failure to declare conflict of interest.

4.8. In case of lack of evidence of misconduct, the editorial process will proceed in the normal way.

5. Open access, licensing and copyright

5.1 *Aniki* has no submission or publication fees and provides immediate open access to its content.

5.2. The articles and reviews published by *Aniki* are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0), which allows readers to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the journal's full texts, provided they are credited and not reused for commercial purposes.

5.3. *Aniki* uses Open Journal Systems 3.1.2.1, developed, supported, and freely distributed by the Public Knowledge Project (PKP) under the GNU General Public License.

5.4. Authors are responsible for obtaining permission for the reproduction of images or any other copyright material.

6. Archiving

6.1. *Aniki*'s full content is available at its official site: <https://aim.org.pt/ojs/index.php/revista>

6.2. *Aniki* is included in RCAAP portal, which collects, aggregates and indexes Open Access scientific contents from Portuguese institutional repositories. Please, check here: <https://www.rcaap.pt/repositoryInfo.jsp?id=aniki>

6.3. *Aniki*'s contents are digitally preserved for long-term access in the PKP Preservation Network (PKP PN).

7. Property and funding

7.1. *Aniki* is owned by the Portuguese Association of Researchers of the Moving Image (AIM – Associação de Investigadores da Imagem em Movimento).

7.2. The journal is currently supported by the Institute of Contemporary History (IHC) of Nova-FCSH, through the Portuguese national funding agency for science, research and technology (FCT) under projects UIDB/04209/2020 and UIDP/04209/2020.

8. Commercial interests

Aniki is under no commercial obligations and publishes no advertising or sponsored contents.

Lisbon, 24 May 2023.