



CODE OF ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE IN PUBLICATION

Notas sobre Mamíferos Sudamericanos stands by the following Code of Ethics and Malpractice in Publication (based on the Committee on Publication Ethics COPE's Best Practice Guidelines, <https://publicationethics.org>), and it is expected of authors, reviewers and editors to follow these guidelines on ethical behavior.

Editors

The Editor-in-Chief of the journal has full authority over the entire content of the journal and is responsible for it. Notas sobre Mamíferos Sudamericanos follows a double peer review process and the editors will ensure that all manuscripts considered for publication will undergo this process. Editor-in-Chief decides which manuscripts will be published based on the journal scope and the reviewers' comments. Editor-in-Chief may seek advice of other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

Editors have the following duties:

- Editorial independence: decisions to edit and publish are not determined by the policies of governments, publishers or any other agency outside of the journal itself; commercial considerations must never compromise intellectual standards.
- Fair play: editorial decisions should be based exclusively on the basis of academic merit of the manuscript and its relevance to the journal's scope, without regard to the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, citizenship, religious belief, political philosophy or institutional affiliation.
- Confidentiality: editors and editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate. Notas sobre Mamíferos Sudamericanos does not disclose reviewers' identities unless requested by them.
- Disclosure: editors and editorial board members will not use unpublished information disclosed in a submitted manuscript for their own research purposes without the authors' explicit written consent.
- Conflicts of interest: editors will recuse themselves from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest arising from competitive, collaborative, or any other kind of relationships with any of the authors connected to the papers.





Reviewers

Reviewers assist editors in making editorial decisions and, through editorial communications with authors, may assist them in improving their manuscripts. Reviewers have the following duties:

- **Qualification:** any reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript should excuse from reviewing so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.
- **Promptness:** reviews are expected to be prompt; any invited reviewer who feels that the review will be impossible in the time requested by the editors should notify them and excuse from reviewing so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.
- **Objectivity:** reviews should be conducted objectively; observations should be formulated clearly with supporting arguments and relevant citation when required, and should help authors to improve the manuscript; personal criticism of the authors and offensive remarks will not be accepted.
- **Confidentiality:** all manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents; they will not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the Editor-in-Chief; this applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.
- **Acknowledgement of sources:** reviewers should call attention on published work that has been overlooked by the authors, and on any statement that requires some relevant citation; reviewers should also notify the editors of any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other manuscript (published or unpublished) of which they have personal knowledge.
- **Disclosure:** reviewers will not use unpublished information disclosed in a submitted manuscript for their own research purposes without the authors' explicit written consent; privileged information or ideas obtained by reviewers as a result of handling the manuscript will be kept confidential and not used for their personal advantage.
- **Conflicts of interest:** reviewers will recuse themselves from considering manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest arising from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships with any of the authors connected to the papers.

Authors

Authorship should be limited to those who have made significant contributions to the conception, design, execution, data acquisition, or interpretation of the study, have drafted the





manuscript or revised it critically for important intellectual content, and have seen and approved the final version of the paper and agreed to its submission for publication. All authors in the manuscript must be able to take public responsibility for the content. All those who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project (such as technical help, writing and editing assistance, general support) but do not meet the criteria for authorship, should be acknowledged in the “Acknowledgments” section. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate coauthors (according to the above definition) and no inappropriate coauthors are included in the author list, and should verify that all coauthors have seen and approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to its submission for publication. Authors warrant that the article does not infringe upon any copyright, contains no libelous or otherwise unlawful statements, and does not otherwise infringe on the rights of others.

The authors attest that their research was done ethically and in compliance with relevant local, national, or international regulations regarding the collection, care, and use of animals, including the maintenance of valid collecting and transport permits, and with necessary approvals for access to and use of field sites, especially environmentally or culturally sensitive areas.

Authors have the following duties:

- **Originality:** authors must declare that they have written and submitted only an original manuscript which has not been published, accepted for publication nor is under editorial review for publication elsewhere; all the work and/or words of other authors should be cited; plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.
- **Acknowledgment of sources:** authors should ensure that they have properly acknowledged the work of others, and should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work.
- **Peer review:** authors are obliged to participate in the peer review process and cooperate fully by responding promptly to editors' requests for raw data and clarifications; in the case of a first decision of minor or major changes needed, authors should respond to the reviewers' comments systematically, point by point, and in a timely manner, revising and re-submitting their manuscript to the journal by the deadline given.
- **Conflicts of interest:** all sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed and any conflict of interest which might be considered to influence the results or interpretation of their research should be expressed on the manuscript.
- **Handling of unethical publishing behavior and ensuring the integrity of the published record:** in the face of allegations of publication misconduct raised by readers, reviewers or





editors, the Editor-in-Chief will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. Cases of possible plagiarism or duplicate/redundant publication will be assessed by the journal. The Editor-in-Chief may decide to retract a paper if the Editorial Board is convinced that serious misconduct has happened. The Editor-in-Chief will also take reviewer misconduct seriously and pursue any allegation of breach of confidentiality, non-declaration of conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial), inappropriate use of confidential material, or delay of peer review for competitive advantage. Allegations of serious reviewer misconduct, such as plagiarism, will be taken to the institutional level.

