

ETHICAL CHARTER FOR JOURNALS

The Ethical Charter for Scientific Journals defines the responsibilities of the publisher, the editorial team and the editorial board of the journal, the authors and the reviewers in order to ensure rigorous, transparent and responsible publication processes and to guarantee the legitimacy of scientific and academic work.

The members of the journal undertake to read and respect this ethical charter, which they sign when taking up their mandate. The same applies to guest editors for special issues and to anyone asked by the editorial team and guest editors to review submitted manuscripts.

ETHICAL RULES APPLICABLE TO JLE JOURNALS

1/ Ethical commitment of the members of the editorial board

The *editorial board* is responsible for all the content published in the journal and seeks to constantly improve its scientific quality.

The editorial board selects articles with impartiality in mind (submission procedure on the journal's website). It pays particular attention to articles that contribute to the scientific debate. Any article presenting a relevant critique of an article published in the journal may be proposed for publication. In addition, any author may propose a response to a critique of his or her article published in the journal.

The members of the editorial board undertake to respect the rules of ethics, to work and make decisions with a constant concern for the ethics of their practices. The same applies to guest editors.

Editorial board and authors

Members of the editorial team must be completely transparent about any links or potential conflicts of interest they may have with authors submitting manuscripts, or authors proposing special issues, or lodging an appeal. Any situation of excessive personal proximity or links of interest must result in the referral of files to other members of the editorial team or editorial board, with the member concerned not taking part in decisions or votes. It is their responsibility to declare any situation, commitment or link that could hinder their objectivity and their ability to work in accordance with the ethical values that guide it.

Editorial board and expert reviewers

Members of the editorial team and guest editors must be particularly vigilant with regard to these potential effects of proximity and conflicts of interest when choosing the experts asked to review the manuscripts received.

Editorial board and review process

Articles are selected solely on the basis of their intellectual or scientific content, without distinction as to the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, nationality, academic affiliation or political philosophy. The editorial board takes into account, in its decisions, the legal requirements regarding defamation, copyright infringement or plagiarism. The procedure to follow to submit an article to the journal

is specified in a document published on the journal's website and updated regularly. Any financial charges for publishing an article are also explicitly mentioned in this document.

Confidentiality during the evaluation process

The members of the editorial team and editorial board undertake not to disclose the content of the manuscripts evaluated, during the evaluation process and prior to publication, or regarding manuscripts evaluated but rejected and not published. They undertake to respect the intellectual property of the authors of these works by not disseminating them, making use of them or exploiting the knowledge or data present in the manuscripts brought to their attention. They undertake to exercise discretion with regard to the manuscript evaluation processes, both during and *after the fact*.

Use of data

The data presented in submitted articles must not be used in the research of an editorial board member or reviewer prior to their possible publication without the explicit written consent of the author.

Editorial board and readers

Sources of funding. Any sources of funding for the research presented in the journal are mentioned.

The editorial board also undertakes to respond to complaints made by readers against the journal.

2/ Role of the editorial board in matters of ethics, professional conduct and scientific integrity

Unethical publication behaviour

The journal's *editorial board* is the body that has authority within the organisation on matters of ethics, professional conduct and scientific integrity. The editorial team refers to it and relies on its opinion on difficult cases that require arbitration.

The editorial board seeks to identify and prevent any behaviour contrary to publication ethics. It undertakes to conduct an investigation in the event of a complaint against the journal, in accordance with the procedure described below. The author is responsible for the alleged offence. The editorial board is always willing to publish corrections, apologies and explanations, if necessary.

It is also before the editorial board that authors can appeal against decisions taken by the editorial team, as well as against the evaluations of their manuscript. And it is to the editorial board that stakeholders - other than the authors - who consider themselves aggrieved can make requests.

To inform its decisions, the editorial board may call on experts and bodies specialising in ethics and professional conduct from outside the board, who are invited on an ad hoc basis to discuss sensitive situations.

Procedure in the event of unethical publication behaviour

A complaint denouncing a practice contrary to publication ethics may be lodged at any time, by anyone, with the journal's editorial board. The person lodging the complaint must provide evidence to substantiate

it. All complaints will be taken seriously by the editorial board and dealt with until a conclusion is reached. All complaints will be dealt with, regardless of the date of publication of the article concerned. The documents relating to the handling of this complaint will be kept by the editorial board.

In the event of a complaint to the magazines, measures are likely to be put in place in a completely transparent manner: interview with the author, letter sent to the author detailing the offence and serving as a warning, publication of an editorial informing the readership, removal of the article from the journal and from indexing databases, informing the readership, embargo on any new article by this author, etc.

3/ Ethical commitment of expert reviewers

Reviewers' mission

The tasks of the reviewers are specified in a document published on the journal's website and updated regularly. The editorial board guarantees the anonymity of the reviewers.

Reviewers are selected for their intellectual and scientific expertise. They are responsible for evaluating manuscripts on their content alone, without distinction of race, sex, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, nationality, academic affiliation or political philosophy. The opinions given by the reviewers must be objective. Reviewers are required to report all articles that are similar to the article submitted to the journal. Reviewers must report any significant publications related to the article that have not yet been cited.

Reviewer ethics

Reviewers undertake to respect the rules of professional ethics and to undertake a serious and objective review of the submitted manuscripts, with respect for the authors. The scientific rigour of the reviews must go hand in hand with benevolence, with potentially critical reviews formulated with the aim of enabling the authors to progress in their work. The feedback provided to the authors on their work must be detailed and constructive.

Reviewers are expected to declare any conflict of interest and to report any significant closeness to the authors of a submitted manuscript, if they are able to identify them. The editorial team will then remove this expert from the manuscript and entrust it to another expert, as well as any element that could affect the objectivity of their judgement.

It is also their responsibility to report to the editorial team any problem or doubt regarding the ethical dimensions of the manuscripts entrusted to them.

The reviewers undertake to respect the anonymity of the evaluation processes, both during and after the evaluation.

The anonymity of the evaluations can only be lifted by decision of the editorial team, and with the explicit agreement of the various stakeholders, and only once an editorial decision to publish has been taken by the journal's editorial team (for example, to thank reviewers who have made a particular contribution to the improvement of a manuscript through their successive feedback).

Reviewers undertake not to disclose the content of the manuscripts reviewed, during the review process and prior to publication, or regarding manuscripts reviewed but rejected and not published. They undertake to respect the intellectual property of the authors of these works, by not disseminating them, by not making use of them and by not exploiting the knowledge or data present in the manuscripts brought to their attention. They undertake to exercise discretion with regard to the evaluation work entrusted to them.

Evaluators must recuse themselves in the event of a conflict of interest with one of the authors or with the content of the manuscript to be evaluated. Furthermore, any evaluator who knows that he or she is not qualified to evaluate a manuscript or who knows that he or she will not be able to do so within a reasonable time frame is required to notify the editorial board and to recuse himself or herself.

Political or commercial interests

Articles are selected on the basis of the academic interest they represent for readers and not on the basis of the commercial or political gain they may bring. The editorial board also ensures the independence of the journal with regard to its publisher and its owner(s). If the journal publishes advertisements, these will be clearly distinguished from the scientific content of the journal.

ETHICAL RULES APPLICABLE TO ACADEMIC AUTHORS

Originality, combating plagiarism, intellectual property

Authors must guarantee the originality of their article and not publish any text that could be considered, in any form whatsoever, to be plagiarism. Any borrowed material must be accurately referenced in the text and in the bibliography, including an indication of the page of origin of any verbatim quotations in quotation marks. Failure to make precise reference to the authors and works that are the source of the ideas, concepts, analyses and statements mobilised and reproduced in a text, even if reformulated, constitutes plagiarism.

The slightest deviation from this rule will result in the manuscript being excluded from the evaluation process, and the fact of establishing the presence of plagiarism *after the fact* of the publication of a manuscript leads to its withdrawal from publication as soon as the plagiarism is detected and proven.

It is the role of the editorial team, guest editors and expert reviewers to ensure compliance with these obvious rules of respect for intellectual property.

The editorial board is the competent body to receive complaints from authors who believe they have been plagiarised in work submitted to or published in the journal.

Multiple, redundant or simultaneous publications

Authors undertake not to submit an article that has been previously published in another journal or a new article that is based exclusively on work already published elsewhere. Similarly, authors undertake not to submit their article to several journals at the same time. The work must be original and unpublished, regardless of the format and nature of the text: research articles, reviews, editorials.

If a paper has been presented at a conference and has been published in the proceedings or made available in any form by the conference organisers, it is up to the authors to rework it so as to submit a text that is substantially different from previous versions.

The updating of the existence of identical or very similar versions of a text submitted to the journal, by human means (alert formulated by expert reviewers, the editorial team, the editorial board or emanating from the academic community) or technological means (thanks to the use of anti-plagiarism software), leads to the immediate exclusion of the manuscript from the evaluation process. If the text has already been published and such facts are brought to the attention of the editorial team retrospectively, the text will be withdrawn from publication.

The editorial team is competent to make decisions in proven cases of non-original manuscripts; more borderline cases will be brought to the attention of the members of the editorial board, which is the deliberative and decision-making body in this matter.

References

Any quotation (or use of the work of other authors) must be identified as such and accompanied by the appropriate references, presented according to the format usually used by the journal. If the author wishes to use information obtained privately (conversation, correspondence), he or she should make every effort to obtain the authorisation of the persons who are the source of this information.

Role of authors and signature of manuscripts

The list of authors must be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the design, realisation or interpretation of the study presented in the text submitted to the journal or to the writing of this text. All authors must be mentioned, with their affiliation. The order of the signatories is decided after discussion between the parties: alphabetical order or choice of an order representing the different levels of contribution of the authors, in descending order from first to last, when it is considered that these are unequal.

The authors must send the editorial team a letter signed by all of them attesting to a consensus decision regarding the order of the authors indicated on the submitted manuscript.

The author in contact with the journal must ensure that only the appropriate co-authors are included in the list of authors, and that all co-authors, after having seen and approved the final version of their text, agreed to submit this article for publication.

Any changes to the list of authors (removing authors or adding new ones), or to the order of the signatures, during the evaluation process of a manuscript must be justified and argued to the editorial team, in a letter signed by all the authors concerned, including those who have been removed or added during the editorial process.

It is the responsibility of the members of the editorial team to ensure that these aspects of intellectual property are respected, and they may ask the signatory authors for any necessary clarification.

Any person who feels wronged, either in relation to the order of the signatories or because they are not a signatory of a work to which they have contributed, during the evaluation of a manuscript or after its publication, may make a written and detailed request for recourse addressed to the editor-in-chief and to the members of the editorial board. The latter has final authority on these aspects.

Defamatory statements

Authors undertake not to exceed the rules of scientific debate in the articles submitted and not to make defamatory statements that could be interpreted as damaging to the reputation of a third party.

Conflicts of interest & sources of funding

Authors must declare any potential professional or financial conflicts of interest. All non-public funding sources behind the research presented in the submitted text must be explicitly mentioned. In the case of public funding, the funding organisations generally request that the fact that the research was supported, the name of the organisation and the name of the project be mentioned in the scientific productions; as these modalities may vary, it is in any case the responsibility of the authors to strictly comply with the requirements of the funders. In the case of private funding, the authors must provide details to the editorial team in a specific appendix.

The authors must also inform the editorial team of any situation that could introduce conflicts of interest (see the JLE ethics charter, which defines the concept of conflicts of interest and distinguishes between different types – financial and non-financial) or possible biases in terms of subjectivity (e.g. research carried out on subjects, data, fields in relation to which the professional or personal situation of at least one author leads to possible conflicts of interest or biased positions).

Failure to declare such situations is a breach of ethical rules, opening up a deliberative procedure as to the follow-up to be given.

Depending on the situation, the editorial team may request that the existence, nature and influence of these interests be explained in the published manuscript.

The editorial team relies on the advice of the editorial board in cases where it appears to require arbitration.

Erratum

Any author who discovers, after publication, a significant error or inaccuracy in his or her own work shall promptly inform the journal's editorial board and cooperate with it to publish an erratum or even to signify the withdrawal of his or her article.

Access to data & conditions for conducting research

It is expected that the research that has produced the data serving as the basis for the submitted manuscripts has been conducted in accordance with the ethics and deontology of the profession, which goes beyond the aspects of methodological rigour alone.

In the case of sensitive research, due to the subject, the field, the actors surveyed, etc., authors are asked to submit their manuscript together with an appendix dedicated to these aspects of methodology and ethics, for the attention of the editorial team and expert reviewers.

The editorial team has the option of requesting any details or additional information (data related to their research) that they deem necessary to understand these dimensions. Here too, the editorial board is the reference body and the ultimate decision-making body in difficult cases.

Paper and digital publication

When submitting their article, authors agree to authorise its distribution in paper and digital format – particularly via the cairn.info platform – unless expressly stated otherwise.

Consent of organisations and individuals participating in the research and cited in the articles

Manuscripts submitted must be very careful when the names of organisations or individuals are cited in the text, without this referring to data, comments or public statements.

In articles that rely on primary data collected as part of the research, particularly through interviews and observations, or that refer to internal documents and non-public data, the actual names of organisations with and on which the research was conducted may only be mentioned with their explicit agreement. It is the responsibility of the authors to obtain such formal written agreement from the legitimate parties within the organisations concerned. The authors must provide written proof of the existence of such an agreement to the journal's editorial team. The same applies to naming individuals in your work, which is also subject to the formal agreement of the individuals concerned.

It is also up to the authors, when they do not wish to or do not have the agreement of the organisations studied to quote them by name, to make the comments and case studies truly anonymous. In the absence of explicit agreement, researchers must guarantee anonymity to organisations and individuals who have been investigated and participated in the study. In general, it is the authors' responsibility to respect any contractual commitments they have signed with funders, partner organisations, sponsors or others. The journal cannot be held responsible in the contrary case.

SUPERVISION OF THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS AND AUTHENTICITY OF MANUSCRIPTS

Some forms of use of digital artificial intelligence (AI) tools, and in particular Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) tools, do not pose major ethical difficulties, provided that the authors report in the most honest, transparent and detailed manner the uses made of these tools. An appendix must then be provided by the authors with the text of the manuscript detailing the AI tools used, and in particular the GAI tools, the use made of them, the prompts used, the iterations carried out, and the degree of subsequent work carried out by the researcher based on the content proposals (text, images, tables, diagrams, etc.) of the GAI.

However, there are red lines that refer to the major timeless ethical principles. This is the case for the authenticity of the work and the non-falsification of data (the data must be 'real' data and not invented or

generated by the researcher, whether or not equipped with a digital GIA tool). The same applies to the originality of the work, and therefore to the fact of not reproducing in extenso writings that were not produced by the researcher but were produced either by other individuals or by technologies, which constitutes plagiarism.