REVISTA DE DEMOGRAFÍA HISTÓRICA – JOURNAL OF IBEROAMERICAN POPULATION STUDIES

Second Series
Former title: Boletín de la Asociación de Demografía Histórica
ISSN: 1696-702X; e-ISSN: 2696-4325

ETHICAL CODE AND GOOD PRACTICE

Working document for review and approval by the Editorial Board of the Revista de Demografía Histórica



Fdo.: José Pablo Blanco Carrasco

Editor of the RDH–JIPS

Proposed revision and expansion · November 2026

1. General information

The Revista de Demografía Histórica–Journal of Iberoamerican Population Studies (RDH, ISSN 1696-702X; e-ISSN 2696-4325) is committed to the university community and society as a whole. Its conduct is guided by the principles of research integrity, responsibility, transparency, editorial independence and respect for people's rights, as well as by the UNESCO Declaration on Science and the Use of Scientific Knowledge (1999) and the recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (https://publicationethics.org/).

This code applies to everyone involved in the journal's activities: the editorial team, authors, external reviewers and, where applicable, collaborating organisations. Its purpose is to safeguard the scientific quality of published content, trust in the editorial process and the integrity of the scholarly record.

All parties shall uphold the following general ethical principles of publication:

- Integrity and honesty in research, analysis, interpretation and communication of results.
- Originality of submissions and appropriate acknowledgement of the ideas, sources, data and contributions of others.
- Impartiality, editorial independence and non-discrimination on personal, institutional, ideological or any other grounds unrelated to the scientific quality of the work.
- Confidentiality of manuscripts, unpublished data, and editorial and review deliberations.
- Transparency in authorship, individual contributions, funding and potential conflicts of interest.
- Compliance with applicable legislation, intellectual property rights, personal data protection and relevant ethical standards.
- Correction of the scholarly record through the publication of clarifications, corrections, expressions of concern or retractions whenever necessary.

2. Responsibilities of the Editorial Team: Editors and Editorial Board

The RDH editorial team, comprising the editor(s) and members of the Editorial Board, shall ensure the journal's ethical conduct and assume its general duties and responsibilities. Decisions shall be based on quality, originality, relevance, clarity of presentation and consistency with the journal's scholarly scope.

2.1. Impartiality and editorial independence

Manuscripts shall be assessed solely on their academic content and compliance with the journal's rules and aims. Editorial decisions shall not be influenced by the authors' nationality, gender, identity, institutional affiliation, beliefs, ideological orientation, professional status or any other personal circumstance.

The editorial team shall safeguard the independence of judgement of all those involved in the review process and prevent personal, institutional, financial or commercial interests from influencing decisions. Acceptance or rejection shall be based on academic criteria and, where appropriate, review reports.

2.2. Confidentiality

Information relating to submitted manuscripts shall be confidential. The editorial team shall not disclose a manuscript's content, authorship or review status to anyone outside the process. Access to documents shall be restricted to those who need them to perform an editorial or reviewing role.

No member of the editorial team may use, for their own research or the benefit of third parties, any unpublished data, arguments, interpretations or materials contained in a manuscript without the authors' express written permission.

2.3. Receipt and preliminary assessment of manuscripts

Receipt of a submission shall be acknowledged to the corresponding author. The editor or responsible editor shall conduct a preliminary assessment to verify its subject relevance, compliance with submission requirements, originality and minimum standards of scientific quality.

The journal may reject a manuscript without external review if it falls outside its scope, substantially fails to comply with editorial requirements, lacks sufficient scientific quality or gives rise to reasonable concerns about misconduct. The decision shall be communicated respectfully and, wherever possible, with reasons.

2.4. Peer review and selection of reviewers

The RDH uses a double-blind external peer-review system. The anonymity of both authors and reviewers shall be maintained throughout the process. Manuscripts shall be sent to specialists with proven expertise in the relevant field, while avoiding incompatibilities and conflicts of interest.

Reviews shall assess, among other aspects, originality, relevance, historiographical and methodological foundations, use of sources, strength of findings, clarity of presentation and suitability of conclusions. Reports inform the editorial decision, which remains the responsibility of the editorial team and not of individual reviewers.

Where reports conflict or do not provide a sufficient basis for a decision, the editorial team may request an additional review. Authors may be asked to revise the manuscript and provide a reasoned response to the comments received.

2.5. Timelines and communication with authors

The RDH asks reviewers to submit their reports within 30 days in order to expedite the review process. If this is not possible, they shall inform the editorial team as soon as they become aware of the delay. The journal shall keep the corresponding author informed of relevant developments and decisions.

2.6. Conflicts of interest involving the editorial team

Members of the editorial team shall disclose any circumstance that could compromise their impartiality or reasonably be perceived as a conflict of interest. Potential incompatibilities include:

- Close family, personal or professional relationships with any of the authors.
- Friendships or manifest hostility that could affect editorial judgement.
- Membership of the same team or research group, funded project or academic structure where a relevant direct relationship exists.
- Recent thesis supervision or co-supervision, scientific collaboration, co-authorship or joint publication.
- Financial, contractual, institutional or intellectual property interests connected with the manuscript.

Where a conflict exists, the person concerned shall withdraw from reviewer selection, deliberations and the editorial decision. Another conflict-free member of the editorial team shall take responsibility for the manuscript. The recusal and reassignment shall be recorded internally.

2.7. Complaints and appeals

Authors may request reconsideration of an editorial decision if they identify a procedural error, a manifestly incorrect interpretation of the reports or a circumstance that may have compromised the impartiality of the review. The reasoned request shall be submitted in writing to the journal’s editor.

The editor shall examine the complaint and may seek the opinion of another Editorial Board member who was not involved in the original decision. A complaint does not entail acceptance of the manuscript or guarantee a new round of review. The outcome shall be communicated with

reasons.

2.8. Corrections, expressions of concern and retractions

The RDH shall safeguard the integrity of the scholarly record and publish corrections, clarifications, expressions of concern or retractions as necessary. The measure adopted shall be proportionate to the nature and extent of the problem identified.

Minor errors that do not affect findings or conclusions may be corrected through an erratum or correction notice. Where there are well-founded doubts about an article's reliability, the journal may publish an expression of concern while investigating the facts. Retraction may be considered where findings or conclusions are shown to be unreliable, substantial plagiarism or undisclosed redundant publication is found, data have been fabricated or falsified, or another serious breach has occurred.

Before taking a decision, the journal shall request explanations and relevant documentation from the authors whenever possible. The editorial decision shall be based on the available information and may, where appropriate, be communicated to the institutions concerned. Retracted articles shall remain accessible in the journal archive, clearly marked as retracted and accompanied by the relevant notice, in order to preserve the traceability of the scholarly record.

3. Responsibilities of authors

Authors are responsible for the entire content of the work they submit and for the accuracy of the information, data, sources and interpretations included. Submission of a manuscript implies acceptance of the journal's editorial requirements and the principles set out in this code.

3.1. Originality, unpublished content and simultaneous submission

Submissions must be original and unpublished and must not be under consideration simultaneously by another journal or publication. Authors shall disclose any previous publication, preliminary version, conference paper, chapter, preprint or related material that substantially overlaps with the submitted manuscript.

Expanded versions of conference papers or abstracts may be accepted where they contain substantial new contributions, identify the earlier version and cite it appropriately. Any reuse or translation of previous work shall be disclosed and justified, avoiding redundant publication.

3.2. Plagiarism, self-plagiarism and research manipulation

The following, among other practices, are contrary to research ethics:

- Plagiarism: presenting other people's ideas, texts, data, images, documents or findings as one's own without proper acknowledgement.
- Self-plagiarism or undisclosed reuse: reproducing substantial parts of one's own previously published work without identifying the source or justifying the reuse.
- Duplicate or redundant publication: submitting or publishing substantially the same work in more than one publication without transparency or justification.
- Data fabrication: inventing data, sources, testimonies, references or findings.
- Falsification or manipulation: altering, selecting or omitting data, images, sources or findings in a way that distorts the research.
- Citation manipulation: including irrelevant references or requesting unjustified citations to artificially increase citation metrics.

The RDH may request explanations, supporting documentation or earlier versions of the work where there are reasonable indications of such practices. Detection of a possible irregularity may lead to rejection or, if the article has already been published, to correction or retraction procedures.

3.3. Sources, citations and use of materials

Authors shall accurately identify and cite the documentary, bibliographic, statistical, visual and digital sources used. Direct quotations shall be clearly distinguished from paraphrases and shall follow the journal's citation style.

Information obtained through conversations, correspondence, interviews or private communications shall not be used without the consent of the person who provided it, unless there is a lawful basis and confidentiality and data-protection obligations are respected.

Where protected texts, tables, images, photographs, maps, charts or other materials are reproduced, authors are responsible for obtaining the necessary permissions and stating their provenance. The conditions of use established by archives, repositories, holding institutions and documentary collections shall also be respected.

3.4. Authorship and contributions

Authorship shall be limited to those who have made a substantial intellectual contribution to the work. Data collection, technical support, funding acquisition or general supervision alone do not justify inclusion as an author.

All named authors shall have participated in the conception or development of the research, drafting or critical revision of the manuscript, and approval of the final version. They shall also take responsibility for their contributions and cooperate in resolving questions concerning the accuracy or integrity of the work.

The corresponding author shall ensure that all persons who meet the authorship criteria are listed, that no person who does not meet those criteria is included, and that all named authors have approved both the submitted and final versions. Individual contributions shall be declared in accordance with the journal's instructions.

Contributions that do not meet the authorship criteria may be acknowledged in the acknowledgements section, provided that the persons concerned have given their consent.

3.5. Funding and acknowledgements

Authors shall disclose all sources of funding that contributed to the research, indicating, where applicable, the funding body and project code or reference. They shall also report relevant grants, scholarships or institutional support. Disclosure of funding does not in itself imply a conflict of interest.

3.6. Conflicts of interest involving authors

Authors shall disclose any personal, professional, institutional, financial or commercial relationship that could influence the design of the research, interpretation of findings or presentation of the manuscript, or could reasonably be perceived as doing so. If no conflict exists, this shall be expressly stated.

3.7. Data availability and management

Authors shall clearly describe the sources and procedures used to obtain, select, process and analyse the data, to the extent necessary for the research to be understood and assessed. Where possible and legally permissible, information shall be provided on data availability or on how access may be requested.

In research based on historical documents, archives, nominative registers or personal data, availability shall be reconciled with applicable legal, archival, contractual and ethical restrictions. Public dissemination of protected, confidential or access-restricted materials shall not be required.

3.8. Data protection, consent and ethical considerations

Where research uses interviews, testimonies, personal data or materials that make living persons identifiable, authors shall comply with applicable data-protection legislation and, where appropriate, obtain informed consent from participants. Relevant ethical procedures shall be explained in the methodology section without disclosing identifying information where authorisation has not been granted.

Research involving vulnerable persons or groups requires particular attention to privacy, confidentiality, risk minimisation and the responsible use of testimonies and images. Where required, approval by the relevant ethics committee shall be stated, or the reason why such approval does not apply shall be explained.

3.9. Use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools

Artificial intelligence tools may not be listed as authors or assume responsibility for an article's content. Ultimate responsibility for the accuracy, originality, integrity and legality of the manuscript rests exclusively with its authors.

Where AI tools are used for substantive research or manuscript-preparation tasks—for example, text generation or transformation, translation, analysis, classification or image production—authors shall disclose the tool used, its purpose and the extent of its contribution. There is no need to disclose conventional spelling-correction or reference-management tools that do not generate intellectual content.

Authors shall verify all generated information, particularly bibliographic references, quotations, transcriptions, data and factual claims. They shall not attribute non-existent references to real sources or present unverified findings as established. They shall also refrain from entering personal data, confidential materials or restricted documentation into external tools.

3.10. Errors in published works

If an author identifies a significant error or inaccuracy in a published work, they shall promptly inform the journal's editor and cooperate in publishing a correction, clarification or retraction, depending on the seriousness of the problem.

4. Responsibilities of external reviewers

External review is an essential part of the RDH's scientific quality-control process. Reviewers shall act with rigour, independence, respect and responsibility, and help improve manuscripts through well-founded comments.

4.1. Acceptance of review and expertise

An invited reviewer shall accept an assignment only if they have sufficient expertise in the subject and can complete the review within the specified timeframe. If they lack the necessary expertise or cannot meet the deadline, they shall inform the journal as soon as possible so that another reviewer can be appointed.

4.2. Confidentiality

Manuscripts received for review are confidential documents. They may not be shared, disseminated, reproduced or used for personal or third-party benefit. Reviewers shall not contact authors directly about the manuscript without the editorial team's authorisation.

The manuscript, or substantial parts of it, shall not be uploaded to generative AI tools or other external services that may store, reuse or expose its content. If specialist advice from another person is required, prior authorisation shall be obtained from the editorial team and anonymity shall be preserved.

4.3. Objectivity and quality of reports

Reviews shall be objective, constructive, respectful and sufficiently reasoned. The work shall be assessed as a whole, including its aims, historiographical framework, sources, methodology, analysis, findings, conclusions, structure and presentation. Criticism shall address the scholarly content and avoid offensive remarks or personal attacks.

Reviewers shall identify possible errors, significant omissions, methodological problems, inappropriate references or indications of misconduct. They shall not use the review to promote their own or third parties' citations unless academically justified.

4.4. Timeliness and compliance with deadlines

Reports should normally be submitted within 30 days and no later than 90 days. If an impediment arises, the reviewer shall inform the editorial team and provide a reasonable expected delivery date or decline the assignment.

4.5. Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers shall identify relevant publications that have not been cited where their inclusion is necessary to assess the state of the art or support the work. They shall also point out inaccurate or incomplete citations, or citations that do not support the claims to which they refer.

4.6. Conflicts of interest

An invited reviewer shall decline the assignment if personal, professional, institutional, financial or academic relationships could compromise their impartiality. Such circumstances include family relationships, recent collaboration, co-authorship, membership of the same project or research group, thesis supervision or co-supervision, and manifest academic rivalry.

If a conflict is identified after accepting the assignment, the reviewer shall inform the editorial team immediately and suspend the review until instructions are received.

5. Handling possible misconduct and complaints

The RDH shall treat allegations of misconduct seriously, confidentially, impartially and diligently. Reports should provide specific information and supporting documentation wherever possible. Misconduct shall not be presumed without examination of the available evidence.

Where there are well-founded suspicions, the editor may:

- Request explanations from authors or other persons involved and require relevant documentation.
- Consult Editorial Board members or independent specialists who have no conflict of interest.
- Temporarily suspend the editorial process while the facts are clarified.
- Reject the manuscript where a confirmed breach makes publication impossible.
- Take corrective action, issue an expression of concern or retract the work if it has already been published.
- Refer the matter to the competent institution where the seriousness and nature of the irregularity warrant it.

The journal shall, to the extent possible and in accordance with applicable law, protect the confidentiality of those who report possible irregularities in good faith. The persons concerned shall have an opportunity to respond to the allegations before a final decision is made, unless there are justified reasons to act otherwise.

6. Archiving, preservation and editorial traceability

The RDH shall securely retain the documentation necessary to evidence editorial management, including submitted manuscripts, revised versions, correspondence with authors and reviewers, review reports and editorial decisions, in accordance with applicable retention periods and obligations.

The journal shall promote the long-term preservation and availability of published content, maintaining the integrity of files and their metadata. Corrections and retractions shall be linked to the relevant article in order to preserve the traceability of the scholarly record.

7. Privacy and protection of information

Names, email addresses and other personal data supplied to the RDH shall be used exclusively for purposes connected with editorial management, review, statistical information, publication and the journal's institutional communications, in accordance with applicable law. They shall not be disclosed to third parties for commercial purposes or used for unrelated purposes.

Access to personal data and editorial documentation shall be limited to those who need it to perform their duties. The journal shall take reasonable measures to prevent unauthorised access, disclosure or retention.

8. Copyright and open-access publication

The RDH publishes its content in open access (OA) under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence (CC BY-NC-NA 4.0). Authors retain ownership of the intellectual property rights and authorship of their works, in accordance with the licence terms and the journal's publication policy.

The journal permits immediate deposit, with no embargo period (0 months), of the final published version of the article (publisher's PDF) in institutional or subject repositories, personal websites and other academic platforms, provided that the licence terms are respected, the original publication is acknowledged and the relevant DOI is included.

The authorisation granted to the journal to edit, reproduce, distribute, communicate to the public and disseminate articles shall be interpreted consistently with authors retaining copyright and publication under the CC BY-NC-NA 4.0 licence. The journal's identification and publication-authorisation form shall not be framed as a full transfer of ownership where the applicable arrangement is one of retained rights and open-licence publication.

9. Graphic materials and website content

The journal shall endeavour to ensure that images, illustrations and other materials included on its website are used with the necessary authorisation, licence or lawful basis. If material is found to have been published without the required acknowledgement or permission, appropriate steps shall be taken to correct the attribution, obtain authorisation or remove the material.

10. Advertising policy and commercial independence

The RDH does not include commercial advertising in its editorial content. Any dissemination of tables of contents, news or information about related scholarly publications shall not influence editorial decisions or compromise the journal's independence, impartiality or academic quality.

11. Updating and implementation of the code

This code applies to works submitted to and published by the RDH and to all persons involved in its editorial process. The Editorial Board is responsible for its dissemination, implementation and periodic review, in order to adapt it to developments in scholarly publishing best practice, COPE recommendations and applicable legislation.

Any substantial amendment to the code shall be approved by the journal's responsible bodies and publicly announced through its official channels.

12. References and good-practice frameworks

- Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Core Practices: https://publicationethics.org/core-practices
- COPE. Guidelines and flowcharts: https://publicationethics.org/guidance
- Norba. Revista de Historia (2026). Ethical Code – Good Practice Guide: https://revista-norbahistoria.unex.es/index.php/NRH/Etica
- Editorial CSIC (2025). Good Practice Guide for Scientific-Academic Publishing. The Publication of Journals and Books by Editorial CSIC (version 3.3, May 2025): http://revistas.csic.es/public/guia_buenas_practicas_CSIC.pdf
- UNESCO (1999). Declaration on Science and the Use of Scientific Knowledge and Science Agenda – Framework for Action: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000116994