

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS

HOW TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS TO <i>QUAESTIO FACTI</i>	2
EDITING RULES	2
Presentation of the manuscripts	2
Presentation of the content.....	2
SECTION POLICIES	3
COPYRIGHT NOTICE	4
ETHICAL GUIDELINES	4
Ethical commitment	4
Procedure for unethical behaviour	5
Anti-plagiarism policy	5
PEER REVIEW PROCESS	6
Guarantee of blind peer review	7



HOW TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS TO QUAESTIO FACTI

All manuscripts should be submitted to the *Quaestio facti*'s Open Journal System website [Online Submissions](#).

Content and format: It is only accepted original and unpublished articles, in both Word and PDF format.

Review: Once received, all manuscripts will be subject to a first formal revision by the editorial board and, if approved, to a blind peer-review process.

Languages: Manuscripts in Spanish, English, Italian, and Portuguese will be accepted.

Extension: It is suggested that the manuscripts do not exceed 15,000 words. Within the section *Conjectures and refutations*, the latter should not exceed 5,000 words.

To submit and publish an article, the journal does not require any fee payment.

EDITING RULES

Presentation of the manuscripts

The manuscripts should include:

1. The author's full name, academic affiliation, and e-mail contact address
2. The article's title. If it contains a subtitle, it should appear in a separate line (following the title)
3. The article's title and subtitle in English
4. An abstract of no more than 150 words in the article's original language.
5. An abstract in English, if this were not the article's original language.
6. 5 key-words in the article's original language
7. 5 key-words in English, if this were not the article's original language
8. Blind-review version of the manuscripts: All manuscripts should include an additional version that will be subject to blind peer-review. **Any information that might identify the author must be removed from this version, including the metadata of the submitted document.**

Presentation of the content

1. *Font and size*

All manuscripts should be written using 12-point Times New Roman font and applying a 1.5 spacing. Each paragraph should begin with an indentation.

2. *Notes*

All notes should be typed single-spaced using 10-point Times New Roman Font, without any indentation. Notes should be numbered consecutively starting from the number 1.

3. *Titles and subtitles*

Titles and subtitles should be structured in the following order: 1, 1.1, 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 2, and so on.

4. *References*

The bibliographical references should follow the **APA (7th edition)** style.

- Short citations (with an extension of 39 words or less) in the main text or in the notes must be flanked by «guillemets» and not be written in italics.

- Long citations (40 words or more in length) should not have quotation marks, and it should appear separate from the text, using 10-point centered font.
- The citations should include the following reference data: author's last name, year, pagination. For example: (Ramírez, 2009, p. 56)

5. Bibliography

It should be ordered alphabetically by the first author's last name and be located at the end of the manuscript according to the APA (7th edition) format.

- Books: Last name, first name initial. (year). *Title of the book in italics: subtitle* (edition, if included). Publisher.
- Journal article: Last name, first name initial. (year). Title of the journal article: subtitle. *The journal's title in italics, volume in italics*(journal number in parentheses), page range.
- Book chapter: Last name, first name initial. (year). Title of the chapter: subtitle. In Initial of author's name and last name (ed.), *The book's title in italics: subtitle* (edition, if included, page range). Publisher.

See the following examples:

Roberts, P. and Zuckerman, A. (2010). *Criminal Evidence* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Picinali, F. (2015). The threshold lies in the method: instructing jurors about reasoning beyond reasonable doubt. *International Journal of Evidence and Proof*, 19(3), pp. 139-153.

Champod, C. (2009). Identification and Individualization. In A. Moenssens and A. Jamieson (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Forensic Sciences* (p. 1508-1511). Wiley.

- Legislation and law cases: consult *Quaestio facti*'s criteria regarding the citation of legislation and law cases.

If an author has various publications in the same year, a letter should be put next to the date beginning with a, b, c... and order the references by year of publication, oldest to newest.

The legislation and law cases references must be included in the bibliography on a separate list.

6. Other criteria

- Quotation marks inside quotation marks will be substituted by "quotation marks"
- In lower case: Authors should also observe the following criteria: the law; legal system; judge; court; prosecutor; chapter
- In upper case: Supreme Court (and other institutions); State
- Use the symbol § for "paragraph"

SECTION POLICIES

Opinions will be issued taking into account the objectives and requirements of the section for which the evaluated paper is submitted. Remember that the sections of the journal are:

(a) Articles. they must be original and outstanding works in the discipline. It is suggested that the texts should not exceed 15,000 words.

(b) Conjectures and refutations. The section contains a text as Conjecture followed by a plurality of short texts as Refutation. It is suggested that the Conjecture texts should not exceed 15,000 words. Refutations should in no case exceed 5,000 words.

(c) *Iuris prudentia*. The section publishes comments on relevant judgments on matters of law and/or evidentiary reasoning.

(d) Science for Legal Proceedings. The section publishes news or analysis of science, relevant to its application in the process.

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

The submission of articles for publication in *Quaestio facti: International Journal on Evidential Reasoning* implies acceptance of the following terms:

(a) The author agrees to respect the ethical guidelines of the journal.

(b) *Quaestio facti* is granted the right of first publication and the license to publish the submitted text in all and printed and electronic formats of the journal.

(c) The author retains copyright and assigns *Marcial Pons* exclusive publishing rights and non-exclusive exploitation rights (reproduction, distribution, public communication, and transformation) to exploit and commercialize the work, in full or in part, in all present or future formats and modes of exploitation, in all languages, for the entire lifetime of the work and throughout the world.

(d) Content published in *Quaestio facti* is subject to a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY)**, the full text of which is available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>. Therefore, copying, distribution, public communication, commercial use and derivative works of the contents of the journal are permitted provided that the source of the publication (*Quaestio facti*), the author of the article, the publisher (*Marcial Pons*) and the institution that publishes it (*Chair of Legal Culture, University of Girona*) is cited. It is the responsibility of the authors to obtain the necessary permissions for the images that may be subject to Copyright.

(e) For the purposes of any reprint, abbreviation or translation of an article from any of its sections, *Quaestio facti* undertakes to request authorization without delay from each author of the work in question, so that he or she may decide whether to authorize such publication.

(f) The authors who decide to republish their work in another journal or book must use the preprint version of the article, maintaining the rights of *Marcial Pons* referred to in section c), and should mention the previous appearance of the contribution in *Quaestio facti*.

(g) In accordance with section e), authors are allowed to deposit their work in general and/or thematic repositories, web pages, etc., for the *preprint* version (version sent for review), *postprint* version (once reviewed and accepted for publication) and the final published article. This self-archiving policy contributes to the dissemination and visibility of articles published in the journal and of *Quaestio facti*.

ETHICAL GUIDELINES

Quaestio facti: International Journal on Evidential Reasoning adheres to the guidelines set by EASE (European Association of Science Editors) for the management, editing, review and publication of scientific results in journals from different fields of knowledge and to the principles of transparency and good practice in academic publications of COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics). The following commitments and procedures are defined in accordance with those guidelines.

Ethical commitment

1. The *authors* undertake to:

- Submit papers which have not been previously published and which are not subject to evaluation by other journals until the evaluation process by this journal has been completed.
 - Accept the rules of publication, review and evaluation of the journal. Submission of papers for evaluation requires a blind copy with the omission of any data that may be identified by the reviewers regarding its authorship.
 - Immediately notify the journal of any situation that may compromise an ethical publication, such as errors in the work submitted, possible conflicts of interest on the part of the author, omission of authors, unauthorized use of images or other elements, unreferenced quotes or plagiarism, and actively collaborate with publishers to address these errors.
2. The *reviewers* of the papers undertake to conduct a critical, honest and constructive review of the scientific quality of the text within the scope of their knowledge and skills. Therefore, they will only review a work if they are competent in the subject to be reviewed and if there are no conflicts of interest. *Quaestio facti* will inform authors in due time and manner about the acceptance or rejection of their work (within a maximum period of five months), ensuring a respectful edition regarding the style and ideas of each author, allowing adequate time for the correction of the final edition.
3. The *Directors, members of the Editorial Board and members of the Advisory Board* undertake to respect the impartiality and confidentiality of the work submitted, its authors and reviewers, so that anonymity preserves the integrity of the entire evaluation process. To this end, they will ensure the selection of the most qualified and specialist reviewers in the field to issue a critical and expert assessment of the work. Furthermore, as far as possible, they will avoid all types of conflicts of interest and will strictly comply with the evaluation, editing and publication times required by the periodicity of the journal.

Procedure for unethical behaviour

Given the suspicion and/or knowledge that bad practice or unethical behaviour have been perpetuated in either published works or those that are in the process of being revised or edited, publishers will undertake appropriate measures to identify such irregularities and/or resolve them. To do this, the editors:

- will guarantee a thorough pre-selection before submitting the articles for review and publication.
- will ask for explanations directly from the authors when a possible infraction is detected, providing the necessary evidence, and they will ask for their collaboration to remedy it.
- will work with professional institutions to investigate the ethics of the publications should an investigation be deemed necessary because the explanations are considered insufficient.

If bad practices are detected during the editing process and the author corrects them, the process will continue. If the author does not accept the proposals or the explanations are considered insufficient, the article will be rejected.

If these unethical behaviours are discovered after the publication of the article, an editorial note will be published, the article will be withdrawn and/or legal action will be taken, depending on the severity.

The Directors, members of the Editorial Board and members of the Advisory Board urge the submission of complaints and appeals regarding possible misconduct in articles published in *Quaestio facti*, as well as of the journal itself, and undertake to respond to them.

Any such communication may be sent to the e-mail of the journal (quaestiofacti@udg.edu) or through the “[Contact](#)” section of the website.

Anti-plagiarism policy

As a specific anti-plagiarism measure, *Quaestio facti* will use plagiarism detection programs for those articles it deems necessary.

Plagiarism is considered serious unethical behaviour and, as such, all articles suspected of plagiarism will be rejected or removed if they have been published.

PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Articles published in *Quaestio facti* are evaluated as follows:

1. All texts received are subject to **formal review by the journal's editorial board**. In this phase of general review, proposals are discarded when they are not in line with the objectives of the journal and/or the scientific quality is not of the desired standard.

Authors of articles rejected for non-compliance with the formal requirements set out in the “Guidelines for Authors” section are given a period of 10 days to correct deficiencies.

Articles accepted in this first instance are submitted for evaluation following the blind peer review process.

2. The **blind peer review** consists of the review and evaluation of the article by experts in the field, chosen by the editorial board, according to their skills and knowledge.

The authors of articles are unknown to reviewers, just as authors do not know who reviews their articles.

The articles in the "*General*" section are subject to double blind peer review, that is to say they are evaluated by two different experts. The articles in the "*Conjectures and refutations*", "*Science for legal proceedings*" and "*Iuris-prudentia*" sections follow the same review process conducted by a single expert.

Reviewers are committed to conducting a critical, honest, and constructive review of the scientific quality of the text within the scope of their knowledge and skills. Therefore, they will only review a work if they are competent in the subject to be reviewed and if there are no conflicts of interest.

Reviewers should issue a report to the journal board detailing whether the article meets the criteria defined by the journal. These are:

- The title reflects the content of the text
- The structure of the text is coherent
- The wording is correct and clear
- The bibliography is up-to-date and properly referenced
- The article contains significant contributions to the thematic area of the journal

Furthermore, the report determines if the article reviewed:

- Is accepted
- Is accepted with the condition of incorporating the proposed modifications. The time allowed to make changes will depend on each item and the suggested changes
- Is not accepted

Should the reports of an article conclude with opposing opinions, the opinion of a third reviewer would be sought.

Quaestio facti will inform authors on the acceptance or rejection of their work within a maximum period of five months.

The journal and the editors will produce a layout and edition of the accepted articles respecting the style and ideas of each author.

Once the article is reviewed, accepted and the layout is finalized, it will be published immediately on the journal's website. The final publication of the article will coincide with the publication of the full issue in January or June of the corresponding year, depending on the section of which it is part.

Guarantee of blind peer review

To ensure that the evaluation of the articles follows the premises of blind review, the authors are asked to send a copy of the article without any personal or identifying data.

Similarly, during the formal review phase, the editorial board verifies that the blind copy of the article meets the required conditions.