

---

## STATEMENT ON ETHICS AND GOOD PUBLICATION PRACTICE

---

The journal “**Enfermería en Cardiología**” (*Nurses in Cardiology*) is committed to guaranteeing the ethics and quality of publications with reference to the Code of Good Practice in Research and Innovation and the Code of Conduct and Good Practices for Editors of Scientific Journals defined by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

The Editorial Committee of the journal undertakes to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies when necessary. In compliance with these good practices, the refereeing system used for the selection of articles is published, along with the evaluation criteria that external evaluators (anonymous and peer) must apply. The journal keeps these criteria up to date, based exclusively on the scientific relevance, originality, clarity, and pertinence of the article presented.

### 1. Responsibilities of the authors

The works submitted for publication by the authors must be original and unpublished. They must justify the reason for this research, offer detailed data and results of high scientific interest, and then include an objective discussion of these results. Scientific articles must be reproducible in other areas or centres that allow confirming or refuting the conclusions of the work.

Authors must follow the ethical considerations of scientific studies, ensuring the anonymity and confidentiality of the objects of study, and must ensure that the study has been conducted following current official standards and in accordance with the World Medical Association and the Declaration of Helsinki (<https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/>).

Authors must present their results clearly, honestly, and without falsification or improper manipulation of data. They must ensure that the data are original and have not been copied, invented, distorted, or manipulated.

Plagiarism in all its forms and multiple or redundant publications, as well as the invention or manipulation of data, are considered serious ethical faults and scientific fraud. Self-plagiarism is also considered deception and scientifically dishonest.

The authorship of the manuscript will correspond to the authors signing the work, who must be those

who contributed to its conception, performance, and development, as well as obtaining data, interpretation of the results, writing, and review. All authors must have contributed significantly to the research.

Authors must inform the editorial team if they have a direct or indirect conflict of interest.

In case of detection of an error in study design or data interpretation, the authors must communicate this as soon as possible to modify the article, withdraw it, or subsequently publish an erratum.

Authors are required to participate in the peer review process and respond to requests from the editorial committee.

### 2. Responsibilities of the editor

The editorial team is committed to carrying out a critical, sincere, constructive, and impartial review of the works. It should also respect the intellectual independence of authors, who should be granted the right to reply if they have been negatively evaluated, and to be evaluated as quickly as possible in order to respect deadlines.

Reviewers will not review manuscripts for which they do not consider themselves competent regarding the subject of study. Nor should they review if there is a conflict of interest with the subject studied.

The editorial process and the editors will guarantee the confidentiality of an article until its publication. Likewise, no person from the editorial team may use data, arguments, or interpretations contained in unpublished works for their own research, except with the express written consent of the person or persons who carried it out.

Reviewers should provide a full critical report with adequate references during the correction process, especially in cases of rejection. They must also inform the journal about suspicions of plagiarism, self-plagiarism, or multiple publications.

#### 2.1. Decision to publish

All articles will first be assessed and evaluated by the director of the journal. In this first step, it must be decided whether a work is suitable for publication, evaluating whether it meets editorial objectives and regulations. After the initial acceptance, it is sent to two independent reviewers (in double-blind mode), experts in their field and able to evaluate the specific

qualities of the work. The editorial team is responsible for the final decision on whether the paper is accepted or rejected.

The assessment will take into account the interest of the article, its contribution to the knowledge of the subject treated, the novelties provided, the correctly established relationships, the critical judgment developed in it, the bibliographic references used, the correct writing, etc., and will indicate recommendations, if pertinent, to achieve any possible improvement.

The decision to publish an article will always be made according to its importance for researchers, professionals, and potential readers. The editorial team must make unbiased decisions regardless of commercial considerations.

The editorial team should not make any decisions about a manuscript if there are conflicts of interest or relationships that pose potential problems with respect to the articles under consideration. Responsibility for the final decision regarding publication will be attributed to the members of the Editorial Team who do not have any conflict of interest.

## **2.2. Review of the works**

The editorial team must ensure that the work is evaluated by at least two specialists in the field, and that this review process has been fair and impartial.

In accordance with reviewers' recommendations, the journal will inform the author or authors regarding the reasoned result of the evaluation by email. The reviewers will confidentially communicate the result of the review (publication without changes, publication with minor corrections, publication with important corrections, or not advisable to publish) and their observations and comments. If the manuscript has been accepted with modifications, the author or authors must resubmit a new version of the article answering the demands and suggestions of the external evaluators.

It is the responsibility of the editorial team to dispense, if necessary, with members of the review team in the case of evaluations of low quality, incorrect, disrespectful, or delivered after the established deadlines.

## **2.3. Identification and prevention of misconduct**

It is the journal's responsibility to prevent misconduct by informing authors and reviewers regarding the ethical behaviour required of them.

The reviewers and editorial team will be asked to identify documents susceptible to research misconduct in order to process the corresponding complaint.

The journal should keep the flow of the article under review to evaluate misconduct and its evolution over time.

In case of complaint, allegation, or dispute, the director of the journal will contact the author to hear their version.

In the case of detecting misconduct, or that corrections must be made, the director of the journal must resolve it based on the recommendations of the COPE.

It is important to carry out a thorough assessment in the case of suspicion, to distinguish cases of human error from a deliberate intent to defraud.

The journal may withdraw a publication in the case of misconduct, issue a note in the case of inconclusive evidence of misconduct, or request correction of the affected excerpt.

## **3. Responsibilities of the reviewers**

All reviewers must know and take into account the editorial policy and the statement on ethics and good practice in publishing of the journal.

The journal must ensure that potential reviewers have recognised and proven work or scientific experience in a field of knowledge. Potential reviewers should provide the information necessary to demonstrate their degree of work and scientific experience, if necessary.

Likewise, all reviewers should abstain if they know that they are not qualified to evaluate a manuscript, if they consider that their evaluation of the material will not be objective, or if they consider themselves in conflict of interest.

Reviewers should evaluate the suitability of the bibliography used and recommend literature to authors, if known.

Reviewers are requested to identify documents in which research misconduct has occurred or appears to have occurred and report to the Editorial Team, which will treat each case accordingly.