Line of conduct and rules adopted by the journal

The editorial board in close conjunction with the scientific committee ensures the Revue de la régulation acts in accordance with the editorial line.

The editorial board is responsible for the journal’s published contents and is constantly looking to improve its academic quality. It oversees the regular renewal of its reading committee and its academic board as well as its own renewal.

The editorial board examines the acceptability of each manuscript submitted and undertakes to do so within 30 days at most. Acceptability is determined on the merits of the manuscript alone and in no way takes account of any non-academic criteria. The editorial board reserves the right to reject any manuscript submitted without passing it on to reviewers (desk reject) if it deems the manuscript is unsuitable for publication or is not consistent with the Revue’s editorial line. These principles apply both to scholarly papers proposed for thematic issues and manuscripts unrelated to any thematic issues (Varia section).

Where an academic manuscript is submitted by a member of the editorial board, that member cannot participate in any manner in discussions concerning the manuscript. The editorial board ensures that no information concerning the processing of the manuscript is disclosed to the member during the review process, which is conducted in compliance with the principles of a double-blind peer review.

In the event an academic manuscript is submitted by an editor of a thematic issue, the foregoing rules apply likewise.

For every academic manuscript that is deemed admissible, the editorial board appoints two reviewers who are not on the editorial board (by a double-blind peer review process) and a member of the editorial board is appointed as the handling editor. This member is tasked with monitoring the manuscript and drafting the summary of the reviews of the manuscript to be sent to the authors together with the peer reviews.

In choosing the independent reviewers and the handling editor, the editorial board of the Revue de la régulation is careful:
• not to assign a manuscript to a reviewer or handling editor known to be in a position of rivalry or to have a conflict of interests with the author(s) that would threaten both the anonymity and objectivity of the report;
• not to assign a manuscript to a reviewer or handling editor who is intellectually, institutionally or personally too close to the author(s), which again might jeopardize the objectivity of the review;
• to choose referees with complementary areas of expertise, especially when the manuscript is of an interdisciplinary character.

The editorial board’s expectations of the reviewers are specified in the standard forms sent out. They guide the drafting of reports and can be found on the journal’s website, in French and in English.

The editorial board undertakes to keep the peer-review process confidential and to see that it is completed in a timely manner.

After a process of revision of the manuscript by the author(s), the editorial board makes a final, positive or negative, decision depending on how the author(s) have addressed the suggestions and comments made by the reviewers and members of the editorial board.

Every submission that is accepted, whether at first reading or after modification by the author(s), is subject to editing in conjunction with the author(s). In all circumstances, the editorial board takes account in its decisions of the statutory and usual requirements concerning defamation, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editorial board reserves the right to use Compilatio software.

Upon receiving the reviews, the editorial board remains the sole decision-maker as to whether the manuscript is accepted for publication, acceptable with modifications, or rejected.

The editorial board of the Revue de la régulation is also careful:

• to assess the relevance and standard of the reviews received. If a review fails to satisfy its criteria, the manuscript is sent to a new reviewer;
• to make sure the wording of the review does not appear insulting or disparaging to the author(s). If necessary, the editorial board may temper the form of the reviews sent on to the author(s) without, however, changing the substance or the line argument;
• if the author(s) of the manuscript make a properly argued challenge as to the quality and relevance of the reviews, the editorial board, after re-reading the manuscript and reviews and deliberating thereon, may appoint other independent reviewers.

Without contravening the principles of equal treatment in the review process, the editorial board is particularly keen to support young scholars in revising their manuscripts. Accordingly, considering that the output of less experienced scholars may be reflected in the initial version of the manuscript by clumsiness, omissions or lack of perspective:

• the editorial board seeks to be particularly alert to the potential for improvement of the manuscript and therefore ensures closer support for the author(s) at each stage of the process, especially by making highly detailed recommendations for the successive versions, which may be more numerous than for manuscripts submitted by experienced scholars.
• the final version of the manuscript must even so comply with the same criteria as to form and substance as any other article published in the journal.

Line of conduct and rules to be adopted by authors
In submitting a manuscript to the Revue de la régulation, authors guarantee that the manuscript is original. They certify that the manuscript has not been published previously and that it has not been submitted concurrently to any other journal. Nonetheless, original manuscripts available elsewhere in the form of working documents may be accepted.

Every submission shall comply with the rules of intellectual property in force and present an exhaustive list of references complying with the journal’s instructions for presentation.

All authors having made a significant contribution to the writing of the manuscript shall be listed as authors, together with their academic affiliations, either in alphabetical order or by their degree of involvement in writing the submission. The corresponding author shall ensure that only appropriate joint authors are included in the author list and that all joint authors have agreed to submission and then to publication.

Authors shall declare any potential conflict of interest or any professional or financial interest. All sources of non-public financing for the research presented in the submission shall be stated explicitly.

When authors receive requests for revisions, they agree to provide:

1. the revised version of their manuscript;
2. a version of the manuscript as revised showing the changes made;
3. a letter explaining in detail how they have taken account of the requests for revision.

All authors who, once the manuscript has been accepted or after its publication, discover any error or serious inaccuracy in their own work shall immediately advise the journal’s editorial board. Authors undertake to cooperate with the editorial board to publish any errata, or even to give notice of retraction of the work.
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