

CHARTER OF THE JSSJ JOURNAL

Justice Spatiale|*Spatial Justice* (JSSJ) is a bilingual English-French, multidisciplinary, peer-reviewed international scientific journal whose main aim is to contribute to the production and promotion of knowledge and understanding of the issues surrounding spatial justice. It is based at the address given in the statutes of the non-profit organisation that supports it.

JSSJ is committed to complying with the ethical standards and good practice recommended by the Journal’s supervisory bodies, including the CNRS Institut des sciences humaines et sociales.

- 1. How the journal operates 2
 - The Editorial Board..... 2
 - Missions 2
 - Decision-making 2
 - Appointment and renewal process..... 2
 - The editorial team..... 3
 - Missions 3
 - Appointment and renewal process..... 3
 - The Scientific Committee 3
 - Tasks : 3
 - Appointment and renewal process..... 3
- 2. Publication policy and evaluation process 4
 - Submitting thematic dossiers..... 4
 - Appointments of theme file coordinators and section editors..... 4
 - Authors’ undertakings..... 5
 - Reviewers’ undertakings 5
 - Manuscript review procedures 5
- 3. Actions subsequent to misconduct or plagiarism 7

1. How the Journal operates

The core of the Journal is the Editorial Board, of which the Editor-in-Chief is a member. The Journal also has a Scientific Committee.

➤ The Editorial Board

- **Missions**

The Editorial Board is the core of JSSJ's operations. Its members meet regularly (at least four times a year) and take decisions on the running of JSSJ, publication projects and the Journal's reputation. The Editorial Board also ensures that JSSJ complies with its commitment to ethical and scientific standards in its review and publication processes. The Editorial Board helps to resolve any disputes that may arise in connection with the operation of the Journal.

- **Decision-making**

The JSSJ Editorial Board operates on the principle of academic collegiality, which means that differences of opinion are taken into consideration without value judgement or discrimination. All members, including the Editor-in-Chief, have equal decision-making powers. If certain decisions do not meet with unanimous approval, the Editorial Board takes a vote and a simple majority prevails.

- **Appointment and renewal process**

The Editorial Board is formed in a way that respects the diversity of its its members' status, affiliations and approaches, while taking account of its location at Paris Nanterre University and the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme (MSH) Mondes.

When it becomes necessary to add to the membership of the Board, in order to identify individuals whose interests converge with those of the Journal, priority consideration is given to candidates who have coordinated an issue or published an article or regularly assessed articles for the Journal. They are appointed by a 2/3 majority of the votes cast.

The terms of office are 4 years, renewable twice, subject to genuine participation in the work of the Editorial Board.

The Journal pays particular attention to diversity in the backgrounds and social and status situations of its members. In its operations, as in its editorial policy, it therefore values and supports people who may be invisible or marginalised in university research (untentured employees in higher education and research, young researchers). Its members ensure that speaking time is balanced and all are encouraged to take initiative and to adopt their own positions.

➤ **The editorial team**

- **Missions**

The Editor-in-Chief role is a collegial position. It is carried out by at least two people. It oversees the publication schedule in concert with the Journal's editor and monitors issues in consultation with the coordinators and section heads. It liaises with the translators. It is also responsible for writing the editorial for each issue, and may involve members of the Editorial Board.

It is responsible for funding applications and presents the financial statement to the Editorial Board each year. It liaises with the supervisory bodies, in particular MSH Mondes.

- **Appointment and renewal process**

The Editors-in-Chief are appointed by the full Editorial Board from among the members of the Editorial Board or the Scientific Committee.

Editors are appointed for a period of 4 years, renewable once. At the end of their term, Editors-in-Chief may join the Journal's Editorial Board or Scientific Committee.

➤ **The Scientific Committee**

- **Tasks:**

The Scientific Committee acts as the Journal's guarantor in dealings with supervisory and other bodies. It is consulted in the event of a conflict within the Editorial Board that cannot be resolved internally; it is consulted in the event of a proposed change in governance or a major change to the editorial line; it responds to any requests from the Editorial Board and the Editor-in-Chief to contribute to its scientific work (adversarial reviews, opinions on projects for scientific events organised by the Journal, etc.).

The Scientific Committee meets as often as necessary and at least once every 2 years—either jointly with the Editorial Board or not, depending on the items on the agenda.

- **Appointment and renewal process**

Members of the Scientific Committee may, if they so wish, include persons who have been editors-in-chief or members of the Editorial Board, as well as persons sitting in an ex officio capacity. Members are appointed for a period of 4 years, renewable as necessary in the light of their contribution to the Journal.

2. Publication policy and review process

Publication of articles on the JSSJ website (<https://www.jssj.org/>) is free of charge. Authors are therefore not charged at any stage of the publication process.

The Editorial Board ensures that all documents submitted to the Journal remain confidential throughout the review process and after its completion. No information about a submitted manuscript is provided except to the authors, reviewers, editors and members of the editorial board.

The editorial committee undertakes to do its utmost to ensure that manuscripts deemed admissible are evaluated within 15 weeks.

➤ **Submitting thematic dossiers**

Unsolicited proposals to coordinate thematic dossiers may be sent to the Journal. Proposals are first discussed by the Editorial Board. Coordination of thematic issues must involve at *least* one member of the Editorial Board. This person may be appointed upstream or downstream of the proposal. This person is responsible for ensuring that the issue is consistent with the Journal's editorial policy, and in particular for ensuring that exchanges with the Editorial Board, the publisher and the Editor-in-Chief run smoothly. As JSSJ is a bilingual English-French Journal, the coordination team must be able to read the texts and take part in discussions about them in both English and French.

➤ **Appointment of thematic dossier coordinators and section editors**

The coordinators and section editors manage the entire process leading up to publication.

- Identification of reviewers and presentation of articles to the Editorial Board, which may also make suggestions.
- Discussions with the reviewers and drafting of the summaries that accompany the reviews sent to the authors.
- Discussions with the authors.
- If necessary, discussion of problematic reviews with the Editorial Board or with the Editor-in-Chief between Board meetings.
- Discussion with the Editorial Board on the acceptance or rejection of articles.
- Suggestions for translators and discussion of these with the Editor-in-Chief, checking the quality of translations in dialogue with the authors where possible.

In the case of thematic dossiers, the decision to accept or reject an article *ultimately* rests with the Editorial Board. Thematic dossier coordinators are also encouraged to seek additional funding, particularly to cover translation costs. They , in conjunction with the section editors, monitor the articles in the sections where the theme is related to that of the thematic dossier.

➤ **Authors' undertakings**

Authors undertake to ensure that the article submitted is not undergoing evaluation and has not already been accepted for publication or been published elsewhere. If part of the content has already been submitted or published elsewhere, the authors will inform the Editor-in-Chief, the section editors or the coordinators, who will decide whether or not to accept the text anyway.

The Journal checks for plagiarism using plagiarism detection software.

Authors undertake to obtain permission to reproduce any content from other sources (photographs, maps, diagrams, audio, video) and to cite these sources. They will provide the publisher with proof of permission to reproduce such content.

Authors will ensure that the privacy of the people involved in the surveys is respected (including image rights). JSSJ considers that research ethics include the protection of vulnerable people and expects articles to present the methodological protocol in such a way as to ensure that this principle has been respected.

➤ **Reviewers' undertakings**

The peer review process is guided by a concern for rigorous and sympathetic evaluation of manuscripts submitted for review. All manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential.

Reviewers must consider the plurality of schools of thought and theoretical positions. They shall clearly express their opinion and back it up with appropriate arguments to enable the manuscript to be improved, through constructive criticism, with a view to its publication. The Editorial Board reserves the right not to pass on inappropriate comments to the authors, and undertakes not to contact colleagues who have made such comments.

If a reviewer considers that he or she has a conflict of interest, he or she will inform the Editorial Board, which will decide what action to take.

Reviewers undertake not to divulge any information about the article outside the editorial team and the peer review process. They will be kept informed of the outcome of the submission.

The list of reviewers is posted on the Journal's website for five continuous years, unless the reviewer requests otherwise.

➤ **Manuscript review procedures**

Submitted manuscripts are assessed for their intellectual content without discrimination on the basis of the authors' gender, sexual orientation, religious or political convictions or origin, and independently of any external support.

Before the manuscript is submitted for review, the Editorial Board will check that it reflects a scientific approach or aligns with the objectives of the section for texts submitted for Espace Public and JSSJ a v-l-u, and that it is in harmony with the Journal's editorial line. If this is not the case, the manuscript will be rejected at this stage. The Editorial Board is alert to potential conflicts of interest in the review of an article. If a member of the Board should find herself or himself in such a situation, she or he will withdraw from the review process and leave during the group discussions about the article concerned.

The manuscripts are then assessed by two reviewers, at least one of whom must be an external reviewer, in a double-blind process: the authors do not know the identity of the reviewers, and the reviewers do not know the identity of the authors. The Editorial Board, together with the coordinators of the dossier or section concerned, shall ensure that the anonymity of each author is preserved. Following the review, if the authors decide to modify their manuscript, the Editorial Board may propose either to continue the review anonymously or to lift anonymity and move to a collaborative mode based on direct interchanges if the reviewers and authors agree.

The Editorial Board alone has the power to decide whether an article should be rejected or definitively accepted. It may, if necessary, seek the opinion of other reviewers at any stage of the manuscript review process.

- **Review criteria**

The review is based on the following criteria:

- the originality of the manuscript;
- the interest and clarity of the scientific enquiry;
- the presence of an appropriate theoretical framework;
- the logical and analytical rigour of the argument;
- the value of the empirical data, the rigour of the methodology and the relevance of the results;
- suitability in relation to the call for contributions, the Journal's editorial line and the standards specific to each section;
- the quality of the figures.

The Journal proposes an evaluation grid that reviewers may choose whether or not to use.

- **Review steps**

The review is conducted in several steps, once the manuscript has been checked for conformity.

- Step 1. Appointment of reviewers by the Editorial Board on the recommendation of the thematic dossier coordinators or section editors, as appropriate.
- Step 2. The thematic dossier coordinators or section editors contact the selected reviewers, send them the manuscript and agree with them the deadline for submitting their review.
- Step 3. The reviewers submit their review report with their recommendation:
 - rejection;
 - requiring major modifications;
 - accept subject to minor modifications.

- Step 4. The thematic dossier coordinators or the section editors send a summary of the review to the authors. The Editorial Board is kept informed of the review feedback.
- Step 5. The authors revise their text, taking into account the requests made in the summary sent to them. They return their revised version within a reasonable time, highlighting the amended passages. In the case of major changes, they will include a text explaining the revisions made. Authors may also choose to withdraw their article. In this case, they will inform the Journal of their decision.

If the authors decide to modify their manuscript, the Editorial Board can propose one of the following options:

- 1) to continue the review anonymously;
 - 2) to lift anonymity and move to a collaborative mode based on direct interchanges with the reviewers if all parties agree.
- Step 6. Manuscripts for which major changes were requested are returned to the reviewers. Those requiring minor changes are reviewed by the thematic dossier coordinators or section editors.

If necessary, the authors can request a second copy of the text, following the process described in step 5.

- Step 7. The entire Journal issue is presented to the Editorial Board for approval.
- Step 8. Accepted articles are edited by the editor, changes are validated by the authors and then sent for translation. Translations are checked by the thematic dossier coordinators or the section editors, by the authors (unless they are unable to do so) and edited by the editor. Changes are approved by the authors. Once the manuscript has been accepted, the author's parent institution will be asked to make a financial contribution to the translation costs, or to pay for the translation directly where this seems possible.

The procedures described above apply to texts submitted to the Journal for the thematic dossiers and the Varia section.

For the Public Space and JSSJ a v-l-u sections, manuscripts are not reviewed or anonymised, but are proofread by the section editors. They may ask authors to make changes. Where necessary, the section editors may also ask a member of the Editorial Board or Scientific Committee to review the manuscript. Manuscripts are validated by the Editorial Board, not by the proofreaders.

3. Actions subsequent to misconduct or plagiarism

Any deviation from the Journal's ethical standards must be reported directly to the Editorial Board, which undertakes to react as quickly as possible in order to preserve the integrity of the contributors and the institutions concerned. The Editorial Board reserves the right to refuse publication of a manuscript on the grounds of misconduct.

Regardless of the date of publication, the Editorial Board investigates all allegations of error or misconduct, giving a voice to all parties involved. Documentation relating to complaints is kept.

The Editorial Board issues corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies where necessary.

If the Editorial Board finds that authors are not complying with the Charter, it reserves the right to interrupt the review or publication process.

If a case of plagiarism is brought to the attention of the Editorial Board, the latter undertakes to assist the victim of plagiarism in his or her efforts.

If plagiarism is identified, publication is immediately suspended. If plagiarism is identified only after publication, the article will be removed from the Journal's website and from all its open-access digital archives.

We would like to thank the Journals *Géocarrefour*, *Urbanités*, *Histoire Médecine et Santé* and *ACME* for using their charters as a basis for discussion in drawing up this charter.

Charter unanimously approved by the Editorial Board on... Any changes to the Charter will be subject to a further vote by the Editorial Board.