

A U  I T I O

SPANISH JOURNAL OF AUDIOLOGY

Vol. 5 Issue 2

Revision of the editorial policies
(transition number)

Published by:
Spanish Audiological Society (AEDA)
ISSN: 1577-3108

Editorial Board

Editorial team:

Editor-in-chief:

Raul Sanchez-Lopez, PhD
Interacoustics Research Unit / Technical
University of Denmark

Associated editors:

Carlos Benitez -Barrera, PhD
University of Texas

Helia Relaño Iborra, PhD
Technical University of Denmark

Gerard Encina-Llamas, PhD
Technical University of Denmark

Miriam I. Marrufo-Pérez, PhD
University of Salamanca

Oscar M. Cañete, PhD
Technical University of Denmark

Editorial office:

Editor Assistant:
Paula Hernández-Ricoy

Open Journal System Administration
Samuel Fernández (Cultural Hosting)

Production editor:

Marcos Ferreira Sanmamed (Publicaciones
Académicas S.A.)

Editorial Board:

José Juan Barajas del Prat, PhD
Clinica Barajas

Enrique López-Poveda, PhD
University of Salamanca

Alicia Huarte Irujo, MD
University of Navarra

Waldo Nogueira-Vázquez, PhD
Hannover Medical School

Emeritus Editors

Franz Zenker Castro
Clinica Barajas.
Editor: 2006-2015

María Visitación Bartolomé
Complutense University of Madrid.
Editor: 2015-2020

Mission and Scope

Mission

AUDITIO | The Spanish Journal of Audiology is an international scientific publication, edited both in Spanish and in English, with rigorous peer review, open access and with an emphasis on dissemination and research in the field of audiology in an inclusive way in which professionals from different disciplines can contribute and share knowledge within the audiological community.

AUDITIO aims to build a bridge between the scientific and hearing health care communities. The editorial team's mission is to eliminate language, economic and academic barriers in order to promote research and generation of knowledge in audiology in Spanish-speaking countries and in the rest of the world. As a final goal, AUDITIO wants to make the members of the Spanish Audiological Society (AEDA) to participate in the journal, promoting scientific pedagogy in all editorial processes and appreciating the contributions of members from different disciplines.

Scope

AUDITIO considers for publication original research article as well as acceptable secondary contributions based on previously published studies in the broad and multidisciplinary field of audiology and hearing sciences. In general, the importance of the contribution for the scientific and clinical community should be emphasized and the writing style should be adequate for a broad and multidisciplinary audience.

AUDITIO publishes scientific articles of interest to the multidisciplinary community of audiology. Authors' contributions are evaluated by expert reviewers in their fields as well as by readers dedicated to other areas of audiology. AUDITIO considers for publication contributions that provide evidence in favor of a better understanding, diagnosis, or rehabilitation of hearing loss.

The subject of the journal includes various aspects of the study of audiology, from fundamental science studies to applied research. In addition, AUDITIO includes expanded content based on comments, critical reviews and technical notes with the aim of sharing practical and applied knowledge that complements the dissemination of scientific knowledge.

Journal Sections

AUDITIO | Research Articles

This section contains "Research Reports" in addition to the classic article types that often appear in scholarly publications. The main difference of AUDITIO is that, apart from the traditional peer review, it will have a non-academic reviewer (e.g: a clinical professional in the field of audiology). In addition, published articles will acknowledge the work of the reviewers (the identity of the reviewers will be part of the record of the article). The evaluation reports and the author's response may also be included as supplementary content (optional). All articles will contain a text box with the title "Clinical Implications" where the authors should emphasize the importance of the article and its connection with a better understanding, diagnosis or rehabilitation of hearing loss.

- **Research reports**, where a synthesis of previous studies is carried out but drafted in such a way that it can be understood by people who are not expert on the research topic. An example of a research report is the synthesis of studies related to a doctoral thesis, or the summary of a scientific project, where the results from a project are presented. The authors must have been involved in the project, but they do not necessarily have to be the first authors of the discussed studies. The aim of the research reports is to disseminate the results to a wider audience and to connect the different studies that have been carried out.
- **Original studies** presenting unpublished data.
- **Replication studies** that confirm or not previous results.
- **Review studies**, where a critical analysis of the existing literature is conducted.
- **Case studies**, where a thorough and detailed examination of a particular case is conducted.
- **Perspective studies**, where a point of view on a specific area of research is presented.

AUDITIO | Research Communications

This section is intended to welcome contributions from the hearing health care community. The content of this section will be considered "expanded material" of academic publications. The contributions will be peer-reviewed by at least one researcher and one health care professional. The article types considered in this section are:

- **Clinical Reports:** Presentation of the results of a student project or MSC thesis with a clear clinical component. Reports with research questions, hypothesis, and statistical analysis are considered "research reports" (see above).
- **Commentary:** Articles reviewing a scientific article published in AUDITIO, providing critical content or a different point of view. Commentaries will contain a summary of the original article, a summary of its findings, and a critical discussion about the content. "Third-party reviewers" of published

articles are encouraged to generate such comments based on their assessment.

- **AEDA Journal Club:** This type of article presents an analysis, like a commentary, of a preferably recent article published in other publications in the audiology area. Authors are encouraged to analyze Open Access articles published in scientific journals such as Trends in Hearing, mdpi Audiology Research, Ear and Hearing, International Journal of Audiology and Hearing Research among others.
- **Technical Notes, Protocols, Book Reviews and Tutorials:** Technical reports on a new technology, diagnostic test or new methods will also be considered for publication. The article must be written objectively and not contain commercial elements. The approach should be descriptive and rigorous, containing an introduction with relevant information and a discussion. The objective is to share practical or theoretical knowledge with the audiological community both scientific and clinical.

AUDITIO | Editorials & Communicationes

In addition to the two sections, there is a section with content controlled from the editorial office. It will have a free format and will be made up of: editorials, Reviews, News, Tributes, etc.

This content will not contain abstracts nor will it be peer-reviewed.

Editorial Policies

This document collects the journal policies of AUDITIO. It describes the ethical standards that all participants in the submission, peer-review and publication process are expected to follow. Whether you are an author, you have been invited to review a paper for AUDITIO, or you are an associated/guest editor for one of our issues, please familiarize yourself with these guidelines.

AUDITIO is committed to follow the ethical principles adopted by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) along with selected policies modified from the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME) and the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE).

For reference, the COPE guidelines alluded in this document can be found here in different languages: <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.26>

Table of Contents

I. Principles of the journal	6
A. Diversity and inclusion	6
B. Transparency.....	6
C. Recognition.....	7
D. Rigour	7
E. Accessibility.....	7
II. Editorial independency.....	7
III. Open Access policies	8
A. Subscriptions.....	8
B. Article processing charges (APC)	8
C. Preservation and Archiving.....	8
D. Auto-archiving policies	8
E. Revenue sources:.....	8
IV. General Publication policies.....	9
A. Disclaimer	9
B. Confidentiality	9
C. Sections and Publication models	9
D. Timeliness	9
E. Protection of research participants.....	9
F. Authorship	10
G. Citation policies.....	10
H. Copyright and licensing:.....	11
I. Preprint policies	11

- J. Plagiarism and Originality 11
- K. Manuscripts Based on the Same Database..... 11
- L. Post-publication discussions and corrections 12
- M. Withdrawal of a submission..... 12
- N. Version control and publication record 12
- O. Data sharing and reproducibility..... 12
- V. Peer-review process 12**
 - A. Peer Reviewer Selection and Contact..... 13
 - B. Reviewer responsibilities..... 13
 - C. Compensation 13
 - D. Conflicts of Interest..... 13
- VI. Research misconduct 14**
 - A. How to make an allegation (rise a concern)?..... 14
 - B. Editor’s responsibility..... 14
 - C. Corrections and Retractions..... 15

I. Principles of the journal

All decisions and processes in the Spanish Journal of Audiology, AUDITIO, are based on the following principles:

A. Diversity and inclusion

AUDITIO welcomes all relevant contributions and is committed to treating submissions fairly and without bias with regards to race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or affiliation. In addition, AUDITIO editors will seek to engage a broad and diverse array of authors, reviewers, editorial staff, editorial board members, and readers as recommended by WAME. AUDITIO also welcomes the contribution of hearing care professionals, especially in the section [AUDITIO | Research Communications](#) as authors and as no-academic reviewers, who participate actively in the peer-review process to contribute an additional point of view that increases the value of the publication.

B. Transparency

All the processes related to the editorial activity of AUDITIO will be public for the readers as long as this does not compromise confidentiality of the evaluation of the scientific contributions. The editorial office is committed to provide statistics of submitted articles as well as data about the human and economic resources of the journal.

C. Recognition

AUDITIO appreciates the work of the different actors involved in the journal. AUDITIO will seek for public recognition for authors, reviewers, editors, collaborators, and funding entities if this does not affect confidentiality principles.

D. Rigour

The contributions considered in AUDITIO are evaluated by experts in a peer-review process. Methods, results interpretations and conclusions have to be based on the scientific method. Rigorous work will be prioritized before innovation, which means that the quality of articles with no positive results or replication studies will be welcome in AUDITIO. The scientific contributions must follow ethical standards.

E. Accessibility

The content of AUDITIO is accessible without subscription. The articles submitted from 2021 on will be available both in Spanish and English.

II. Editorial independency

AUDITIO is a publication of the Spanish Audiological Society (AEDA; Asociación Española de Audiología). Both the AEDA Board of Directors and the AUDITIO editorial team are committed to maintaining editorial independence (<https://wame.org/editorial-independence>) of the journal. All editorial decisions will be based on the quality of the contributions and rigorous peer-review, without any political, financial or personal influences related to AEDA. To establish clear boundaries between the association and the journal, the following competencies have been defined:

- Journal director / managing editor: the managing editor will be appointed by the AEDA Board of Directors in the person of a member of the Board of Directors. His/her responsibility is to ensure the quality of the publication especially regarding the quality of the production process and workflow.
- Editor in chief: the editor-in-chief will also be appointed by the AEDA board of directors, at the proposal of the managing editor who will give priority to AEDA members with recognized scientific and /or academic aptitudes for this position. His/her responsibility is to ensure the scientific quality of the publication. The positions of editor-in-chief and managing editor may be held by the same person.
- Editors: to ensure editorial independence, up to a maximum of two people can simultaneously hold a position on the editorial team (co-editors and associate editors) of AUDITIO and on the AEDA board of directors, including the Editor-in-Chief and the Director.

- Editorial board: The role of the editorial board is to advise and provide vision on the future of the scientific journal. The members of the AEDA board of directors may not be part of the editorial board.
- Guest editors: on relevant occasions (e.g., specific research topics, special issues, etc.), members of the AEDA board of directors may act as guest editors. Their appointment will be based solely on their scientific competence and / or academic background.

In broad terms, AUDITIO follows the recommendations of COPE stated here: [http://publicationethics.org/files/Learned Society Guidelines 0.pdf](http://publicationethics.org/files/Learned_Society_Guidelines_0.pdf)

III. Open Access policies

A. Subscriptions

All the content in AUDITIO is Open access. The articles are published under Creative Commons licenses. From 2021, the authors can choose the license at the time of the submission and/or acceptance.

B. Article processing charges (APC)

AUDITIO does not apply article processing charges (APC) to the members of the Spanish Audiological Society (AEDA). For non-members, the article processing charges are partly covered by AEDA until December 2023. The APC covers the production, translation and correction of the accepted articles and is payable only if your article is accepted. Payment will be required immediately after peer review. The APC is subject to taxes where applicable. The current APC (2021 -2023) is 150€.

C. Preservation and Archiving

AUDITIO is preserved in the Public Knowledge Project Preservation Network and in LOCKSS

D. Auto-archiving policies

AUDITIO allows the auto-archiving of the pre-print and post-print versions by the authors in public and private repositories. Authors are permitted and encouraged to post their work online (e.g., in institutional repositories or on their website) prior to and during the submission process, as it can lead to productive exchanges, as well as earlier and greater citation of published work (See [The Effect of Open Access](#)).

E. Revenue sources:

AUDITIO is a self-financed open access journal published by the Asociación Española de Audiología. Article publication charges levied to non-member authors is the only source of income which is utilized in maintaining the administrative cost. The APC is based on operating expenses including the cost of

web maintenance, article processing, XML-JATS captures, corrections and translations. AEDA is committed to cover the 70% of the APC until December 2023.

At the moment, AUDITIO does not receive any revenue from advertising, reprints, institutional support or subscriptions.

IV. General Publication policies

A. Disclaimer

The responsibility for the authenticity of scientific findings, interpretations, opinions, and materials of articles published in AUDITIO are solely with the authors. The reviewers' reports result of the peer-review process that are published as supplemental material are responsibility of the authors and reviewers that participated in it.

B. Confidentiality

Manuscripts submitted to AUDITIO are privileged communications that are the authors' private, confidential property. AUDITIO will not share information about manuscripts, including whether they have been received and are under review, their content and status in the review process, criticism by reviewers, and their fate, to anyone other than the authors and reviewers.

C. Sections and Publication models

AUDITIO has two publication sections, [AUDITIO | Research articles](#) and [AUDITIO | Research Communications](#). Both follow a [confidential single-blind peer-review process](#).

D. Timeliness

AUDITIO is committed to process submissions in a timely manner. AUDITIO strives to notify whether the submission will proceed to review within 5 working days. A first decision, except in exceptional cases properly notified to the author, can be expected after 4-5 weeks.

E. Protection of research participants

All investigators should ensure that the planning conduct and reporting of human research are in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration as revised in 2013.

- Any manuscript submitted to AUDITIO should only contain anonymized data.
- If human subjects are participants of a research study or clinical investigation, a written consent form should always be provided and signed by the participant.
- All authors should seek approval to conduct research from an independent local, regional or national review body (e.g., ethics committee, institutional review board).

- Approval by a responsible review body does not preclude editors from forming their own judgment whether the conduct of the research was appropriate.
- When reporting experiments on non-human animals, authors should indicate whether institutional and national standards for the care and use of laboratory animals were followed. Further guidance on animal research ethics is available from the International Association of Veterinary Editors' Consensus Author Guidelines on Animal Ethics and Welfare.

F. Authorship

Authorship confers credit and has important academic, social, and financial implications. Authorship also implies responsibility and accountability for published work. AUDITIO follows the recommendations for authorship expressed by the ICMJE (<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html>).

The following 4 criteria must be met to be considered an author:

1. Substantial contributions to the work contained in the manuscript.
2. Critical revision of the important intellectual content.
3. Final approval of the version to be published.
4. Being accountable for the parts of the work he or she has done, an author should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific other parts of the work. In addition, authors should have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors.

Those people involved who otherwise do not meet all four criteria should be included in the acknowledgments section instead. It is the responsibility of the submitting author to provide an accurate list of co-authors.

AUDITIO does not support gift, honorary or ghost authorship as defined by the American Journal Experts (https://www.aje.com/dist/docs/Authorship_Attribution_EN.pdf). Therefore, manuscripts submitted to AUDITIO are required to provide the authors contributions following the criteria of the [CRediT – Contributions Role Taxonomy](#)

G. Citation policies

AUDITIO strongly encourage the citation of primary literature, and thus has a sufficiently large limit on the number of references that can be included (50 for research articles and 30 for research communications). However, the relevance of the included citation will be assessed by the editor and the reviewers. Citation of previous work from the same author or research group should be adequately justified. AUDITIO encourages authors to include DOIs for their citations.

H. Copyright and licensing:

Authors retain copyright and grant the journal right of first publication with the work simultaneously licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution License](#) that allows others to share the work with an acknowledgement of the work's authorship and initial publication in this journal.

Authors may enter separate, additional contractual arrangements for the non-exclusive distribution of the journal's published version of the work (e.g., publish it in a book), with an acknowledgement of its initial publication in this journal.

I. Preprint policies

AUDITIO allows and encourages submissions that have been previously made available in a preprint server.

J. Plagiarism and Originality

Plagiarism is considered unacceptable. AUDITIO uses Turnitin tools over the accepted manuscripts to evaluate their originality and similarity. Direct translation with no appropriate attribution and citation will also be considered plagiarism.

AUDITIO only accepts manuscripts that are unique. I.e., authors may not submit the same manuscript, in the same or different languages, simultaneously to other journals.

Acceptable Secondary Publication is admitted in the following cases:

- Conference papers and thesis: only if additional value is added by e.g., extending the discussion or introduction sections. Appropriate reference must be made to the original work, and the author must be sure that they still hold publishing rights to the material.
- For the publication of “research reports” and “clinical reports”, secondary publication will be accepted, as long as the submission aims to bring research results to a new audience, as well as that the licensing of the original publications allows for derivative work. The secondary version must inform readers that it is a derived work and cite the original.

K. Manuscripts Based on the Same Database

If separate manuscripts analysing the same data (e.g., from a publicly available database) are submitted to AUDITIO, the manuscripts will be considered independently, as recommended by the ICMJE (<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/publishing-and-editorial-issues/overlapping-publications.html>). Only if the submissions are substantially different to each other will they be considered for publication. If two or more articles with these characteristics are being edited by different editors and there is no sign that indicates that the authors of the manuscripts know the existence of the other's work, the Editor-in-chief might contact both parties making possible the

discussion of each other's work. If only titles or abstracts are shared between the two groups of authors, this will not be considered a breach of confidentiality.

L. Post-publication discussions and corrections

Errors are part of science, therefore AUDITIO allows for corrections. Authors may contact editors to publish a note of correction as well as an updated manuscript, as long as the main conclusions and interpretations of the work are unchanged. If substantial errors that alter the conclusions of the study are found, the editors may choose to retract the manuscript. AUDITIO follows the COPE guidelines for retractions and expressions of concern (<https://publicationethics.org/newsevents/cope%E2%80%99s-retraction-guidelines>). Any concern related to an article published in AUDITIO must be communicated to the editor and publisher to initiate the corresponding investigation at manuscritos@aedaweb.com.

M. Withdrawal of a submission

If an author chooses to withdraw their manuscript from the peer-review process it will be archived in AUDITIO's submissions system and still bound by confidentiality. The archived version may only be accessed by external quality agencies (e.g., FECYT) with proper notification to the author.

N. Version control and publication record

All versions the articles published in AUDITIO will remain available once published unless the correction is due to a grammatical error or a typo. When multiple versions of the same article are available these articles are clearly labelled with the date of publication and version number.

O. Data sharing and reproducibility

AUTIO expects all authors to comply with data storage regulations according to their institution/funding sources. If the original data is requested by a reviewer or editor for the proper evaluation of the manuscript authors must be able to provide it or risk a rejection or retraction. By publishing in AUDITIO, authors agree that they will make their data available to qualified researchers, in a timely manner and with minimal restrictions. Authors must make datasets available in public repositories such as Zenodo.

V. Peer-review process

AUDITIO adopts the Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers proposed by COPE (<https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.9>) with emphasis in the following specifications:

- All content published in AUDITIO is peer-reviewed except the section of journal communications which contains editorials, obituaries, announcements, notes on the journal policies, etc.
- AUDITIO editors have the right to reject a submitted manuscript before starting a formal peer review process if the submission is deemed inappropriate or outside AUDITIO's scope.

- The reviewers get recognition of their work by appearing publicly in the article. However, their identity remains unknown by the authors during the peer-review process unless the reviewer decides to sign his/her evaluation.
- The reports from the peer-review process may be published as supplemental material if all the parties (authors and reviewers) agree that the review reports should be public due to their scientific interest. In this case the article will be labelled as “open peer-review”.

A. Peer Reviewer Selection and Contact

In the sections [AUDITIO | Research articles](#) and [AUDITIO | Research Communications](#) authors will be allowed to suggest potential reviewers. The editor may choose within those suggested or contact other reviewers.

B. Reviewer responsibilities

Reviewers are bounded by confidentiality, they must follow AUDITIO’s review guidelines ([link](#)). Reviewers are encouraged to evaluate the manuscript in collaboration with students and young scientist if relevant. The invited reviewer should then inform the editor to give credit and recognition to the student as well.

C. Compensation

Reviewers and editors do not receive any economical compensation. The main benefit of the reviewer’s voluntary participation is of scientific nature. Reviewers are publicly recognized for their contribution in the published article. Furthermore, the reviewer’s reports can be public after the peer-review as part of the article records or in external services such as Publons. AEDA may consider additional ways of non-economical appreciation (e.g., discounts in conferences or courses organized by AEDA)

D. Conflicts of Interest

AUDITIO’s policies on conflict of interest are based on the recommendations by ICMJE (<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/author-responsibilities--conflicts-of-interest.html>). The disclosure of any conflict or competing interest will not be seen, a priori, as problematic. However, the declared conflicts of interest will help the editorial team process the contributions to AUDITIO adequately. The non-disclosure of possible conflicts of interest can be a motive of rejection or retraction.

A competing or conflicting interest is defined as anything that might inappropriately influence (bias) - or be perceived to influence - the full and objective presentation, review or publication of research findings or reviews. Competing interests can be financial, professional or personal, and can be held by authors, their employers, funders, reviewers, editors and editorial staff.

For authors

Authors must include information regarding the provider of financial and material support of their research in the Funding section at the end of the manuscript. This statement should include authors' grant support, funding sources, and the provision of equipment and supplies.

For reviewers

Reviewers should declare any association with the authors of a manuscript. Additionally, reviewers should disclose any financial or professional associations that could be perceived as interfering with the objectivity of their scientific assessment of the manuscript under review. A joint-publication or a relation such as that of PhD student – supervisor, can be considered a conflict of interest if the last collaboration was published within the last 4 years.

For editors

AUDITIO editors are obliged to delegate the peer review of any original self-authored research article to another member of the editorial or advisory board. Editors (associate and invited) who make final editorial decisions on articles must have no financial, personal or professional involvement with the manuscript under consideration. If a potential bias exists, they should withdraw from handling the paper.

AUDITIO editors will always base decisions on the quality of the work and not on its potential effect on the Journal's commercial success. Publishing fees or waiver status should not influence editorial decision making.

VI. Research misconduct

Plagiarism, citation manipulation, and data falsification/fabrication are unacceptable. In case of any suspicion or allegation of misconduct the manuscripts are treated according to the COPE guidelines (<https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.26>).

A. How to make an allegation (rise a concern)?

Any author, reader, editor or reviewer of AUDITIO can submit an allegation or raise a concern related to the published or unpublished work with suspected misconduct by writing to manuscripts@aedaweb.com.

B. Editor's responsibility

Editors must act in case of suspected misconduct. The editor should not only reject the manuscript but start an investigation to pursue the alleged cases. The extend of this duty includes unpublished manuscripts. The editors should always seek for the response of the authors first, followed by the relevant employers and institutions.

An editor can, at any time, add an expression of concern to a published article if there exist a serious allegation supported by sufficient evidence. This will inform the readers that the article is being investigated.

C. Corrections and Retractions

If a correction is needed AUDITIO will publish a correction notice as soon as possible detailing changes from the original publication. The correction will be included as an indexed part of the AUDITIO volumes. All previous versions of the article will be archived and available in www.auditio.com.

Retraction with republication (also referred to as “replacement”) can be considered in cases where honest error (e.g., a misclassification or miscalculation) leads to a major change in the direction or significance of the results, interpretations, and conclusions.

CONTRIBUTORS

Document preparation: Helia Relaño-Iborra.
Document Revision: Raul Sanchez-Lopez, Miriam I. Marrufo-Pérez.
Other contributions: Paula Hernández-Ricoy, Gerard Encina-Llamas, Carlos Benitez -Barrera, Oscar M. Cañete, Waldo Nogueira-Vázquez

PUBLISHED: 17th May 2021

Author Guidelines

AUDITIO considers different types of manuscripts for publication. Authors should prepare their manuscript according to the guidelines described below.

Submitted manuscripts should conform to the ethical recommendations of the Publication Ethics Committee (COPE), as indicated in the editorial policies.

All manuscripts must be submitted together with the document [Author's statements and article information](#).

Table of Contents

I. Templates.....	18
II. Languages	18
III. First Page.....	18
A. Authors and affiliations	18
B. Author's Contributions	18
IV. AUDITIO sections and article types	19
A. AUDITIO Research Articles	19
B. AUDITIO Research Communications.....	20
C. AUDITIO Editorials & Communications.....	22
V. Style guide.....	22
A. Nomenclature.....	22
B. Guidelines for figures	22
C. Guidelines for tables.....	23
D. Main text	23
E. Acknowledgements.....	23
F. Conflict of interest.....	23
G. References	24
H. Complementary material	24

I. Templates

Manuscripts will be submitted in an OpenOffice, Microsoft Word, RTF, or LaTeX file format. Templates for each type of article can be found on our website (Word and Latex formats are provided).

II. Languages

All submitted manuscripts must meet the international Spanish or English language standards to be considered for publication. All manuscripts will be published in Spanish and English and will be assigned with a DOI (Digital Object Identifier).

III. First Page

A. Authors and affiliations

Authors' names must be separated by commas. Affiliations shall be indicated by superscript numbers following each surname and shall include the following information:

Institute or Department, Organization, City, State Abbreviation (Us, Canada, and Australia only) and Country.

The corresponding author must be marked with an asterisk in the list of authors. The corresponding author's name, postal address, telephone number and email address must be included on the manuscript's cover page. Authors are required to use their institutional email when possible, and should avoid including commercial emails (e.g. Google, Yahoo, etc.).

B. Author's Contributions

Authors who have contributed equally to the manuscript must be marked with a symbol (†) in the authors list. In addition, each author's contributions must be public following the guidelines and nomenclature [of the CRediT – Contributions Role Taxonomy](#)

For example:

María Pérez^{1†}, José González^{2†} and JuanDelgado¹

¹ Department of Audiology, University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain.

† These authors have contributed equivalently to the present work and share the first authorship.

Contribution of authors:

MP and JG, conceptualization, drafting, revision, manuscript editing, data analysis, methodology, and visualization. JD, conceptualization, acquisition of funds, supervision and writing, revision, and manuscript editing.

IV. AUDITIO sections and article types

A. AUDITIO | Research Articles

Research articles include:

1. Original studies presenting unpublished data.
2. Replication studies that confirm or not previous results.
3. Review studies, where a critical analysis of the existing literature is conducted.
4. Case studies, where a thorough and detailed examination of a particular case is conducted.
5. Perspective studies, where a point of view on a specific area of research is presented.
6. Research reports, where a synthesis of previous studies is carried out but drafted in such a way that it can be understood by people who are not expert on the research topic. An example of a research report is the synthesis of studies related to a doctoral thesis, or the summary of a scientific project, where the results from a project are presented. The authors must have been involved in the project, but they do not necessarily have to be the first authors of the discussed studies. The aim of the research reports is to disseminate the results to a wider audience and to connect the different studies that have been carried out.

Research articles will be reviewed by two academic reviewers (peer review) and a non-academic reviewer who will evaluate the relevance of the study to the audiology community. The identity of the reviewers will be publicly revealed once the article is published.

Articles must have a minimum of 2000 words and a maximum of 4000 words (6 pages). The maximum number of graphic elements will be 5 and the reference limit is 50. Research articles should have the following information:

- **Page 1:**
 - Title.
 - Abbreviated title.
 - Name and surname of all authors in the order provided for publication.
 - Author's affiliations.
 - Corresponding author.
 - Contribution of the authors.

- **Page 2:**

Abstract (250 words).

Keywords

Clinical implications (150 words). The clinical implications of the results and its connection to a better understanding, diagnosis and/or rehabilitation of hearing loss or other auditory disorders will be highlighted. The main objective is to explain the relevance of the study to clinical professionals.

- **Page 3 and up:**

At least the following sections should be included depending on the item type:

- *Original research studies or replication studies:* Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions, Conflict of Interest, References.
- *Review studies:* Introduction, Materials and Methods (including systematic review protocol; search strategy; data sources; data extraction and analyses), Results (including synthesized findings and biases risk assessment), Discussion, Conclusions, Conflict of Interest, References.
- *Case Studies:* Introduction, Context and Case Description, Results, Discussion, Conclusions, Conflict of Interest, References.
- *Perspective Studies:* Introduction, Discussion (including possible future directions), Conclusions, Conflict of Interest, References.
- *Research reports:* Introduction, Materials y Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions, Conflict of Interest, References.

In general, the importance of the contribution for the scientific and clinical community should be emphasized and the writing style should be adequate for a broad and multidisciplinary audience.

B. AUDITIO | Research Communications

Scientific communications include:

1. Studies reviewing a scientific article from a critical or novel point of view.
2. Technical notes, protocols or tutorials on a new technology, and new diagnostic tests or methodologies that were developed objectively and do not have commercial elements.
3. Clinical reports. The main aim of clinical reports is to contribute to the knowledge in the audiological field presenting cases that can (1) illustrate a new principle, (2) provide practical and new approaches to the diagnosis or treatment of a hearing disease, or (3) support or refute a treatment commonly used for hearing diseases. The results of a student project or MSc thesis with a clear clinical component may be presented in this section.
4. Journal clubs, which will be the result from the regular meeting of AEDA members and will provide a critical evaluation from recent articles in the literature.

Manuscripts will be peer-reviewed (two expert reviewers on the topic) and a non-academic reviewer. Once the article is published, the identity of the reviewers will be publicly recognized.

Articles must have between 1500 and 2000 words (3 pages) and a maximum of 3 graphic elements. The format should be as follows:

- **Page 1:**

- Title.
- Abbreviated title.
- Name and surname of all authors in the order provided for publication.
- Author affiliations.
- Correspondence author.

- **Page 2:**

Abstract

Keywords

- **Page 3 and up:**

Although the articles in this this section do not follow the typical [IMRaD format](#), the author should know what the scope of each of the article types is:

- **Clinical Reports:** Presentation of the results of a student project or MSC thesis with a clear clinical component. Reports with research questions, hypothesis, and statistical analysis are considered "research reports" (see above).
- **Commentary:** Articles reviewing a scientific article published in AUDITIO, providing critical content or a different point of view. Commentaries will contain a summary of the original article, a summary of its findings, and a critical discussion about the content. "Third-party reviewers" of published articles are encouraged to generate such comments based on their assessment.
- **AEDA Journal Club:** This type of article presents an analysis, like a commentary, of a preferably recent article published in other publications in the audiology area. Authors are encouraged to analyze Open Access articles published in in scientific journals such as Trends in Hearing, mdpi Audiology Research, Ear and Hearing, International Journal of Audiology and Hearing Research among others.
- **Technical Notes, Protocols, Book Reviews and Tutorials:** Technical reports on a new technology, diagnostic test or new methods will also be considered for publication. The article must be written objectively and not contain commercial elements. The approach should be descriptive and rigorous, containing an introduction with relevant information and a discussion. The objective is to share practical or theoretical knowledge with the audiological community both scientific and clinical.

In general, the importance of the contribution for the scientific and clinical community should be emphasized and the writing style should be adequate for a broad and multidisciplinary audience.

In addition, scientific communications should include a summary table with the following information:

Findings	Perspectives
Limitations	Considerations

C. AUDITIO | Editorials & Communications

Editorials, reviews, news, tributes, communications from the Spanish Association of Audiology (AEDA), etc. will be included as "communications". Communications have a free format, and they will only be accepted following an invitation from the editorial team or the editorial board. It is not necessary to submit a summary and the manuscript will not be peer reviewed. It will have a maximum length of 1000 words.

V. Style guide

A. Nomenclature

Units of the International System of Units should be used in all manuscripts.

The use of abbreviations should be minimized, and these should be defined the first time they are used. For example:

"[...] the use of potential evoked brainstem hearings (PEATC)."

Equations should be inserted in editable format preferably using the Word Equation Editor or the MathML [standard](#).

B. Guidelines for figures

Individual figures must have a maximum of 85 millimeters (one column) or 180 millimeters (2 columns).

If the figure has more than one panel, the panels must be indicated using the labels A, B, C, D etc. in bold uppercase letters. Charts must include legend on axes (including units).

The font size should not be less than 8 points when viewed in actual size.

Any line on the chart must not be less than one wide point.

Images must be sent in EPS or TIFF format with a resolution of 300 dpi in final size. Figures can be sent in a single ZIP file or in separate files during the submission process.

Figure legends must begin with "Figure X", for example, "Figure 1". All legends must be placed under each figure embedded in the manuscript. Figure panels are designated with bold uppercase letters.

C. Guidelines for tables

Tables must be inserted in editable format. Table titles should be placed immediately before the table starting with "Table X", for example, "Table 1". Use only one paragraph for the title. The acronyms used in the tables must be defined in a lower cell.

Large tables that cover multiple pages cannot be included in the final publication view for formatting reasons. These tables will be published as supplementary material.

D. Main text

The text must have double leading and 12 font size points. Italics should be used instead of underlined. Figures, illustrations, and tables should be placed in the appropriate text places (typically where they are first referenced) and not at the end. The document must contain page and line numbers to facilitate the review process. Research studies should include in the main text:

- **Introduction**

Cannot be divided into subsections.

- **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This section can be divided into subsections and should be sufficiently detailed to guarantee that procedures can be replicated. Studies with animals or humans should include an ethical approval statement in this section (for more information, see the Bioethics section).

- **Results**

This section can be divided into subsections. Footnotes can be used, although their use should be minimized.

- **Discussion**

It can be divided into subsections. This section may include, for example, comparison with previous studies, deficiencies and potential limitations of the study, future direction of research, etc.

- **Conclusions**

The most relevant findings of the study should be briefly summarized.

E. Acknowledgements

This section should recognize the contributions of collaborators, institutions or agencies that contributed to the development of the study.

F. Conflict of interest

All financial, commercial or other relations that may be perceived as representing a possible conflict of interest should be mentioned. If no such relationship exists, the authors shall declare that the investigation was conducted in the absence of commercial or financial relations that could be interpreted as a possible conflict of interest.

G. References

References will be identified in the text according to the standards of the American [Psychological Association \(APA\)](#)

(<https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references>).

The list of references should only include articles that are published or accepted. Accepted but unpublished manuscripts should be described as "in press". References to data repositories or computer code are allowed. The version and unique identifier should be included when available. It is not recommended to cite master's thesis or doctoral theses as well as lecture articles if there was an article published in a scientific journal with similar content.

References to articles deposited on *preprint* servers (pre-prints) are allowed as long as there is a DOI or URL available and the quote clearly mentions that the contribution is a pre-print. If there is a peer-reviewed publication for pre-printing, then the publication of the official journal should be cited. The use of pre-impressions that have not been updated in the last year is discouraged as it suggests that the study is not being considered for publication in a scientific journal.

The DOI of the study cited should be provided whenever available.

H. Complementary material

Data and elements that are not of paramount importance or that cannot be included in the article for extension reasons (videos, PowerPoint presentations, etc.) may be presented as supplementary material. The supplementary material will be displayed along with the published article.

CONTRIBUTORS

Document preparation: Miriam I. Marrufo-Pérez & Gerard Encina-Llamas.
Document Revision: Raul Sanchez-Lopez.
Other contributions: Helia Relaño-Iborra, Paula Hernández-Ricoy, Carlos Benitez -Barrera, Oscar M. Cañete.

PUBLISHED: 18th May 2021

Reviewer Guidelines

External reviewers are an essential part of the AUDITIO journal. Peer evaluation (or arbitration) of scientific articles is essential to ensure the excellence of scientific publication. For this reason, reviewers receive public recognition by appearing on the first page of published articles. Evaluations are performed by two types of reviewers. Academic reviewers; who are recognized scientists' experts in the main topic of the article, and non-academic reviewers; who are clinical health care professionals (i.e. hearing care professionals, speech pathologists, otolaryngologists) whose main occupation is not research. In research articles, the authors receive two academic reviews and one clinic, while in scientific communications the authors receive at least one review of each type.

Table of Contents

- I. Pre-acceptance steps of the invitation to review a manuscript 28**
- II. What is the role of reviewers in academics and clinicians? 29**
- III. How do you assess a manuscript? 29**
 - A. Scope29
 - B. Writing.....29
 - C. Originality.....29
 - D. Reproducibility29
 - E. Manuscript structure30
 - F. Ethical issues30
- IV. Types of evaluation 30**
 - A. Quantitative assessment.....31
 - B. Qualitative evaluation.....32
 - C. Reviewer's Final Recommendation33

AUDITIO ensures the independence and anonymity of authors and reviewers throughout the evaluator process. Reviewers of rejected articles are made public once a year on the journal's official website.

I. Pre-acceptance steps of the invitation to review a manuscript

Upon receipt of a manuscript, and before moving on to the arbitration process, AUDITIO's editorial team ensures that the manuscript complies with the journal's focus and interest, as well as the specifications indicated in the [authors' guidelines](#). The editor then makes a review invitation to the reviewers that it considers most qualified for the topic of the article to be evaluated. The author(s) provides a list of six potential reviewers who serve as a starting point for the editor. Once the invitation is sent, the reviewers receive the summary of the manuscript in question and should accept or reject the invitation based on the following criteria:

- **Availability:** Reviewing a manuscript critically and constructively takes time. The reviewer should consider whether they have the time to complete the review within the timeframe indicated by the editor which will usually be two weeks.
- **Knowledge and academic experience about the contents of the manuscript.** The reviewer should assess whether he has the necessary competence to evaluate the subject of the manuscript critically and constructively.
- **Conflict of interest.** In case the reviewer suspects before or during the review process that there is a relationship of academic closeness (collaboration, same institution, etc), commercial or family with the authors of the manuscript, the manuscript should reject the invitation. For example, co-authoring articles at a time of fewer than four years is considered a conflict of interest. Reviewers may state that potential authors may have conflicts of interest in advance, to avoid being invited to review manuscripts for which they are not eligible as reviewers.
- **Confidentiality commitment.** AUDITIO journal requires its reviewers to make an express commitment to confidentiality during the evaluation process. Under no circumstances shall the information contained in the manuscript be disclosed or made public. If a reviewer wants to consult with colleagues or collaborators on aspects related to the review, he/she should consult with the editor for approval. This restricted broadcast should be explicitly approved by the editor (as recommended by [COPE](#)).
- **Supervised review.** At AUDITIO we encourage "novel reviews" by PhD and postdoctoral students. If the reviewer wants to work collaboratively with a student on the review, the reviewer should notify the publisher for approval. Also, the student should adopt the same commitment of confidentiality, reveal conflicts of interest and be recognized for his work in the review.

The decision to accept or reject the invitation should be notified to the editor as soon as possible through the Open Journal System form. If you reject the invitation, it is recommended that you specify

the reasons for the decision. If the editor does not get a response from the reviewer within three business days, the review will be considered as not accepted.

II. What is the role of reviewers in academics and clinicians?

The academic reviewer's job is to analyze the contents of the manuscript **critically and constructively**, the author thus helping the author improve the manuscript and the editor to decide on acceptance. The academic reviewer should focus on assessing whether the work presented answers a question(s) of interest to the discipline of audiology, is based on previous literature, is rigorous in its methodology and the interpretation of the results is appropriate. The clinical reviewer should focus on aspects such as content clarity, impact to the audiological community, and accessibility of language and content to specialized but non-expert audiences.

III. How do you assess a manuscript?

A. Scope

The topic of the article should be relevant to readers of the journal AUDITIO. Also, the article should be specific within the topics of interest to the journal and provide relevant and meaningful information for the international audiological community.

B. Writing

The writing of the manuscript should be clear and concise. The content should be backed by prior scientific literature, providing citations and references of interest to support its argumentation. The reviewer's job is not to correct the language and grammar of the text. However, specific comments on these aspects of the text are accepted.

C. Originality

Reviewers should assess the originality of the manuscript. Some criteria of originality include: 1) If the manuscript is novel enough concerning the previously existing literature*, 2) if it expands current scientific knowledge regarding the subject covered, 3) the research question(s) is clinically or theoretically relevant. If the reviewer suspects that the contents of the manuscript have been copied from another source, the reviewer should inform the publisher as soon as possible. Plagiarism is unacceptable.

*Originality should not be evaluated if the manuscript is a *replication study* or a *research report*.

D. Reproducibility

The accuracy and thoroughness of the methods used to answer the questions and hypotheses raised should be evaluated in detail. If the study is a replication study, the reviewer should ensure and

comment on the extent to which the methods proposed to reproduce the methods of the original study.

E. Manuscript structure

Although each type of article has a different structure (see [Guidelines for authors](#) and templates), all of the studies should contain at least the following sections: title, abbreviated title, summary, keywords, introduction, discussion, conclusions and conflict of interests. Research articles should incorporate a section of clinical implications and scientific communications a summary table (see [Authors' Guidelines](#)). Also, the reviewer may indicate whether it deems it necessary to add any sections or subsections not originally included in the manuscript.

The reviewer also values the quality and justification of figures and tables in their context. Any visual element should be referenced in the main text. If these elements are unclear, unnecessary, or incomplete, the reviewer shall indicate this in its review.

Finally, the reviewer should evaluate the bibliographic references provided. References should be accurate, and relevant to support the information provided. If any relevant references are omitted, the reviewer should reflect them in their review. It is considered a bad praxis the over-representation of the previous work of authors that is not justified. Also, it is not acceptable for the reviewer to suggest including citations to his work if it is not relevant to improve the scientific quality of the article.

F. Ethical issues

In case the reviewer detects any type of fraudulent behaviour (redundant publication, plagiarism, invented data etc.) should inform the editor immediately, who shall take appropriate measures following AUDITIO's editorial policies.

IV. Types of evaluation

The reviewer has to provide a quantitative assessment of the manuscript based on the criteria set out in Table 1. Quantitative evaluation allows a score to be established to help the editor establish a criterion in the evaluation of the manuscript (see Table 2). The quantitative evaluation is only relevant for the section [AUDITIO | Research Articles](#). Also, the reviewer has in any case to provide a qualitative evaluation of the manuscripts based on the criteria described above.

A. Quantitative assessment

Table 1 Guide to Quantitative Valuation

Total score (Max 20 possible points)	recommendation
0-10 (50%) points	Decline submission
11-13 (66%) points	Resubmit for review
14-17 points (86%) points	Revisions required
≥ 18 points	Accept submission

For each aspect to be evaluated provide your assessment on a scale of 0 to 4 points

Table 2: Evaluation table for original articles

	Totally disagree	Disagree	undecisive	agree	Totally agree
	0	1	2	3	4
Introduction (relevant) and approach to the problem are appropriate					
The proposed methodology is appropriate to answer the research question					
Results are presented clearly and concisely					
Discussion adequately addresses the results					
The conclusions are directly related to the results obtained					

B. Qualitative evaluation

Reviewers' comments should be respectful and above all constructive. Unnecessary comments or personal details should not be included. Comments should guide the author on how to make changes that improve the quality of the article in possible subsequent versions of the manuscript. Clear and concise information on any aspect that might improve the manuscript should be provided. The reviewer should also indicate whether the comments expressed are personal opinions, questions or inaccuracies to be fixed that are supported by evidence in previous literature.

The qualitative evaluation will be sent to the authors as they have been prepared by the reviewer. Because of this, it is important to be rigorous with the organization, clarity of arguments and spelling of the text. The assessments provided by the reviewer should avoid, as far as possible, any misinterpretation. The editor may ask the reviewer for rectification if it finds comments that may be interpreted as offensive. Some expressions to avoid would be "It is not serious that...", "This analysis denotes complete ignorance on the part of the authors", etc.

The evaluation will be introduced in the Open Journal System in three text boxes:

- a) Summary of the article: The reviewer should give his vision of the article in a paragraph that includes the main objective, the reportable findings and the conclusion. This summary will serve the publisher and authors of the manuscript to detect if there has been any misunderstanding in the essential elements of the manuscript. The summary is particularly important for clinical reviewers.
- b) General considerations/comments: The reviewer should formulate his or her reluctance, point by point in this section. The reviewer may suggest clarifications on fundamental content by asking questions about aspects not covered in the text. These considerations will be reviewed point by point by the authors even if the article is accepted. The objective of this section is to highlight possible aspects of the study that may invalidate the analysis, interpretations or conclusions expressed by the authors.
- c) Specific/Minor Comments: The reviewer can ask specific questions or suggest changes in the style and language used in the text. You don't have to report all the errata, but if any were detected you will communicate here. The objective of this section is to improve the clarity of the manuscript.

C. Reviewer's Final Recommendation

Based on the qualitative and quantitative assessment, the reviewer shall issue a recommendation on the acceptance of the manuscript. This will be considered by the publisher, who has ultimate responsibility for the decision of publication or not of the manors written. The categories of this recommendation are as follows:

- a) Accept submission
- b) Revisions required (Minor Revision)
- c) Resubmit review (Major revision)
- d) Resubmit elsewhere (Out of the scope or more suitable for other section)
- e) Decline submission (Rejection)
- f) See Comments (reviewer have comments related to ethics and/or further suggestions)

Also, the reviewer will be able to type in a text box confidential comments for the editor that will not be visible to the author.

CONTRIBUTORS

Document preparation: Carlos Benitez -Barrera, Oscar M. Cañete.
Document Revision: Raul Sanchez-Lopez.
Other contributions: Helia Relaño-Iborra, Paula Hernández-Ricoy, Carlos Benitez -Barrera, Oscar M. Cañete, Miriam I. Marrufo-Pérez & Gerard Encina-Llamas.

PUBLISHED: 21th May 2021

AUDITIO: the renewed Spanish Journal of Audiology

Juan García-Valdecasas Bernal

Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Virgen de las Nieves University Hospital, Granada, Spain
President of the Spanish Audiological Society, Asociación Española de Audiología (AEDA)



A renewed AUDITIO! World Hearing Day is coming, and we could not have chosen a better time to welcome the new AUDITIO. After many months of work, AEDA has managed to renew its journal in a unique way. A team, led by Dr. Raul Sánchez, brand new Editor-in-Chief of the journal, began to work with the aim of renovating, modernizing, and adapting the journal to the needs of the 21st century. It may surprise you but AUDITIO is a pioneering journal in audiology as it was designed, by the Fundación Canaria Dr. Barajas in 2001, as a free access electronic journal. I assure you that in 2001 this format was quite a novelty and this fact has marked its existence. The distribution of AUDITIO through the internet among the Spanish-speaking community made it the most widely distributed Audiology journal in the Spanish language and therefore one of the most widely read journals. AUDITIO has always maintained its academic orientation and has successfully fulfilled its goal: the free dissemination of Audiology. So why did it have to

... A key element for promoting the scientific evidence-based clinical practice by disseminating new knowledge about the field of audiology, also in Spanish

be renewed? It was a demand from our associates and a thorn in many of us. So much so that it became a goal of my action program for the legislature of the Presidency in the 2020 elections.

The reason for this demand was clear: its lack of periodicity. In the last five years AUDITIO has suffered ups and downs and a lack of regularity, due to a lower reception of publications. It has not been due to lack of work from its Editor-in-Chief, Dr. Bartolomé, who knew how to surround herself with a great team of reviewers, was able to encourage university students and masterfully handled her contacts with prestigious researchers to maintain the greatest possible regularity. We should all thank her for her effort, dedication and results, but AUDITIO was slowly getting sick and we were unable to detect it and we were unable to find solutions. And in the face of illness, renew or die. It was the cruel reality that AEDA had to face. And after delving into the reasons, we discovered that AUDITIO still had possibilities and we decided to bet on it and mark a turning point. AUDITIO and audiology in

Spanish deserve it. Because audiology is one of the disciplines of science with the greatest scientific production and we must base its future development on it. AUDITIO must maintain its unique role, as a means of expression within audiology in the Spanish language.

A key element in the promotion of clinical practice based on scientific evidence and the speaker of knowledge in audiology in the Spanish language where to publish new research, projects, clinical practice guides, conference summaries, etc. A young and dynamic communication medium adjusted to the highest scientific rigor. AUDITIO is worth it and must have its space in our discipline and our language (the 2nd most widely spoken mother tongue in the world). Today, World Hearing Day, begins a new era for AUDITIO. A journal whose publications will be easily found by readers, a modern journal, according to the needs of authors and readers. For this, we aspire strongly and adopt the Open Journal System (for content management, applications, reviews and production), we register all content with Digital Object Identifiers (DOI), we adapt the journal to FECYT quality standards and adjust the contents for a better indexing of Google Scholar, RedIB, PubMed, WoS, Scielo, etc. A new time, new standards, an objective within the reach of this Editorial Board, an effort by AEDA associates and a brilliant job, catalyzed by its member and editor-in-chief/managing editor of the journal, Raul Sánchez-López, PhD. Congratulations to all!

García-Valdecasas Bernal, J., AUDITIO: the renewed Spanish Journal of Audiology , AUDITIO vol. 5(2) 1-2.

<https://doi.org/10.51445/sja.auditio.vol5.2021.0064>

<https://journal.auditio.com>

Published: 03.04.2021

© the Author. This article is published under license Creative Commons Attribution 4.0. which allows the use, redistribution and the creation of derivative works without prior permission.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.es>



On authorship in scholarly publications

Raúl H Sánchez-López
Editor de AUDITIO

The ethical statements and editorial policies of a scholarly journal provide tools to ensure the rigor and quality of the published works. One of the issues that is often discussed is the authorship of scientific articles.

In general, authors are those who have contributed intellectually and substantially to the preparation of a study. Institutions such as the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) recommend basing the definition of author on four simple criteria. These are, and I literally quote:

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

If a contributor to the study meets the first criterion, he/she must always be offered the co-authorship of the manuscript, and the co-author must accept or reject this invitation. If accepted, the co-author must be actively involved in the preparation of the manuscript, since, if he/she fails to meet the other three criteria, he/she should not be considered the author of the manuscript according to ICMJE.

It is important that contributors agree prior to submission, or even prior the manuscript preparation, on the role that each contributor has in the study. There may be contributors who do not want to be part of the group of listed authors and there may also be people who have been deliberately omitted. In any case, it is important that the person responsible for the investigation, or the author in charge of the correspondence, clarifies these points before submission.

There are cases in which some people end up being part of the list of authors even if they do not meet any of the authorship criteria according to ICMJE, or only one. This is known as "gifted authorship". When a head of service or department is listed as an author for the mere fact of being responsible for the institution but has not actively and intellectually contributed to the de-

velopment of the article is considered "gift authorship". At other times these names are included to maximize the possibility of acceptance of the manuscript, even without the knowledge of the person involved ("guest authorship"). In all these cases AUDITIO is against these practices as indicated in our editorial policies.

Another case that can generate authorship disputes is the "ghost authorship", which happens when a contributor that meets the criteria of authorship has not been included as an author in a manuscript. The best way to deal with these cases is to reach an understanding, ideally in the form of a written contributorship agreement. This agreement would contain designate who the authors are and who are to appear in the acknowledgements section.

One way to avoid "gifted authorship" or "ghost authorship", is to use Contributors Roles Taxonomy (CRediT). The authors have to express in the manuscript what was the role of each author using 14 possible roles, from conceptualization to the review and editing of the final manuscript, through the analysis of data, visualization of results, etc. In this way, the scientific journal has the possibility to identify cases such as those mentioned above more easily.

In any case, disputes over authorship or contributions cannot be resolved by the *journal*, which must approach the institutions to which the authors belong if they do not reach an agreement. If there are allegations of authorship, the *journal* follows clear guidelines contained in "Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals". The editorial team of AUDITIO follows the recommendations of the Committee

On Publications Ethics (COPE) and makes use of the reviews of existing cases discussed in COPE forum.

References

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (2019). Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals. File Available in [ENGLISH](#) and [SPANISH](#).

Council of Science Editors. Authorship and Authorship Responsibilities [Archive available in the Internet archive](#)

Committee on Publication ethics (2019). What to do if you suspect ghost, guest or gift authorship. <https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.18>

CRediT - Contributor Roles Taxonomy <https://casrai.org/credit/>

Sanchez-Lopez. R. , On authorship in academic publications, *AUDITIO* vol. 5(2) 37-38.

<https://doi.org/10.51445/sja.auditio.vol5.2021.0074>

<https://journal.auditio.com>

Published: 28.07.2021

© the Author. This article is published under a Creative Commons Attribution license 4.0.Ia which allows the use, redistribution and creation of derivative works without prior permission.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.es>



On the peer-review process

Raul H Sanchez-Lopez
EDITOR of AUDITIO

The peer-review process is a vital and of great importance process in scholarly publishing. Articles that are published in a scientific journal are evaluated by at least two external reviewers. The mission of this evaluation is to ensure that the scientific article has important scientific questions, adequate and accurate interpretations and conclusions, and a well-executed methodology. Quoting verbatim the words of Kelly et al., (2014): "[...] peer-reviewed articles provide a reliable form of scientific communication."

Brief history

Peer review was implemented in scientific journals as early as the XVII century. In the XVIII century, journals published by societies mentioned in their editorial policies that members of society, with interest or experience in the subject of the article, would receive the submission for their evaluation. Also, that the identity of peer reviewers may not be revealed. This practice, sometimes called "arbitration", was implemented in most academic publications as early as the XIX century and has remained until now. Currently, a new revolution is taking part on peer-review process, trying to make the process more dynamic and transparent due to to new

technologies. For a read on the history of peer review I recommend a recent entry of the F1000Research blog post written by Yousuf Al-Mousawi (2020).

The workflow of a scientific journal

A scientific article is not like a newspaper article, written by a journalist, that can appear in a magazine. The process before publishing a scientific article involves several steps in which different actors (authors, reviewers, editors) are involved.

Inspired by the content of the course "How to become an editor" of the Public Knowledge Project (PKP) School, I have adapted the steps to follow to the specific case of AUDITIO.

1. Pre-review process

- 1.a) The author prepares and submit the manuscript.
- 1.b) The editor-in-chief oversees the submission, ensuring that this is complete and that it can be considered further. If the manuscript is

incomplete, the editor will request changes before being submitted for peer review.

- 1.c) The editor and editorial team evaluate and decide if the submission can be sent for review. If the subject of the submission does not fall within the scope of the *journal* or the submission does not comply with what is stated in the guide for authors, it may be rejected.

2. Peer-review process:

- 2.a) The editor (either the journal editor, associate editor, or guest editor) is responsible for overseeing the process, selecting and inviting reviewers, and making the final decision on its publication.
- 2.b) Reviewers evaluate the manuscript for scientific validity, consistency, and readability. They must complete an evaluation report following the guidelines of the journal.
- 2.c) The editor then makes the decision to "accept", "reject" or "request revisions".
- 2.d) In the case of requesting revisions, the editor returns the manuscript to the authors along with the reports of the reviewers.

3. Revision and resubmission

- 3.a) Authors will have to review their manuscript based on the reviewers' reports and respond to their comments. Certain notions and advice on the style and form of the response letter can be found in Annesley, T.M. (2011).
- 3.b) The author resubmits the manuscript, this time not as a new submission but as a revision of the original submission.

- 3.c) The editor must check that the comments have been answered point by point. The editor can then make the final decision or conduct a new round of review.

- 3.d) In case of submission for review, the revised manuscript is sent back to external reviewers, which returns the manuscript to peer review process 2.

The final decision of the editor will be "accept" or "reject". Processes 2 and 3 may be repeated several times if the manuscript requires additional revisions for the editor to make the final decision. On some occasions the editor may suggest the manuscript to be submitted to another section of the journal where the content of the article might be more suitable.

In AUDITIO, all articles submitted to the "Research Articles" and "Research Communications" sections are reviewed by three reviewers, at least one of them being an academic expert on the subject and another of the reviewers a hearing care professional. The aim is to ensure the interest of the contribution for the scientific and clinical community and to foster a style suitable for a broad and multidisciplinary audience.

How to perform a review

A review is an opportunity to provide an external opinion that can improve the content of a scientific publication. It is important to emphasize that review is a confidential process. The content of the article is considered intellectual property of the authors that should not be shared with third parties, and the reviewers must maintain their anonymity and not

disclose their identity to the authors and third parties during the process. In addition, the process must be rigorous, the reviewer has to be impartial and evaluate the manuscript objectively even if he/she does not share or approve the opinion or conclusions of the authors.

In AUDITIO, the review report comprises three parts; 1) a summary of the contribution in the words of the reviewer; 2) Comments and considerations; and 3) Specific comments. The way of writing these parts I have summarized in these "4Cs" easy to remember:

- Be **constructive**: the aim of the review is to improve the quality of the manuscript. However, it is also important to highlight the strengths of the manuscript and not only to base the report on pointing out the points to be improved.
- Be **concise**: The review should be easy to read (i.e; contain complete and useful information) but should not be unnecessarily extensive.
- Be **clear**: perhaps the most important of the "4Cs". Clarity does not only mean concreteness, but also avoiding any kind of ambiguity. Authors should know exactly "how" they can improve their manuscript and "where" they should focus their efforts during the revision.
- Be **courteous**: A scientific article involves a lot of work so derogatory, biased, or ironic comments do not benefit either the author or the publication.

Other *journals* such as PLOS ONE summarize this piece of advice in "Dos and don'ts". Overall, the reviewers must be empathetic and assess his review from the perspective of the author, asking themselves, "Would I be able to improve the manuscript based on these comments myself?"

AUDITIO, communication and scientific pedagogy

At AUDITIO, we are aware that many of the readers are not familiar with the processes behind scientific journals. However, we believe that it is important that the members of the Spanish Audiological Society (AEDA) participate in this process, regardless of their previous research work or their experience in the specific topic. That is why the editorial team in collaboration with the new AEDA workgroups, is committed to help new authors and reviewers contribute to the life of the scientific journal AUDITIO. This editorial, as well as future communications, support our mission to do scientific pedagogy in the broad and multidisciplinary community of Spanish-speaking researchers and professionals in the field of audiology.

References

Annesley, T.M. (2011). Top 10 tips for responding to reviewer and editor comments. *Clinical Chemistry*, 57(4), 551–554. <https://doi.org/10.1373/clinchem.2011.162388>

[ENGLISH](#) (translation)

Kelly, J., Sadeghieh, T., & Adeli, K. (2014). Peer Review in Scientific Publications: Benefits, Critiques, & A Survival Guide. *EJIFCC*, 25(3), 227–243.

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (2019). Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals. Archive Available in [ENGLISH](#) and [SPANISH](#).

PLOS ONE "How to write a peer-review". Internet Archive [Link](#)

Yousuf Al-Mousawi (2020) "A brief history of peer-review". F1000 Blog entry [Link](#)

To cite this article:

Sanchez-Lopez. A. (2021), On the Peer Review Process vol. 5(2) 39-42. <https://doi.org/10.51445/sja.auditio.vol5.2021.0076>

<https://journal.auditio.com>

Published: 31.08.2021

© the Author. This article is published under a Creative Commons Attribution license 4.0.Ia which allows the use, redistribution and creation of derivative works without prior permission.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.es>

