



ISSN : 2105-665X

## **Ethical duties and responsibilities**

### **Editors' responsibilities**

The editor-in-chief, with the help of editorial board, judge the relevance of the articles submitted with regard to the journal's scope (multidisciplinary application-oriented journal of remote sensing), and is responsible for deciding or not to publish the articles submitted. The decision is based on the review reports issued by external referees, and should be made in a balanced, objective and fair way, without any extra-scientific considerations nor any kind of discriminations. The editor-in-chief guarantees by his action the scientific quality and integrity of the journal.

All submitted articles are subject to a rigorous, single-blind peer review, involving the use of (at least) two expert evaluators, unrelated to the authors or their institutions. Each expert must complete the evaluation form (Annex 1) and justify its opinions and recommendations.

Editors ensure that unpublished text or data disclosed in the peer-review process are kept confidential, and strive to inform the author of their decision in a reasonable period of 3-4 months .

### **Referees' responsibilities**

Referees make an objective judgement on the quality and the scientific relevance of the submitted article in the strict interest of its qualitative improvement. Reviews must be clearly supported with some arguments and relevant quotations without personal criticism of the author.

Referees ensure to deliver on time their review to the editor-in-chief in an appropriate form ready to be communicated to the author. They can add confidential comments (not communicated to authors) and, if needed and useful, they can provide an annotated version of the manuscript (Word or pdf file).

Referees who feel unqualified to review a submitted article should notify the editor-in-chief that they cannot conduct the review process. Referees must promptly inform the editor-in-chief of any conflict of interest resulting from a relationship with the author. Text or data must be kept confidential by the referees along the peer-review process and must not be used for personal advantage.

### **Authors' responsibilities**

Authors guarantee that their work is entirely original and ensure that they do not have committed plagiarism or auto-plagiat as well as any kind of copyright infringement. They confirm that they do hold all the rights pertaining to their article. The article submitted should not have been previously published neither identically nor in a similar form and should be an entirely original work. Authors should not submit the same article to another journal while under review.

Authors should acknowledge all sources of data used in their research and properly quote publications that have been influential in their work.

Authors must declare any potential conflict of interest that might exercise an undue influence on the results or interpretation of their research.

Authors should promptly notify the editor-in-chief or the publisher if a significant error in their publication is identified and cooperate with the journal's editors in order to formulate an erratum.

### **Publisher responsibilities**

The publisher makes sure that the standards outlined above are maintained and guarantees the circulation and publication on time of both the digital and paper versions of the articles.

The publisher can decide on the measures to be taken in case of delay in the publication and strives to respect the regularity of publication of a volume per year, including 4 quarterly issues (possibly grouped into double, triple or quadruple issues).

### **Procedures for dealing with unethical behaviour**

The editors and the publisher will adopt and follow all reasonable procedures in case of ethical misconduct, such as copyright infringement or plagiarism, up to the formal retraction of the article from the journal.

### **Annex 1 : Evaluation form**

see below



**MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION FORM**

Title :

Author(s) :

**Overall evaluation of manuscript :**

Accept as submitted	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accept with suggested revisions	<input type="checkbox"/>
Possibly accept after extensive revision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not appropriate for this journal (*)	<input type="checkbox"/>

(\*) If possible suggest alternative journal :

**1. Thematic interest**

of local interest only		of regional interest		of international interest	
------------------------	--	----------------------	--	---------------------------	--

**2. Is the **title** appropriate and reflecting the content of the paper ?**

yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
no (*)	<input type="checkbox"/>

(\*) Suggestion of alternative title :

3. **Abstract** reflecting the content and main results?

yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
no	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. **Introduction** indicating the state of the art and the objectives of the present paper?

yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
no	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. **Study site** well described ?

yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
no	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Is the **research methodology** utilized relevant and properly administered? Are the methods of **data analysis** adequate?

inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	very adequate
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

7. Are the **results** sufficient, logical, and in relation to objectives?

insufficient	1	2	3	4	5	very good
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

8. **Discussion** with accurate interpretations, verified hypotheses and results discussed in relation to the results of previous work?

yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
no	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. **Conclusion** with an appreciation of results and action for future research?

yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
no	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. Are **bibliographic references** adequate?

inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	very adequate
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

If needed, suggestions of additional references:

11. **Plates, figures and tables** adequate and useful?

inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	very adequate
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

If needed, suggestions for modifying, adding or deleting plates, figures or tables

12. **Comments to the author(s)**

Please provide here, or in an attached file, the reasons for acceptance or rejection, as well as any suggestions that you might feel are appropriate for revisions or improvements. Most authors will appreciate frankness combined with a modicum of tact.

**13. Confidential comments to the editor-in-chief**

Please rate below the **scholarly quality** of the manuscript and, if needed, give other comments (not transmitted to the author(s)):

low                      1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      very high

--	--	--	--	--

---

I am enclosing a WORD or PDF file of the manuscript with added minor corrections


All my suggestions have been provided on the present form

In case of requested extensive revision, would you like to examine the revised version of the manuscript?

yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
no	<input type="checkbox"/>

Your name is kept confidential. However, if you would like to let you know of the author(s), please mention your name here:

---

Return by e-mail to :

[revue.photointerpretation@gmail.com](mailto:revue.photointerpretation@gmail.com)

Postal address:

Bernard LACAZE

2 route de la Ramigère

17120 Mortagne-sur-Gironde, France

[lacaze.bernard@gmail.com](mailto:lacaze.bernard@gmail.com)