

Publication Ethics and Malpractice statement

Section A: Publication and authorship

1. Papers submitted should fall within the limits set out in the “Author’s Guidelines” listed on the website.
2. All submitted papers are subject to strict peer-review process involving 2 reviewers who are experts in the area of manuscript submitted. However, the number of reviewers is decided by the Editorial board in special cases.
3. The process of review is double-blind in nature, where the authors are unaware of the identity of the reviewers and the referees are unaware of the identity of the authors and their institutions. This is true even if an editorial board member happens to be one of the authors.
4. Authors maybe asked to suggest names of potential referees, if the Editor feels the need.
5. Papers are reviewed on content, originality, and readability.
6. The Board of Editors is committed to a fair but speedy and time-bound review process.
7. The end of a review process results in recommendation of changes followed by a next round of review or acceptance with recommended changes, or rejection.
8. Rejected articles, if resubmitted with major changes, will be considered as a fresh submission.
9. All accepted manuscripts will have to satisfy the legal requirements of copyright infringement and plagiarism.
10. Any changes in authorship, after submission, will have to be with the consent from all authors.
11. In submissions which are not under the category of review articles, original work is a compulsory requirement.

Section B: Authors' responsibilities

By submitting the manuscript to this journal, Authors agree that

- 1 . the manuscript is their original work
- 2 . all the co-authors have contributed to the work significantly.
- 3 . the manuscript has not been submitted to any other Journal in past or in the present.
- 4 . the rejection of comments made by referees can lead to second round of fresh review process.
- 5 . data and analysis borrowed from other works, should be with proper referencing and permissions (where required). Violation of this point can lead to automatic rejection of the manuscript.
- 6 . “conflicts of interests”, if any, should be declared by authors in advance.

Section C: Peer review/responsibility for the reviewers

- 1 . Referees should keep all the contents of the manuscript confidential.
- 2 . Referees should immediately inform the Editor-in-chief, if the identity of the authors is revealed directly or indirectly to them or if approached by the authors themselves to influence the review process
- 3 . Referees should conduct the review process objectively, with no biases towards the topic or contents.
- 4 . Referees should adhere to any guidelines/suggestions issued by the Board of Editors (BOE) during the submission of the manuscript for review.
- 5 . Referees should finish the process in time-bound manner, or report their inability to do so as soon as possible. BOE then reserves the right to initiate a fresh review process and the comments from the previous referee may be ignored.

Section D: Editorial responsibilities

1. The Editor-in-chief has the complete responsibility and authority to accept/reject articles.
- 2 . Editor-in-chief shall consult one or all Consulting Editors for their advice on issues which are deemed by her/him to be complex in nature.
- 3 . Each of the Editors (including Consulting Editors) shall take the responsibility to complete the review process of any given submission in timely fashion.
- 4 . The Editor responsible for the review process will ensure that the process is completed within time-bound limits and that the quality of the paper accepted is of high integrity and academic in nature.
- 5 . Editors shall ensure that the double-blind review process is strictly adhered to.
- 6 . Editors should not change the decision of acceptance (or rejection) unless they have a very strong academic or legal reason.