

PUBLICATION ETHICS (CORE PRACTICES)

These publication ethics and core practices have been developed in accordance with Committee on publication Ethics (COPE) in order to promote quality of research in all fields. A brief description of core practices Global Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities have been described for the guidance of authors and reviewers.

1. AUTHORSHIP AND CONTRIBUTIONS

1.1 Definition of Authorship

The term authorship can refer to the creator or originator of an idea (e.g, the author of the theory of relativity) or the individual or individuals who develop and bring to fruition the product that disseminates intellectual or creative works (e.g, the author of a poem or a scholarly article). Authorship conveys significant privileges, responsibilities, and legal rights; in the scholarly arena, it also forms the basis for rewards and career advancement. At a minimum, authors should guarantee that they have done the work as presented and that they have not violated any other author's legal rights (e.g, copyright) in the process.

1.2 Problems of Authorship

Various types of authorship problem encountered. Problems commonly stem from (i) individuals who claim that they deserve to be authors but have been omitted; (ii) individuals who have been included as authors but without their consent; (iii) individuals who agree to be authors but who back away from responsibility if something goes wrong – such as if an issue with the integrity of the paper comes to light; and (iv) confusion over multiple authorship. In case of such problems, the Journal will refer the matter to the institution to whom authors belong and will not publish the paper until resolution of these problems.

1.3 Disputed authorship

If a dispute arises between or among authors about authorship the Editor withholds the paper until resolution of the issue. In case of non-resolution of dispute among the authors the paper will not be published and all relevant authors will be informed formally.

1.4 Requirements for an Author

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) recommends that an author should meet the following four criteria:

- Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work;
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content;
- Final approval of the version to be published;
- 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.

Council of Science Editors (CSE) describes authors as follows:

“Authors are individuals identified by the research group to have made substantial contributions to the reported work and agree to be accountable for these contributions. In addition to being accountable for the parts of the work he or she has done, an author should be able to identify which of their coauthors are responsible for specific other parts of the work. In addition, an author should have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors. All authors should review and approve the final manuscript.”

1.5 Applying authorship at a journal level:

As per the requirements of the ICMJE, CSE, all authors must sign a statement of authorship as a condition of publication. Such a statement should ideally include:

- A declaration that that person, and all other named authors, fulfil the authorship criteria laid out in the journal’s authorship policy
- A declaration that no other individuals deserving of authorship have been omitted
- A statement of what exactly that person contributed to the paper (journals should also consider publishing this information)
- A declaration that that person takes responsibility for the integrity of the paper.

2. Allegations of Misconduct

These allegations include dual or multiple submissions of paper, withdrawal of paper after acceptance without any valid reason, including fake person as an author. In case of arising these allegations the Editor is authorized to thorough investigate the allegation and does not publish paper until the allegations are proved fake. If any allegation is proved the Editor will reject the paper and ban its author (s) to resubmit any piece of research work in future to the Journal. If disagreement between reviewer and author is risen and author is not willing to accept the views of reviewer and level allegation of conflict of interest against him the Editor will inform the reviewer about the allegations of author and send the paper for second review from a neutral reviewer. The Editor will keep the second review process secret and inform the author the outcomes of second review. The Editor will not publish paper until the issue of conflict of interest is resolved. If third party lodged complaint that author has got published his student’s paper in his name, the Editor will get the contact detail of the student from third party and will direct contact him to verify the allegation. If third party is failed to provide contact detail of the student the allegation will assume to be false until third party provides solid proof to prove his allegation.

3.Complaints and Appeals

If an author has lodged complaint that any staff member of Journal including handing Editor has sent his paper back and asked him to include citation of his work in his paper. The Journal will call explanation

from its staff member and after investigating the complaint fully, will take action against responsible persons and will take policy initiative to prevent such practice in future. If a person complains that his published work has been submitted by another person in his name and provides documentary proof the Journal will call explanation from accused person to clarify his position. If the accused person is unable to prove the genuineness of his research work the Journal will cancel his paper as well as authorship and will also inform both accused and accuser about its decision. However, the accused will be given the right of appeal to Editor-in-Chief within 15 days of the decision.

4. Conflict of Interest/Competing interest

If an author submits a paper containing findings against a business firm. He does not reveal his conflict of interest before the publishing of paper. Similarly, if an author receives funds from a business firm A to write a research paper to damage the goodwill of firm B through fabricated data or findings. During the course of publishing of such paper or after publishing, a person lodges complaint to Journal that the author had conflict of interest or competing interest, the Editor will ask the author to explain his position. If the response of the author is proved unsatisfactory the Editor will take action against him and will publish corrigendum, beside barring the author to get published his research work in Journal in future. The Editor will advise the author (s) of every paper to disclose his conflict of interest/or competing interest before publishing of paper.

5. Data and Reproducibility

The reviewer informed the Editor that the data used in a research paper appears to be fabricated and its originality is doubtful. The Editor will ask the author to provide authenticity letter from the industry or institution to whom his research is related. If the author fails to prove that his data is original or authentic the Editor will not publish the paper. Similarly, if a reviewer points out that an author reproduces data already published and used by another author without quoting source the Editor will not publish the paper until he is satisfied about the originality of data. The integrity of data is mandatory because the findings and results are built on it.

6. Ethical Oversight

Ethical oversight should include, but is not limited to, policies on consent to publication, publication on vulnerable populations, ethical conduct of research using animals, ethical conduct of research using human subjects, handling confidential data and of business/marketing practices. If the Journal receives concerns from the readers about these ethical oversight it will refer the matter to the author(s) to remove these ethical oversight and print corrigendum accordingly.

7. Intellectual Property

Many issues relating to intellectual property arises. These issues include licenses for published scale, dispute between two authors, license for using a published scale, suspected plagiarism in a submitted

manuscript, duplicate publishing of paper, etc. Plagiarism, in fact, is an intellectual crime and the Journal deal with it strictly. The Journal is committed not to publish any paper having plagiarism of more than 20 percent and prefer to publish paper having similarity around 15 percent. If any complaint is received even after publishing of paper, the Journal will fully investigate the issue, seek explanation from the author and act accordingly. Where two persons claim to be author of a paper the journal will not publish it until settlement of authorship issue.

8. Journal Management

The Journal Management team consists of professionals having vast experience of editing, printing and publishing. All decisions of management are transparent. Similarly, review process of research papers is strictly confidential and identity of reviewers are kept secret during the course of review. Every author is informed about the decision of the reviewer and editor well-in-time and they are given sufficient time and valid ground before rejection of his paper. The publishing fee and procedure of review of the paper are clearly explained for the guidance of author. The management of Journal maintains its neutrality at all cost and breach of SOP by any staff member may result in termination of service. There is no gender and racial discrimination policy at any level and the Management of Journal is committed to serve research community all over the world.

9. Peer Review

Peer review in all its forms plays an important role in ensuring the integrity and quality of the scholarly record. The process depends to a large extent on trust, and requires that everyone involved behaves responsibly and ethically. Peer reviewers play a central and critical role in the peer-review process, but too often come to the role without any guidance and unaware of their ethical obligations. The journal, after receiving the paper, deleted author name, affiliations and address from the paper, and sent abstract and text material to reviewers having experience in relevant field. The reviewers will be requested to complete review process within 15 days to 30 days. They will ask to mention whether the paper under review needs major or minor revisions. Then paper will be sent to author without disclosing the name of reviewer and his affiliation, to remove revisions within a week. If the author is failed to remove major revisions his paper will be rejected. Sometimes, the author challenges the revisions of reviewer and declares them invalid or biased then the Editor will seek the opinion of another neutral reviewer about the major revisions. If the second reviewer also endorses major revisions and reject the objection of author the Journal will decline to publish paper and inform the author about the decision.

9.1 Being a Reviewer

9.1.1 Professional Responsibility of Reviewers:

Authors who have benefited from the peer review process should consider becoming peer reviewers as a part of their professional responsibilities. Some journals require a formal process of appointment to the

review panel, and some require specific expertise; anyone interested in becoming a reviewer should look for the journal guidelines on peer review and follow any requirements posted. In order to assign appropriate reviewers, editors must match reviewers with the scope of the content in a manuscript to get the best reviews possible. Potential reviewers should provide journals with personal and professional information that is accurate and a fair representation of their expertise, including verifiable and accurate contact information. It is important to recognize that impersonation of another individual during the review process is considered serious misconduct. When approached to review, agree to review only if you have the necessary expertise to assess the manuscript and can be unbiased in your assessment. It is better to identify clearly any gaps in your expertise when asked to review.

9.1.2 Review Process: Before printing, blind peer review will be conducted and the editor will mediate between authors and reviewers and confidentiality of both will be maintained. Peer review will not be published. Review will be owned by Journal and third party.

9.1.3 Competing interests: Ensure you declare all potential competing, or conflicting, interests. If you are unsure about a potential competing interest that may prevent you from reviewing, do raise this. Competing interests may be personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious in nature. If you are currently employed at the same institution as any of the authors or have been recent (e.g., within the past 3 years) mentors, mentees, close collaborators or joint grant holders, you should not agree to review. In addition, you should not agree to review a manuscript just to gain sight of it with no intention of submitting a review, or agree to review a manuscript that is very similar to one you have in preparation or under consideration at another journal.

9.1.4 Timeliness: It is courteous to respond to an invitation to peer review within a reasonable time-frame, even if you cannot undertake the review. If you feel qualified to judge a particular manuscript, you should agree to review only if you are able to return a review within the proposed or mutually agreed time-frame. Always inform the journal promptly if your circumstances change and you cannot fulfil your original agreement or if you require an extension. If you cannot review, it is helpful to make suggestions for alternative reviewers if relevant, based on their expertise and without any influence of personal considerations or any intention of the manuscript receiving a specific outcome (either positive or negative).

9.2 Conducting a review

2.2.1 Initial steps:

Read the manuscript, supplementary data files and ancillary material thoroughly (e.g., reviewer instructions, required ethics and policy statements), getting back to the journal if anything is not clear and requesting any missing or incomplete items you need. Do not contact the authors directly without the permission of the journal. It is important to understand the scope of the review before commencing (i.e., is a review of raw data expected?).

9.2.2 Confidentiality:

Respect the confidentiality of the peer review process and refrain from using information obtained during the peer review process for your own or another's advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others.

(Possible breach of reviewer confidentiality). Do not involve anyone else in the review of a manuscript (including early career researchers you are mentoring), without first obtaining permission from the journal (Reviewer asks trainee to review manuscript). The names of any individuals who have helped with the review should be included so that they are associated with the manuscript in the journal's records and can also receive due recognition for their efforts.

9.2.3 Bias and competing interests:

It is important to remain unbiased by considerations related to the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, origins of a manuscript or by commercial considerations. If you discover a competing interest that might prevent you from providing a fair and unbiased review, notify the journal and seek advice (Reviewer requests to be added as an author after publication). While waiting for a response, refrain from looking at the manuscript and associated material in case the request to review is rescinded. Similarly, notify the journal as soon as possible if you find you do not have the necessary expertise to assess the relevant aspects of a manuscript so as not to unduly delay the review process. In the case of double-blind review, if you suspect the identity of the author(s) notify the journal if this knowledge raises any potential competing or conflict of interest.

9.2.4 Suspicion of ethics violations:

If you come across any irregularities with respect to research and publication ethics do let the journal know. For example, you may have concerns that misconduct occurred during either the research or the writing and submission of the manuscript, or you may notice substantial similarity between the manuscript and a concurrent submission to another journal or a published article. In the case of these or any other ethical concerns, contact the editor directly and do not attempt to investigate on your own. It is appropriate to cooperate, in confidence, with the journal, but not to personally investigate further unless the journal asks for additional information or advice.

9.2.5 Transferability of peer review:

Publishers may have policies related to transferring peer reviews to other journals in the publisher's portfolio (sometimes referred to as portable or cascading peer review). Reviewers may be asked to give permission for the transfer of their reviews if that is journal policy. If a manuscript is rejected from one journal and submitted to another, and you are asked to review that same manuscript, you should be prepared to review the manuscript afresh as it may have changed between the two submissions and the journal's criteria for evaluation and acceptance may be different. In the interests of transparency and efficiency it

may be appropriate to provide your original review for the new journal (with permission to do so from the original journal), explaining that you had reviewed the submission previously and noting any changes.

9.3 Preparing a report

9.3.1 Format:

Follow journals' instructions for writing and posting the review. If a particular format or scoring rubric is required, use the tools supplied by the journal. Be objective and constructive in your review, providing feedback that will help the authors to improve their manuscript. For example, be specific in your critique, and provide supporting evidence with appropriate references to substantiate general statements, to help editors in their evaluation. Be professional and refrain from being hostile or inflammatory and from making libelous or derogatory personal comments or unfounded accusations (Personal remarks within a post-publication literature forum).

9.3.2 Appropriate feedback:

Keep in mind that the editor requires a fair, honest, and unbiased assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript. Most journals allow reviewers to provide confidential comments to the editor as well as comments to be read by the authors. The journal may also ask for a recommendation to accept/revise/reject; any recommendation should be congruent with the comments provided in the review. If you have not reviewed the whole manuscript, do indicate which aspects of the manuscript you have assessed. Ensure your comments and recommendations for the editor are consistent with your report for the authors; most feedback should be put in the report that the authors will see. Confidential comments to the Editor should not be a place for denigration or false accusation, done in the knowledge that the authors will not see your comments.

9.3.3 Language and style: Remember it is the authors' paper, so do not attempt to rewrite it to your own preferred style if it is basically sound and clear; suggestions for changes that improve clarity are, however, important. In addition, be aware of the sensitivities surrounding language issues that are due to the authors writing in a language that is not their first or most proficient language, and phrase the feedback appropriately and with due respect.

9.3.4. Suggestions for further work: It is the job of the peer reviewer to comment on the quality and of the work they receive. If the work is not clear because of missing analyses, the reviewer should comment and explain what additional analyses would clarify the work submitted. It is not the job of the reviewer to extend the work beyond its current scope. Be clear which (if any) suggested additional investigations are essential to support claims made in the manuscript under consideration and which will just strengthen or extend the work.

9.3.5 Accountability: Prepare the report by yourself, unless you have permission from the journal to involve another person. Refrain from making unfair and negative comments or including unjustified

criticisms of any competitors' work that is mentioned in the manuscript. Refrain from suggesting that authors include citations to your (or an associate's) work merely to increase citation counts or to enhance the visibility of your or your associate's work; suggestions must be based on valid academic or technological reasons. Do not intentionally prolong the review process, either by delaying the submission of your review or by requesting unnecessary additional information from the journal or author. If you are the Editor handling a manuscript and decide to provide a review of that manuscript yourself (perhaps if another reviewer could not return a report), do this transparently and not under the guise of an anonymous additional reviewer.

9.3.6 What to consider after peer review:

If possible, try to accommodate requests from journals to review revisions or resubmissions of manuscripts you have reviewed previously. It is helpful to respond promptly if contacted by a journal about matters related to your review and to provide the information required. Similarly, contact the journal if anything relevant comes to light after you have submitted your review that might affect your original feedback and recommendations. Continue to respect the confidential nature of the review process and do not reveal details of the manuscript after peer review unless you have permission from the author and the journal.

9.3.7 Peer review training and mentoring

Take advantage of opportunities to enroll in mentorship or training programs to improve your peer review skills. Offer to mentor early career researchers as they learn the peer review process. Supervisors who wish to involve their students or junior researchers in peer review must request permission from the Editor and abide by the Editor's decision. In cases where a student performs the review under the guidance of the supervisor, that should be noted and the student should be acknowledged as the reviewer of record. It may also be helpful to read the reviews from the other reviewers, if these are provided by the journal, to improve your own understanding of the topic and the reason for the editorial decision.

10. Post Publication discussion and correction

As the journal is online available after publishing, it is free to use, discuss its contents, mention mistakes, errors, or duplication, etc. The Journal will welcome debate on issues, letters to editor and comments on any paper and complaints. The journal will investigate all complaints, seek comments from relevant authors and correct errors. In case of duplication and plagiarism, if proved, the Journal has a right to retract the paper.