

Jinnah Business Review

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

Jinnah Business Review – JBR is a peer-reviewed international journal committed to promoting the highest ethical publication practices and to maintaining the integrity of the scientific record. It is not a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics – COPE, but it follows COPE's Code of Conduct.

The following statement defines what is to be expected of the key participants in the publishing process: authors, reviewers, the editor and the publisher.

Publication and authorship

The journal publishes exclusively unpublished papers.

By submitting a manuscript the authors confirm that it is the result of their own original work for which they accept scientific and ethical responsibility (especially with respect to plagiarism, forgery of data, multiple reporting or publishing identical research results, abuse of authorship, or any other form of academic misdemeanor).

Additionally, by submitting a manuscript, the authors confirm that the same manuscript has not been published or submitted for publishing elsewhere.

Publication is free of charge for authors submitting the articles.

Authors' responsibilities

Authors who submit articles to the journal JBR affirm that manuscript contents are original.

Authors' submission also implies that the manuscript has not been published previously in any language, either fully or partly, and is not currently submitted for publication elsewhere. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Authors of reports of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

Authors' submission implies that all data in article are real and authentic. Authors should retain raw data related to their submitted paper, and must provide it for editorial review, upon request of the editor.

Authors should acknowledge all sources of data used in the research and cite publications that have influenced their research. If the authors have used the work and/or words of others, they need to ensure that this has been appropriately cited or quoted.

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the research. All those who have made significant contributions to the paper should be listed as

co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors.

The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included in the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

All authors should disclose any financial or other substantive conflict of interest in their manuscript that might be construed to influence its results or interpretation.

Authors of submitted articles are obliged to participate in the peer-review process.

If authors discover a significant mistake or inaccuracy in their published paper, it is their obligation to promptly notify the journal editor and provide retractions or corrections of mistakes.

Responsibility for the reviewers

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. The reviewers should respect the confidentiality of peer review and not reveal any details of the manuscript or its review, during or after the peer-review process, beyond those that are released by the journal.

Reviewers should agree to review only manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner. If a selected reviewer feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or within proposed time-frame, he/she should notify the editor and excuse himself/herself from the review process.

The review of submitted manuscripts should be conducted objectively. The reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments, refraining from being hostile or inflammatory, and from making defamatory or derogatory personal comments.

Reviewers should point out relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors.

Reviewers should not use information obtained during the peer-review process for their own or any other person's or organization's advantage or to disadvantage or discredit others.

All reviewers should have no conflict of interest with respect to the research, the authors or the research funders connected to the manuscript.

Reviewers should ensure that their review is based on the merits of the work and not influenced, either positively or negatively, by any personal, financial, or other conflicting considerations or by intellectual biases.

Reviewers should notify the journal immediately if they come across any irregularities, have concerns about ethical aspects of the work, are aware of substantial similarity between the manuscript and a concurrent submission to another journal or a published article, or suspect that misconduct may have occurred during either the research or the writing and submission of the manuscript. Reviewers should, however, keep their concerns confidential and not personally investigate further unless the journal asks for further information or advice.

Editor's responsibilities

The editor will ensure that all published papers and reviews of research have been reviewed by suitably qualified reviewers and that the peer-review process is fair, unbiased and timely. The editor preserves anonymity of reviewers.

The editor has responsibility to ensure that all information regarding manuscripts submitted to the journal JBR remain confidential.

The editor ensures that each manuscript is initially evaluated by the editor, who may make use of appropriate means, to examine the originality of the contents of the manuscript. After the manuscript passes this test, it is forwarded to two reviewers for double-blind peer review, and each of them will make a recommendation to publish the manuscript in its present form or to modify or to reject it.

The editor's decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication are based only on the paper's importance, originality and clarity, and the study's relevance to the remit of the journal.

The editor ensures that each received manuscript is evaluated according to its intellectual content without regard to authors' gender, race, religion, etc.

The editor cannot use unpublished materials disclosed in the submitted manuscript for his/her own research, without prior written consent of the authors.

The editor is always willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. If mistakes are found in the article, the editor will promptly provide their retractions or corrections.

A new editor will not overturn decisions to publish submissions made by the previous editor unless serious problems are identified.

The editor will act if he/she suspects misconduct or if an allegation of misconduct is brought to him/her. This duty extends to both published and unpublished papers.

Editor's decisions will not be affected by the origin of the manuscript, including the nationality, ethnicity, political beliefs, race, or religion of the authors. The decisions to edit and publish a manuscript will not be determined by the policies of governments or other agencies outside of the journal itself.

Publishing ethics issues

The editorial board is responsible for monitoring publishing ethics/preventing publication malpractice.

The editor and the editorial board will ensure the integrity of the academic record.

Unethical behavior is unacceptable and the journal JBR does not tolerate plagiarism or fraudulent data.

The editor and the editorial board will ensure corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

The relations of the editor with publishers and owners will be based on the principle of editorial independence.

The editor makes decisions on which articles to publish based on their quality and suitability for the journal, without interference from the journal publisher as well as according to intellectual and ethical standards instead of immediate financial or political gain.

The publisher will provide reasonable practical support to the editor so that he/she can follow the COPE Code of Conduct for Journal.

Following the COPE Code of Conduct for Journal Editors, in cases of suspected or alleged research or publication misconduct, the editor will first seek a response from those suspected of misconduct. If he/she is not satisfied with the response, he/she will ask the relevant employers or institutions to investigate. The editor will make all reasonable efforts to ensure that a proper investigation into alleged misconduct is conducted.

The editor and editorial board of JBR will:

- Inform institutions if they suspect misconduct by their researchers and provide evidence to support these concerns;
- Cooperate with investigations and respond to institutions' questions about misconduct allegations;
- Be prepared to issue retractions or corrections when provided with findings of misconduct arising from investigations;
- Have policies for responding to institutions and other organizations that investigate cases of research misconduct.

Investigations into possible misconduct will generally be undertaken by the researcher's institution and not by editors. If a journal has published unreliable or fraudulent information, the editor has a duty to correct or retract this.

Therefore, even when faced with apparently strong evidence of misconduct (e.g. plagiarism or inappropriate image manipulation), and a clear need to correct the published record, the editor will liaise with institutions and ensure they are informed.

The editor follows the COPE guidelines on retractions.

The editor will consider retracting a publication if:

- There is clear evidence that the findings are unreliable, either as a result of misconduct (e.g. data fabrication) or honest error (e.g. miscalculation or experimental error);
- The findings have previously been published elsewhere without proper cross-referencing, permission or justification (i.e. cases of redundant publication);
- It constitutes plagiarism;
- It reports unethical research.

The retraction will be clearly identifiable to readers and indexing systems.