

PUBLICATION ETHICS

Open Access Journal

In a publishing model like open access, research information is available to readers or the reader's institution at no cost. These readers are free to read, distribute, download or print part of or full article without subscribing to it for any non-commercial purpose. **The Jurio Cratis International Journal of Law and Policy (JCIJLP)** is freely available online under 'Creative Commons' copyright license policy **CC-BY-NC-SA**.

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

Our guidelines are entirely consistent with the COPE Principles of Transparency and Best Practice Guidelines, the COPE Code of Conduct. (COPE Guidelines can be found here: <https://publicationethics.org>) and the University Grants Commission (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018 (Complete UGC Regulation can be found here: https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/7771545_academic-integrity-Regulation2018.pdf). Jurio Cratis advocates for quality research work, and the editorial board - peer reviewer ensures the sanctity of academic publication.

Duties of editors

In addition to many general duties, such as constantly improving the quality and integrity of the journal, striving to meet the needs of authors and readers, encouraging academic debate, and others, the editors accept the obligation to apply best will and practice to cope with the following responsibilities:

Editorial Board

The Editorial Board will consist the recognized experts in the field. The editor will provide:

- All members' full names.
- Affiliations.
- Updated contact information to the editorial office and upload the same on the journal's web page.

Publication decisions

The editor of a peer-reviewed journal is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The validation of the work in question and its importance to researchers and readers must always drive such decisions. The editor may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism. The editor may confer with other editors or reviewers (or society officers) in making this decision.

Peer review process

All of a journal's content should be subject to peer review. Article submitted for possible publication are subject to a double-blind peer-review process. Editors first review articles. The editor may reject it out of hand either because it is not dealing with the subject matter for that journal or because it is manifestly of a low quality so that it cannot be considered. Articles that are found suitable for review are then sent to two experts in the field of the article. Referees of the article are unknown to each other. Referees should classify the articles as publishable, with amendments and improvements, or not publishable. Referees' evaluations usually include an explicit recommendation of what to do with the manuscript. The author then sees the referees' comments.

Editors should be ready to justify any substantial deviation from the described process. Editors should not reverse decisions on publication unless they identify serious problems.

Editors should publish guidance to either authors or reviewers on everything they expected. This guidance should be regularly updated and will refer to or link this code.

Fair play

An editor should evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

Confidentiality

The editor and editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Editors must not use unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript in their research without the authors' written consent. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Editors should recuse themselves (i.e., should ask a co-editor, associate editor, or other members of the editorial board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts with conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the articles. Editors should require all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication. If needed, other appropriate action should be taken, such as publishing a retraction or expression of concern; it should ensure that the peer-review process for sponsored supplements is the same as that used for the prominent journal. Items in sponsored accessories should be accepted solely based on academic merit and interest to readers and not be influenced by commercial considerations. Editors should identify Non-peer-reviewed sections of their journal.

Involvement and cooperation in investigations

In conjunction with the publisher (or society), an editor should take reasonably responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published article, in conjunction with the publisher (or society). Such measures will generally include contacting the manuscript's author and considering the individual complaint or claims made. However, it may also communicate further to the relevant institutions and research bodies. If the complaint is upheld, the publication of a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or other note may be appropriate measures. Every reported act of unethical publishing behavior must be looked into, even if discovered years after publication.

Digital Archiving

The editor will ensure digital preservation of access to the journal content through Zenodo.

Duties of Authors

Reporting Standards

Authors of reports of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed and an objective discussion of its significance. The article should represent the underlying data accurately. The article should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable. Review and professional publication articles should also be accurate and objective and identify editorial opinion works.

Data access and retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data connected with an article for editorial review. They should, in any event, be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

Originality and plagiarism

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others, this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Plagiarism takes many forms, from 'passing off' another's article as the author's article to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's article (without attribution) to claiming results from research conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication

An author should not generally publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable. In general, an author should not submit a previously published article for consideration in another journal.

Acknowledgement of sources

Proper acknowledgement of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, must not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source. Information obtained in confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, must not be used without the author's explicit written consent of the work involved in these services.

Authorship of the article

Authorship should be limited to those who have contributed to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Where others 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 co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the article and have agreed to its submission for publication.

Hazards and human or animal subjects

If the work involves chemicals, procedures, or equipment with any unusual hazards inherent in their use, the author must identify them in the manuscript. Suppose the work consists of the use of animal or human subjects. In that case, the author should ensure that the manuscript contains a statement that performed all procedures in compliance with relevant laws and institutional guidelines and that the appropriate institutional committee(s) has approved them. Authors should include a statement in the manuscript that obtained informed consent for experimentation with human subjects. The privacy rights of human subjects must always be observed.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflicts of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. Authors should disclose all sources of financial support for the project. Examples of potential conflicts of interest include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. Authors should disclose potential conflicts of interest at the earliest stage possible.

Fundamental errors in published works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in their published work, they must promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the article. Suppose the editor or the publisher learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error. In that case, the author must promptly retract or correct the article or provide evidence to the editor of the correctness of the original article.

Duties of Reviewers

Contribution to editorial decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions, and the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the article. Peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication and lies at the heart of the scientific method. JCIJLP shares the view of many that all scholars who wish to contribute to publications must do a fair share of reviewing.

Promptness

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process.

Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

Standards of objectivity

Reviewers should conduct reviews objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that the authors have not cited. The appropriate citation should accompany any previously reported statement as an observation, derivation, or argument. A reviewer should also call to the editor's

attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published article of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

Reviewers must not use unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript in a reviewer's research without the author's express written consent. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts with conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the articles.

