

PUBLISHING ETHICAL GUIDELINES

Publication Ethics

Ethical Guidelines for the Editors (Issued by HEC)

The Editor of a research journal plays an important role in establishing and maintaining the professional standards. The Editor is expected to perform the responsibility towards the journal on its all aspects and at varied stages i.e. from receiving of an article to publishing it. Keeping this in view, it becomes prime responsibility of an editor to adapt the following guidelines while publishing papers in his/her research journal.

✚ The Editor's Responsibilities

The Editor is responsible for:

- Establishing and maintaining quality of the journal by publishing quality papers.
- Promotion of freedom of expression within the cultural, constitutional/legal framework,
- Providing integrity and credibility of the research contributions,
- Meeting the needs of authors and readers,
- Maintaining ethical standards of their journal,
- Providing corrigendum for any correction, clarification and apologies where required.

✚ Good practices for their job would include to:

- Encourage new ideas and suggestions of authors, peer reviewers, members of editorial board and readers for improving quality of the journal.
- Apply the process of blind peer review in true letter and spirit,
- Promote innovative findings in respective field and publishing them on priority,

- Promote anti plagiarism policy,
- Educate contributors (authors) about ethical practices in research, and
- Implement the journal's policy without institutional pressure and revise the policy from time to time.

Fair play and Impartiality

- The criteria for the selection of research papers must be impartial and the Editor should select academically and scientifically sound articles.
- The Editor should: Promptly respond to the author (s) of the papers submitted for publication, and
 - Assign a specific number to an article submitted for processing; and
 - Pay impartial consideration to all research papers submitted for publication.
- To ensure evaluation of the content of research papers impartially,
 - Disregard the discriminating factors, e.g. gender, race, ethnicity, religious belief, cultural sentiments, political affiliation, seniority and/or institutional association of the author(s) while selecting articles for publication,
- To ensure impartiality of the review process by informing the reviewer (s) that s/he needs to disclose any conflicts of interest regarding the submitted research paper.

Confidentiality

- The Editor must ensure confidentiality of the author(s) and reviewers during the process of double-blind peer review,
- Information pertaining to a research paper should not be disclosed by the Editor to anyone except the author(s), reviewer(s), and editorial board members,

- Upon reaching a decision about a research paper, only the Editor may disclose or announce title of the study and name of the author(s) that has been accepted for publication. Any other information may only be disclosed with the prior approval of the author(s), and
- Confidentiality of the participants of the research should also be ensured by protecting personal information (e.g. identifiable personal details, images, and/or individual results).
- Editor should declare clear guidelines to the contributors (authors) regarding confidentiality of the individual participant.
- Prior to publication, the content of the manuscript should be kept confidential, both the Editor and reviewer(s) will not share or use any part of the work.

Editing and Formatting Guidelines

- Editor has responsibility to prepare explicit guidelines with respect to formatting and editing of each manuscript.
- These guidelines must be available online as well as should be printed on each of the issues of the Journal.

The Review Process

- Details about the review process should be declared.
- Editor should ensure that all published papers have gone through a double-blind peer review, and at least one of the reviewers is from outside the country.
- Editor should ensure that peer-review is masked in both directions and as such the identity of the author is removed from the manuscript prior to its review in order to protect the confidentiality and privacy.
- Editor should provide sufficient guidelines to reviewers, including necessary information about the review process and provide them a reviewer comment form for recording his/her comments.

- Editor must ensure that peer review process is prompt, nondiscriminatory and highly professional.
- Editor should develop a system of confidentiality of research papers undergoing the review process.
- Editor is required to send reviewers' comments to author(s) promptly and should ensure that the corrections suggested by the reviewers are incorporated by the author(s) in true letter and spirit.
- Editor to critically evaluate peer review practices regularly and make improvements, if, required.
- The Editor should maintain a database of competent and qualified reviewers. For this purpose, various sources other than personal contacts to identify new reviewers (e.g. referring by author (s), citations and references section in a book/journal), can be used.
- Editor should refer troublesome cases (e.g. in case of one acceptance and one rejection or any conflict arisen after review) to Advisory Committee in order to resolve the matter agreeably.

Dealing with Misconduct

- The Editor should encourage reviewers to comment on ethical issues and possible research and publication misconduct (e.g. inappropriate research design, incomplete detail on participant's consent, data manipulation, and presentation).
- Editor should encourage reviewers to comment on the validity of submitted research paper and identify 'subtle (simply copy-paste)' and/or 'blatant (paraphrasing)' type of plagiarism, if, practiced by the author(s).
- Editor should confirm plagiarism (carry out objective check through Turnitin) and/or searching for similar titles to the submitted research paper, and

- Editor should be prepared to publish a corrigendum, remove and retract a plagiarized article if it comes to his/her knowledge subsequent to its publication.

Transparency

- The Editor must ensure that multiple papers as a principal investigator submitted by an author should not be published in the same issue.
- Only ONE co-authorship is allowed for those authors who also contribute a research paper as a principal investigator in the same issue.
- The Editor should adopt authorship or co-authorship policy that will set an example in the scientific community and strictly discourage any misconduct (e.g. forcible inclusion of a name in the author list). Authorship should only be given to those individuals who have substantially contributed in the said article.

Conflict of Interest

- In order to ensure transparency and following guidelines of Higher Education Commission Pakistan (HEC), International Journal of Psychological and Behavioural Research (IJPBR) do not publish any research article from the members of editorial board.
- The Editor should not edit a submitted paper for those author(s) and/or institution against which s/he has any conflicts of interest (e.g. resulting from competitive, collaborative and/or professional standing).
- The Editor should also apply this guideline on their reviewers and Editorial Board members.
- The Editor must publish a list of common interests (e.g. financial, academic and/or any other type) for all Editorial Board members and editorial staff. This list should be updated from time to time.

Disclosure

- The Editor must not use any unpublished information/data from the submitted research paper without the permission of the author(s), and

- Any information received after the peer review process must be kept confidential and not used for personal gains.

Publication Decisions

- The Editorial Board should only shortlist research papers which have relevance to the scope of the journal clearly stated in the Journal, using his /her judgment, but without any personal bias.
- After completion of the reviewing process, the submission of revised manuscript, and assessing the quality and validity, the Editor has a right to accept or reject a research paper.
- The Editor's decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based purely on merit, academic standards and professional demands of the journal.
- The Editor must justify the reason (s) of rejecting a research paper to author(s). This may include:
 - Failure to fit in the scope of the journal (may be communicated after preliminary review)
 - Insufficient depth of content
 - Major errors related to design, analysis, write up and format
 - Any misconduct or conflicting factors (e.g. plagiarism, copyright infringement, legal issues, fake data, authorship issues)
- The Editor is required to timely communicate the editorial decision to the author(s),
- The Editors should not reverse decisions in favor or against author(s) on their own.

Establishing a Procedure for Appeal

The Editor is responsible for establishing a proper mechanism for appeals launched against:

- The rejection of a research paper.

- Objections to publications causing harm to any party.
- Violation of Ethical boundaries in any manner.

Ethical Guidelines for Authors (Issued by HEC)

The following ethical guidelines are obligatory for all author(s) violation of which may result in application of penalties by the editor, including but not limited to the suspension or revocation of publishing privileges.

✚ Reporting Standards

- It is the author(s)' responsibility to ensure that the research report and data contain adequate detail and references to the sources of information in order to allow others to reproduce the results.
- Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

Originality and Plagiarism

- It is the author(s)' responsibility to make certain that s/he has submitted an entirely original work, giving due credit, by virtue of proper citations, to the works and/or words of others where they have been used.
- Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is not acceptable.
- Material quoted verbatim from the author(s)' previously published work or other sources must be placed in quotation marks.
- Falsification of data: ranges from fabrication to deceptive selective reporting of findings and omission of conflicting data, or willful suppression and/or distortion of data.
- As per HEC's policy, in case the manuscript has a similarity index of more than 19%, it will either be rejected or left at the discretion of the Editorial Board for the purposes of a conditional acceptance.

Declaration

- Authors are required to provide an undertaking / declaration stating that the manuscript under consideration contains solely their original work that is not under consideration for publishing in any other journal in any form.
- A manuscript that is co-authored must be accompanied by an undertaking explicitly stating that each author has contributed substantially towards the preparation of the manuscript in order to claim right to authorship.
- It is the responsibility of the corresponding author that s/he has ensured that all those who have substantially contributed in the manuscripts have been included in the author list and they have agreed to the order of authorship.

Multiple, Redundant and Current Publication

- Authors should not submit manuscripts describing essentially the same research to more than one journal or publication except if it is a re-submission of a rejected or withdrawn manuscript.
- Authors may re-publish previously conducted research that has been substantially altered or corrected using more meticulous analysis or by adding more data.
- Simultaneous submission of the same manuscript to any other Journal is unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Acknowledgment of Sources

- Authors are instructed to mention proper acknowledgment of the work of others, including clear indications of the sources of all information quoted or offered, except what is common knowledge. •
- The author(s) must also acknowledge the contributions of people, organizations and institutes who assisted the process of research, including those who provided technical help, writing assistance or financial funding (in the acknowledgement).
- It is duty of the author(s) to conduct a literature review and properly cite the original publications that describe closely related work.

Authorship Credit

- Authorship of the work may only be credited to those who have made a noteworthy contribution in conceptualization, design, conducting, data analysis and writing up of the manuscript.
- It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to include the name(s) of only those coauthors who have made significant contributions to the work.
- The corresponding author should ensure that all co- authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.
- Others who have participated in certain substantive aspect of the research should be acknowledged for their contribution in an "Acknowledgement" section.

- Individuals, who helped in data acquisition, provided administrative support, organizations which may have helped in data acquisition must be acknowledged in the "Acknowledgement" section.

✚ Privacy of Participants

- Authors must respect the privacy of the participant of research and must not use any information obtained from them without their informed consent.
- Authors should ensure that only information that improves understanding of the study is shared.
- Authors must ensure that in occasions where the identity of the participant needs to be revealed in the study, clear and informed consent of the concerned party is obtained.
- In the case of the demise of a participant, consent must be obtained from the family of the deceased.

✚ Data Access and Retention

- If any question arises about the accuracy or validity of the research work during the review process, the author(s) should provide raw data to the Editor.

✚ Images

- The author(s) should ensure that images included in an account of research performed or in the data collection as part of the research are free from manipulation,.
- The author(s) must provide an accurate description of how the images were generated and produced.

✚ Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

- The potential and relevant competing financial, personal, social or other interest of all author(s) that might be affected by publication of the results contained in the manuscript must be conveyed to the editor.

- The author(s) should disclose any potential conflict of interest at the earliest possible stage, including but not limited to employment, consultancies, honoraria, patent applications/registrations, grants or other funding.
- All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed alongside a brief overview of the role played, if any by the responses during various stages of the research.
- Authors should state the conflict of interest clearly in the submission statement form. This statement should also appear at the end of the text before the references. If there are no conflicts of interests, the authors should state, “none to declare.”

Copy Right Policy

- Authors may have to sign an agreement allowing the journal to reserve the right to circulate the article and all other derivative works such as translations.

Manuscript Acceptance and Rejection

- The review period can last between 1-2 months or longer and during this period the author(s) reserve the right to contact the Editor to ask about status of the submitted manuscript.
- Once the review process has been completed, the author will be informed about the status of the manuscript which could either be an acceptance, rejection or revisions.
- In the case of rejection, the author(s) reserves the right to publish the article elsewhere.
- In case of revisions, the author(s) must provide an description of all corrections made in the manuscript and the revised manuscript should, then, go through the process of verification of revisions and be accepted or rejected accordingly.
- In case of dissatisfaction over the decision of rejection, the author can appeal the decision by contacting the Editor.

Dealing with Human Subjects

- When reporting experiments on human subjects, authors should indicate whether the procedures followed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on human experimentation and with the latest version of American Psychological Association.
- Every manuscript submitted to IJPBR involving human subjects should have the ethical approval by the ethical review board of the institution. The statement should be written on the official letterhead of the Ethical Review committee of the institution duly stamped and signed by the Chairperson of the committee. The study should be approved prospectively.
- All case reports require an approval on the institutional letterhead from the head of the department. A statement should be included that participants gave informed consent before being included in the study or for publication of a case report.

Ethical Guidelines for Reviewers (Issued by HEC)

Scholars accepting to review a research paper have an ethical responsibility to complete this assignment professionally. The quality, credibility and reputation of a journal also depend on the peer review process. The Higher Education Commission (HEC), Pakistan has listed down 'Ethical Guidelines for Reviewers' so that all reviewers provide their valuable services in a standardized manner.

+ Suitability and Promptness

The Reviewers should:

- Inform the Editor, if they do not have the subject expertise required to carry out the review and s/he should inform the Editor immediately after receiving a request.
- Be responsible to act promptly and submit review report on time.
- Immediately inform the Editor of any possible delays and suggest another date of submission for a review report, and
- Not unnecessarily delay the review process, either by prolonged delay in submission of their review or by requesting unnecessary additional data/information from the Editor or author(s).

+ Standards of Objectivity

- The reviews should be objectively carried out with a consideration of high academic, scholarly and scientific standards.
- All judgments should be meticulously established and maintained in order to ensure the full comprehension of the reviewer's comments by the editors and the author(s).
- Both reviewers and author(s) in rebuttal should avoid unsupported assertions,
- The reviewer may justifiably criticize a manuscript but it would be inappropriate to resort to personal criticism on the author(s), and
- The reviewers should ensure that their decision is purely based on the quality of the research paper and not influenced, either positively or negatively, by any personal, financial, or other conflicting considerations or by intellectual bias.

+ Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

- A reviewer should not, for the purpose of his/her own research, use unpublished material disclosed in a submitted manuscript.

- The data included in the research paper is confidential and the reviewer shall not be allowed to use it for his/her personal study.
- A reviewer must declare any potentially conflicting interests (e.g. personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious). In such situation, s/he will be required to follow the policies of International Journal of Psychological and Behavioural Research (IJPBR).
- A reviewer should be honest enough to declare conflicts of interest, if the research paper under review is the same as to his/her presently conducted study.
- If the reviewer feels unqualified to separate his/her bias, s/he should immediately return the manuscript to the Editor without review, and justify to him/her about the situation.

Confidentiality

- Reviewers should consider the research paper as a confidential document and must not discuss its content on any platform except in cases where professional advice is being sought with the authorization of the Editor, and
- Reviewers are professionally and ethically bound not to disclose the details of any research paper prior to its publication without the prior approval of the Editor.

Ethical Considerations

- If the reviewer suspects that the research paper is almost the same as someone else's work, s/he will ethically inform the Editor and provide its citation as a reference.
- If the reviewer suspects that results in the research paper to be untrue/unrealistic/fake, s/he will share it with the Editor.
- If there has been an indication of violating ethical norms in the treatment of human beings (e.g. children, female, poor people, disabled, elderly, etc), then this should be identified to the Editor, and

- If the research paper is based on any previous research study or is replica of an earlier work, or the work is plagiarized for e.g. the author has not acknowledged/referenced others' work appropriately, then this should be brought in the Editor's knowledge.

Originality

For evaluating originality, the reviewers should consider the following elements:

- Does the research paper add to existing knowledge?
- Are the research questions and/or hypotheses in line with the objective of the research work?

Structure

- If the layout and format of the paper is not according to the prescribed version, the reviewers should discuss it with the Editor or should include this observation in their review report.
- On the other hand, if the research paper is exceptionally well written, the reviewer may overlook the formatting issues. At other times, the reviewers may suggest restructuring the paper before publication. The following elements should be carefully evaluated:
- If there is serious problem of language or expression and the reviewer gets the impression that the research paper does not fulfill linguistic requirements and readers would face difficulties reading and comprehending the paper. The reviewer should record this deficiency in his/her report and suggest the editor to make its proper editing. Such a situation may arise when the author(s)' native language is not English.
- Whether the data presented in the paper is original or reproduced from previously conducted or published work. The papers which reflect originality should be given preference for publication.
- The clarity of illustrations including photographs, models, charts, images and figures is essential to note. If there is duplication then it should be reported in the review report. Similarly, descriptions provided in the “Results” section should correspond with the data presented in tables/figures, if not then it should be clearly listed in the review report.

Critically review the statistical analysis of the data. Also check the rational and appropriateness of the specific analysis.

- The reviewers should read the “Methodology” section in detail and make sure that the author(s) has demonstrated the understanding of the procedures being used and presented in the manuscript.
- The relationship between “Data, Findings and Discussion” requires a thorough evaluation thoroughly. Unnecessary conjecture or unfounded conclusions that are not based on the presented data are not acceptable.
- Further questions to be addressed are whether: the organization of the research paper is appropriate or deviates from the standard or prescribed format?
- Does the author(s) follow the guidelines prescribed by the journal for preparation and submission of the manuscript?
- Is the research paper free from typographical errors?

Review Report

- The reviewer must explicitly write his/her observations in the section of 'comments' because author(s) will only have access to the comments reviewers have made,
- For writing a review report, the reviewers are requested to complete a prescribed form (s).
- It is helpful for both the Editor and author(s) if the reviewer writes a brief summary in the first section of the review report. This summary should comprise the reviewer's final decision and inferences drawn from a full review.
- Any personal comments on author(s) should be avoided and final remarks should be written in a courteous and positive manner.
- Indicating any deficiencies is important. For the understanding of the Editor and author(s), the reviewers should highlight these deficiencies in some detail with specificity. This should help justify the comments made by the reviewer,

- When a reviewer makes a decision regarding the research paper, it should be clearly indicated as 'Reject', 'Accept without revision', or 'Need Revision' and either of the decisions should have justification.
- The reviewers should indicate the revisions clearly and comprehensively, and show willingness to confirm the revisions submitted by the author(s), if Editor wishes so, and
- The final decision about publishing a research paper (either accept or reject) will solely rest with the Editor and it is not a reviewer's job to take part in this decision. The editor will surely consider reviewer's comments and have a right to send the paper for another opinion or send it back to the author(s) for revision before making the final decision.

Ethical Guidelines for Publisher

Women University Mardan as publisher of IJPBR is committed to make sure that the potential for advertising, reprint or other commercial income has no influence or impact on editorial board decisions. We also provide widespread education and recommendation on publishing ethics standards, particularly for early career researchers. We support editors in communications with other publishers and/or journals where this is helpful to editors and are prepared to provide specialized legal review and counsel if required.

Editorial Policies

Plagiarism, data fabrication and image manipulation policy

- Plagiarism is not acceptable in IJPBR.
- International Journal of Psychological and Behavioural Research (IJPBR) is committed to promote original work of no tolerance for plagiarism.

- Plagiarism includes copying text, ideas, images, or data from another source, even from your own publications, without giving credit to the original source. All submissions will be subjected to plagiarism evaluation before editorial processing.
- It is the author(s) responsibility to ascertain that she/he has submitted completely original work, giving due credit, by virtue of proper citations of cited work, to the works and/or words of others where they are used/cited.
- Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is not acceptable on any cost.
- Less than 19% similarity index policy is followed as per HEC guidelines.

✚ Identification and dealing with research (Scientific) misconduct

- The Editor encourages reviewers to comment on ethical issues and possible research and publication misconduct (e.g. inappropriate research design, incomplete detail on participant's consent, data manipulation, and presentation).
- The International Journal of Psychological and Behavioural Research (IJPBR) encourage reviewers to comment on the validity of submitted research paper and identify 'subtle (simply copy-paste)' and/or 'blatant (paraphrasing)' type of plagiarism, if, practiced by the author(s).

✚ Multiple, redundant or concurrent submissions policy

- An author should not publish manuscripts describing basically the same research in more than one journal of primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal at the same time constitutes unethical behaviour and is unacceptable.
- In general, an author should not submit for consideration in another journal a paper that has been published previously.

✚ Authorship Credit

- Authorship of the work may only be credited to those who have made a noteworthy contribution in conceptualization, design, conducting, data analysis and writing up of the manuscript.

- It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to include the name(s) of only those coauthor (s) who have made significant contributions to the work.
- The corresponding author should ensure that all co- authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication. Others who have participated in certain substantive aspect of the research should be acknowledged for their contribution in an "Acknowledgement" section.

Any change to the author list during the editorial process or after publication should be approved by all authors, including any who have been removed. The corresponding author should act as a point of contact between the editor and the other authors and should keep co-authors informed and involve them in major decisions about the publication. IJPBR reserve the right to request evidence of authorship, and changes to authorship after acceptance will be made at the discretion of IJPBR.

Authorization and declaration

- Authors must accept full responsibility for the content of their articles. Editorial Board and the Publisher of the journal are not responsible for the opinions and statements expressed by the authors in their published material in IJPBR.
- To use the copyrighted material (for example psychological instruments, table, figure etc.), the author/s must seek the permission from the Author/s and Publisher of the material and send the copy of the permission letters via e-mail to the Editor IJPBR for records.
- While submitting the paper the author (s) must sign an ethical statement that “the article has not been published or sent for publication elsewhere”. And the authors acknowledge that they have disclosed all and any actual or potential conflicts of interest with their work or partial benefits connected with it.

Peer Review Policy

- Reviewers are informed about details of the review process.
- International Journal of Psychological and Behavioural Research (IJPBR) ensure that all the published papers have gone through a double-blind peer review, and at least one of the reviewers is from outside the country.

- International Journal of Psychological and Behavioural Research (IJPBR) make sure that peer-review is masked in both directions and as such the identity of the author is removed from the manuscript prior to its review in order to protect the confidentiality and privacy.
- The Reviewers are provided with sufficient guidelines for review process, and a reviewer comment form for recording his/her comments is also provided.
- The Editor ensures that peer review process is prompt, nondiscriminatory and highly professional.
- The International Journal of Psychological and Behavioural Research (IJPBR) have a system of confidentiality of research papers undergoing the review process.
- The reviewers' comments are shared promptly with the author(s) and editorial team makes sure that the corrections suggested by the reviewers are incorporated by the author(s) in true letter and spirit.
- The Editor refers troublesome cases (e.g. in case of one acceptance and one rejection or any conflict arisen after review) to Advisory Committee in order to resolve the matter cordially.

Checks applied to all reviewers:

- ✓ Reviewers must hold no conflicts of interest with the authors, including if they have published together in the last three years.
- ✓ That they hold a PhD.
- ✓ They must have recent publications in the field.
- ✓ IJPBR asks reviewers to inform the editor if they hold a conflict of interests that may prejudice the review report, either in a positive or negative way.
- ✓ Enough guidelines must be provided to reviewers together with a review comments form for recording comments.

Copyright, licensing and open Access policy

Copyright of the manuscripts published are retained by the author/authors and the first publication rights granted to IJPBR. Editor IJPBR or other team members will not be responsible for any successive use of the author(s) work. If so desired, it is the job of author (s) to bring an infringement action.

Article Correction, Retraction and withdrawal Policy

Article Corrections

Authors are encouraged to report errors in their articles with regard to the precision of published material. Only errors that impact the article considerably will be considered. Corrections are made at the journal's discretion. The correction procedure depends on the publication stage of the article. Corrections will be published under corrections and addendum in a later issue of the journal.

Article Retractions

Articles may be retracted because of scientific misconduct in cases such as multiple submissions, false claims of authorship, plagiarism or deceitful use of data. A signed statement from the concerned authors will be required to be submitted before an article can be retracted. Agreement of all authors of a paper is required before a retraction can be published. A notice of retraction will be published and linked to the original article clearly marked as a retracted. The notice will also include the reason for the retraction and who is retracting the article. The original article will not be removed from online or print versions of the journal, but will be identified as a retracted article. Retractions will also be listed on the contents page. IJPBR follows the recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) for retraction

Article Withdrawal

Articles can be withdrawn either by the authors or the publisher. Article withdrawal by authors may be acceptable only for the most undeniable and inevitable reasons, after submitting a letter signed by all authors of the article to the editorial office explaining the reason for article

withdrawal. Authors must not assume that their article has been withdrawn until they have received appropriate notification from the editorial office. If an article is found to infringe the ethical publishing guidelines of IJPBR such as bogus claims of authorship, duplicate publication, fake use of data, plagiarism, multiple submission the publisher has all the rights to withdraw that article.

Citation Policy

- The *International Journal of Psychological and Behavioural Research (IJPBR)* follows a variant of APA styles.
- Authors should ensure that where the material is taken from other sources (including their own published writing) the source is clearly cited and that where appropriate permission is obtained.
- Excessive self-citation of own work by the author is highly discouraged.
- Authors should not preferentially cite their own or their friends', peers', or institution's publications.
- In accordance with COPE guidelines, we expect that "original wording taken directly from publications by other researchers should appear in quotation marks with the appropriate citations." This condition also applies to an author's own work.

Complaint Process

Editorial board of IJPBR is committed to offer quality services to its contributors and believes in building trust and respect with all the authors, and researchers. In order to ensure the maintenance of high quality, IJPBR believes to improve by responding to appeals and complaints and rectifying its mistakes.

Complaint must relate to contents, procedures, or policies that are the responsibility of IJPBR editorial staff.

- Authors/readers can submit their appeal directly at: jbhs@wumardan.edu.pk
- The application must provide detail rationalization. The chief editor would look after the matter independently and forward it to some appropriate IJPBR editorial board member. Finally, the board member after going through the whole complaint/justification can finally recommend acceptance of appeal, further review, or maintain the original decision (if any).

Time Frame for Complaint Process:

Initial response to the complaint will be made within 5 working days. Further full response will be given within two weeks if possible. If this is not possible an interim response will be given. Complaints processing can take time depending on the matter.

Funding Source

Authors should list all funding sources in the Acknowledgments section. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of their funder designation.