

Publication Ethics & Malpractice Statement

Srusti Management Review is a double blind peer-reviewed journal. This statement spells out ethical behaviour of all parties involved in the act of publishing an article for this journal, i.e.: the author, the editors, the peer-reviewers and the publisher. This statement is based on COPE's Best Practice Guidelines for journal editors.

Duties of Editors

Decision on The Publication of Articles

The Editor- In - Chief and Managing Editor of Srusti Management Review are responsible for deciding which of the articles are to be accepted for publication after undergoing double blind peer review should be published. The Editor- In - Chief and the Managing Editor may be guided by the policies of the journal's Editorial Board and subjected to such legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. However, neither the Editor- In- Chief nor the Managing Editor have the authority to influence the reviewers who are conducting the blind review of the articles submitted for peer review.

1. Fair Play

Manuscripts shall be evaluated solely on their intellectual merit without regard to authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy.

2. Confidentiality

The Editor - In - Chief, the Managing Editor and any 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.

3. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used by anyone who has a view of the manuscript (while handling it) in his or her own research without the express written consent of the author.

Duties of Reviewers

1. Contribution of Double Blind Peer Review

Double Blind Peer review assists the reviewers in making editorial decisions, while editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper. The reviewers don't know the author's identity, as any identifying information will be stripped from the document before review. Reviewers' comments to the editors are confidential and, before passing on to the author, they will be made anonymous. The names of the reviewers remain strictly confidential; with their identities known only the Editor-In-Chief and the Managing Editor.

2. Promptness

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the assigned manuscript or unable to provide a prompt review should notify the Editor- In - Chief and the Managing Editor and excuse himself/herself from the review process.

3. Confidentiality

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- In - Chief and the Managing Editor.

4. Standards of Objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. There shall be no personal criticism of the author. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

5. Acknowledgment of Sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that had been previously reported elsewhere should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the Editor- In- Chief/Managing Editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

6. Confidentiality

Privileged information or ideas obtained through double blind peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.

7. Conflict of Interest

Reviewers should not review manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

Duties of Authors

1. Reporting Standards

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 behaviour and are unacceptable.

2. Data Access and Retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data in connection with a paper for editorial review, and should be prepared to provide public access to such, if practicable, and should in any event, be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

3. Originality and Plagiarism

Authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others, this must be appropriately cited or quoted.

4. Multiple Publications

An author should not in general 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 behaviour and is unacceptable.

5. Acknowledgment of Sources

Proper acknowledgment 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.

6. Authorship of the Paper

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution 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 there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors.

7. The Corresponding Author

The Corresponding Author is the author responsible for communicating with the journal for publication. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on 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.

8. Acknowledgment of Funding Sources

Sources of funding for the research reported in the article should be duly acknowledged at the end of the article.

9. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

10. Fundamental Errors in Published Works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the Editor - In - Chief/Managing Editor and cooperate with the editors to retract or correct the paper.