

Journal Policies

Focus and Scope

Sci Journo – InClintion's Science Journal welcomes contributions in all fields of sciences which includes basic sciences such as Physics, Chemistry, and Biology and applied sciences such as Engineering and Technology, Medicine, Pharmacy, Biotechnology, Biophysics, and many other allied sciences of basic sciences.

It is industry focused journal in that bridges the gap between industry and academia and aims to cover industrial and commercial topics. Our aim is to help readers for acquiring more knowledge, we have decided to focus also on research and updates in different areas of science. It works on peer reviewed model of editing and reviewing manuscripts.

Sectional Policies

	Open Submission	Indexed	Peer Reviewed
Editorial		Yes	
Original/Research Articles	Yes	Yes	Yes
Review Articles	Yes	Yes	Yes
News	Yes		
Breif Reports	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thesis Abstracts	Yes		Yes
Press releases	Yes	Yes	

Peer Review Process

All submitted manuscripts are read by the editorial staff. To save time for authors and peer-reviewers, only those papers that seem most likely to meet our editorial criteria are sent for formal review. Those papers judged by the editors to be of insufficient general interest or otherwise inappropriate are rejected promptly without external review (although these decisions may be based on informal advice from specialists in the field).

Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest to our readership are sent for formal review, typically to two or three reviewers, but sometimes more if special advice is needed (for example on statistics or a particular technique). The editors then make a decision based on the reviewers' advice, from among several possibilities:

- Accept, with or without editorial revisions
- Invite the authors to revise their manuscript to address specific concerns before a final decision is reached
- Reject, but indicate to the authors that further work might justify a resubmission
- Reject outright, typically on grounds of specialist interest, lack of novelty, insufficient conceptual advance or major technical and/or interpretational problems

Reviewers are welcome to recommend a particular course of action, but they should bear in mind that the other reviewers of a particular paper may have different technical expertise and/or views, and the editors may have to make a decision based on conflicting advice. The most useful reports, therefore, provide the editors with the



information on which a decision should be based. Setting out the arguments for and against publication is often more helpful to the editors than a direct recommendation one way or the other.

Editorial decisions are not a matter of counting votes or numerical rank assessments, and we do not always follow the majority recommendation. We try to evaluate the strength of the arguments raised by each reviewer and by the authors, and we may also consider other information not available to either party. Our primary responsibilities are to our readers and to the scientific community at large, and in deciding how best to serve them, we must weigh the claims of each paper against the many others also under consideration.

We may return to reviewers for further advice, particularly in cases where they disagree with each other, or where the authors believe they have been misunderstood on points of fact. We therefore ask that reviewers should be willing to provide follow-up advice as requested. We are very aware, however, that reviewers are usually reluctant to be drawn into prolonged disputes, so we try to keep consultation to the minimum we judge necessary to provide a fair hearing for the authors.

When reviewers agree to assess a paper, we consider this a commitment to review subsequent revisions. However, editors will not send a resubmitted paper back to the reviewers if it seems that the authors have not made a serious attempt to address the criticisms.

We take reviewers' criticisms seriously; in particular, we are very reluctant to disregard technical criticisms. In cases where one reviewer alone opposes publication, we may consult the other reviewers as to whether s/he is applying an unduly critical standard. We occasionally bring in additional reviewers to resolve disputes, but we prefer to avoid doing so unless there is a specific issue, for example a specialist technical point, on which we feel a need for further advice.

Open Access Policy

This journal provides immediate open access to its content on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge.

Abstracting and indexing information

Sci Journo aims to get indexed in Indexus Copernicus, Chemical Abstracts, Directory of open access journals, Google scholar, OpenJGate, PrimoCentral, ProQuest, Scimago Journal Ranking, SCOLOAR, SCOPUS, SIIC databases, Summon by Serial Solutions, Ulrich's International Periodical Directory, etc. With continuous improvement in quality and fast response from editorial department, we will get impact factor in coming years. For achieving these goals, we are working now under standards set up by Council for Science Editors, Committee on Publication Ethics.



Publication ethics and malpractice statement

This statement states ethical behaviour of all parties involved in the act of publishing an article in the Sci Journo, i.e. the author, the peer-reviewer, the chief editor and editors, and the publisher.

Sci Journo is fully committed in the codes of conduct and international standards established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and available free of charge on its website (<http://publicationethics.org/>).

Our ethics statements are based on; COPE's Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors(<http://publicationethics.org/files/u7141/1999pdf13.pdf>) and COPE Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors(http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/Best_Practice.pdf)

Duties of Authors

Reporting standards

Authors of original research should present an accurate account of the work done as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Data of the research should be represented accurately in the article. An article should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

Data Access and Retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data in connection with an article submitted 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.

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. Such quotations and citations must be listed in the Reference at the end of the article.

Multiple Publication

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.

Acknowledgement 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.

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 study, and should be listed as co-authors. Others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors.



Corresponding Author

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. All co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

Acknowledgment of Funding Sources

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

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.

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 journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

Duties of Reviewers

Contribution of Peer Review

Peer review assists the chief editor and the editorial board in making editorial decisions while editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.

Unqualified to Review or Promptness

Any reviewer who feels unqualified to review the assigned manuscript or unable to provide a prompt review should notify the editor and excuse himself/herself from the review process.

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 chief editor.



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.

Acknowledgement 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 chief editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Confidentiality

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

Conflict of Interest

Reviewers should decline to review manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors.

DUTIES OF EDITORS

Decision on the Publication of Articles

The chief editor of the Sci Journo is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The chief editor may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board subjected to such legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The chief editor may confer with other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

Fair play

Manuscripts shall be evaluated solely on their intellectual merit.

Confidentiality

The chief editor/editors 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.

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.

Good Editors should

(1) General duties and responsibilities

- actively seek the views of authors, readers, reviewers and editorial board members about ways of improving their journal's processes
- encourage and be aware of research into peer review and 'journalology' and reassess journal processes in the light of new findings
- work to persuade their publishers to provide them with appropriate resources, guidance from experts (e.g. designers, lawyers) and adequate training to perform their role in a professional manner and raise the quality of their journal
- support initiatives designed to reduce academic misconduct
- support initiatives to educate researchers about publication ethics
- assess the effects of their journal policies on author and reviewer behaviour and revise policies, as required, to encourage responsible behaviour and discourage misconduct
- ensure that any press releases issued by the journal reflect the message of the reported article and put it into context

(2) Relations with readers

- ensure that all published reports of research have been reviewed by suitably qualified reviewers (e.g. including statistical review where appropriate)
- ensure that non-peer-reviewed sections of their journal are clearly identified
- adopt processes that encourage accuracy, completeness and clarity of research reporting (e.g. technical editing, use of CONSORT checklist for randomised trials)
- consider developing a transparency policy to encourage maximum disclosure about the provenance of nonresearch articles
- adopt authorship or contributorship systems that promote good practice (i.e. so that listings accurately reflect who did the work) and discourage misconduct (e.g. ghost and guest authors)
- inform readers about steps taken to ensure that submissions from members of the journal's staff or editorial board receive an objective and unbiased evaluation

(3) Relations with authors

- publish clear instructions in their journals about submission and what they expect from authors
- provide guidance about criteria for authorship and/or who should be listed as a contributor
- review author instructions regularly and provide links to relevant guidelines (e.g. ICMJE, COPE)
- require all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication
- ensure that appropriate reviewers are selected for submissions (i.e. individuals who are able to judge the work and are free from disqualifying competing interests)

- respect requests from authors that an individual should not review their submission, if these are well-reasoned.
- be guided by the COPE flowcharts in cases of suspected misconduct or disputed authorship
- publish details of how they handle cases of suspected misconduct (e.g. with links to the COPE flowcharts)

(4) Relations with reviewers

- provide clear advice to reviewers (which should be straightforward and regularly updated)
- require reviewers to disclose any potential competing interests before agreeing to review a submission
- encourage reviewers to comment on ethical questions and possible research misconduct raised by submissions, (e.g. unethical research design, insufficient detail on patient consent or protection of research subjects, including animals)
- encourage reviewers to ensure the originality of submissions and be alert to redundant publication and plagiarism
- consider providing reviewers with tools to detect related publications (e.g. links to cited references and bibliographic searches)
- seek to acknowledge the contribution of reviewers to the journal
- encourage academic institutions to recognise peer-review activities as part of the scholarly process
- monitor the performance of peer reviewers and take steps to ensure this is of high quality
- develop and maintain a database of suitable reviewers, and update this on the basis of reviewer performance
- remove from the journal's database any reviewers who consistently produce discourteous, poor quality or late reviews
- seek to add new reviewers to the database to replace those who have been removed (because of poor performance or other reasons)
- ensure that the reviewer database reflects the academic community for their journal (e.g. by auditing the database in terms of reviewer age, gender, location, etc.)
- use a wide range of sources (not just personal contacts) to identify potential new reviewers (e.g. author suggestions, bibliographic databases)
- follow the COPE flowchart in cases of suspected reviewer misconduct

(5) Relations with journal owners and publishers

- establish mechanisms to handle disagreements between themselves and the journal owner/publisher with due process
- have a written contract(s) setting out their relationship with the journal's owner and/or publisher (the terms of this contract should be in line with the COPE Code of Conduct)
- communicate regularly with their journal's owners and publishers

(6) Editorial and peer-review processes

- ensure that people involved with the editorial process (including themselves) receive adequate training and keep abreast of the latest guidelines, recommendations and evidence about peer review and journal management
- keep informed about research into peer review and technological advances
- adopt peer-review methods best suited for their journal and the research community it serves

- review peer-review practices periodically to see if improvement is possible
- refer troubling cases to COPE, especially when questions arise that are not addressed by the COPE flow charts, or new types of publication misconduct are suspected
- consider appointing an ombudsperson to adjudicate in complaints that cannot be resolved internally

(7) Quality assurance

- have systems in place to detect falsified data, e.g. manipulated photographic images or plagiarised text (either for routine use or when suspicions are raised)
- base decisions about journal house style on relevant evidence of factors that raise the quality of reporting (e.g. adopting structured abstracts, applying guidance such as CONSORT2) rather than simply on aesthetic grounds or personal preference

(8) Protecting individual data

- publish their policy on publishing individual data (e.g. identifiable patient details or images) and explain this clearly to authors

(9) Encouraging academic integrity

- request evidence of ethical research approval for all relevant submissions and be prepared to question authors about aspects such as how patient consent was obtained or what methods were employed to minimize animal suffering
- ensure that reports of clinical trials cite compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki⁶, Good Clinical Practice and other relevant guidelines to safeguard participants
- ensure that reports of experiments on, or studies of, animals cite compliance with the US Department of Health and Human Services Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals or other relevant guidelines
- consider appointing a journal ethics panel to advise on specific cases and review journal policies periodically

(10) Ensuring the integrity of the academic record

- take steps to reduce covert redundant publication, e.g. by requiring all clinical trials to be registered
- ensure that published material is securely archived (e.g. via online permanent repositories, such as PubMed Central)
- have systems in place to give authors the opportunity to make original research articles freely available

(11) Intellectual property

- adopt systems for detecting plagiarism (e.g. software, searching for similar titles) in submitted items (either routinely or when suspicions are raised)
- support authors whose copyright has been breached or who have been the victims of plagiarism
- be prepared to defend authors' rights and pursue offenders (e.g. by requesting retractions or removal of material from websites) irrespective of whether their journal holds the copyright

(12) Commercial considerations

- have policies and systems in place to ensure that commercial considerations do not affect editorial decisions (e.g. advertising departments should operate independently from editorial departments)
- publish a description of their journal's income sources (e.g. the proportions received from display advertising, reprint sales, special supplements, page charges, etc.)
 - ensure that the peer-review process for sponsored supplements is the same as that used for the main journal
 - ensure that items in sponsored supplements are accepted solely on the basis of academic merit and interest to readers and is not influenced by commercial considerations

(13) Conflicts of interest

- publish lists of relevant interests (financial, academic and other kinds) of all editorial staff and members of editorial boards (which should be updated at least annually)
- adopt suitable policies for handling submissions from themselves, employees or members of the editorial board to ensure unbiased review (and have these set out in writing)