

JNLUD – Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

The Journal of National Law University Delhi follows the [COPE Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors](#). In addition, it is expected of the editorial board, the reviewers and editors to follow the best-practice guidelines on ethical behavior and malpractice contained herein.

I. Duties of Editorial Board

1. Publication Decisions

The editorial board of the journal is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The editorial board may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board, the relevance of the work for readers of the journal and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editorial board may confer with reviewers in making this decision.

2. Fair Play

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

3. Confidentiality

The editor board 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, as necessary.

The editorial board must not disclose the identity of the author to the peer reviewer who is reviewing the author's manuscript.

4. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author.

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

An editor should excuse herself/himself/themself (i.e. should ask a co-editor instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts in which he/she/they have a conflict of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscripts.

In the event, the editorial board is required to take a final call on a reviewer's recommendation, regarding a manuscript submitted by a colleague of an editor, the editorial board shall not deviate from the reviewer's recommendation.

5. Grievance Redressal, Investigation, and Corrective Measures

The editorial board should take reasonably responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper. Such measures will generally include contacting the author of the manuscript or paper and giving due consideration of the respective complaint or claims made but may also include further communications to the relevant institutions and research bodies, and if the complaint is upheld, the publication of a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or other note, as may be relevant. Every reported act of unethical publishing behavior must be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication.

II. Duties of Reviewers

1. Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Peer reviewers assist the editor board in making editorial decisions. Their comments also help authors in improving their manuscripts, which shall be communicated to the author through the editorial board.

2. Promptness

Any selected reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editorial board and excuse herself/himself/themselves from the review process.

3. Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents and should not be used or referred to for personal advantage. They must not be shown to or discussed with anyone except the editorial board.

4. Standards of Objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments, so that authors can use them for improving the manuscript.

5. Acknowledgement of Sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement which is an observation, derivation, or argument which has been previously reported should be accompanied by a relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editorial board's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have knowledge.

6. Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

Reviewers should not consider 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.

III. Duties of Authors

1. Reporting Standards

Authors of reports of original research should present an accurate account of the research 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.

2. Data Access and Retention

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

3. Originality and Plagiarism

The authors should ensure that they have submitted entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others, that must be appropriately cited or quoted. Authors should ensure that the plagiarism is within reasonable and acceptable limits (subject to editorial discretion, the acceptable limit of plagiarism would be 25%).

4. Multiple, Redundant, or Concurrent 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 behavior and is unacceptable.

5. 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. 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 the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, must not be used without the explicit written permission of the author of the work involved in these services.

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. 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.

7. Peer Review

All authors are obliged to participate in the peer review process by promptly providing access to raw data, clarifications, and other information asked for by the editorial board. In case of suggestions provided by the reviewer for improving the manuscript, the authors should systematically respond to every comment provided by the reviewer, point by point, and in a timely manner, and resubmit the revised manuscript within the time provided by the editorial board.

8. 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. Examples of potential conflicts of interest which should be disclosed include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. Potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed at the earliest stage possible.

9. Fundamental errors in published works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her/their published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the editorial board and cooperate with the editorial board in retracting or correcting the paper. If the editorial board learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error, it is the obligation of the author to promptly retract or correct the paper or provide evidence to the editorial board of the correctness of the original paper.