

NIET Journal of Discourse, Technology, and Society (NJDTS)

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

The Journal (NJDTS) is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and takes all possible measures against publication malpractice. Authors, reviewers, and editors are expected to follow the ethical guidelines set out below, which are based on the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.

1. Publication Decisions

The Editorial board members of NJDTS is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. This decision is guided by legal requirements in force regarding libel, copyright infringement, and plagiarism. The Editor-in-Chief may confer with other editors or reviewers in making this decision.

2. Fair Play

Manuscripts are evaluated solely on their intellectual content, without regard to the authors' race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy.

3. Confidentiality

The editor board will 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 appropriate.

4. Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

Unpublished data or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and must not be used by editors or reviewers for their own research purposes without the express written consent of the author. Editors will recuse themselves (i.e., ask a co-editor, associate editor, or other member of the editorial board to review and consider) from handling manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest arising from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships/connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscript.

5. Duties of Authors

5.1 Reporting Standards

Authors 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 manuscript. A manuscript should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

5.2 Originality and Plagiarism

Authors must 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. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable. Manuscripts may be screened for textual similarity using plagiarism-detection software.

5.3 Data Access and Retention

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data of their study together with the manuscript for editorial review and should be prepared to provide public access to such data and, in any event, should be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

5.4 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 behaviour and is unacceptable.

5.5 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.

5.6 Authorship of the Manuscript

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 others have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research, they should be acknowledged. The corresponding author must ensure that all appropriate co-authors are included on the manuscript and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version and agreed to its submission for publication.

5.7 Hazards and Human or Animal Subjects

If the work involves chemicals, procedures, or equipment that have any unusual hazards inherent in their use, the author must clearly identify these in the manuscript. If the work involves human participants or animals, authors must confirm that all procedures were performed in compliance with relevant institutional and national guidelines and regulations, and with the appropriate institutional committee(s) approval, and, where applicable, informed consent was obtained.

5.8 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.

5.9 Fundamental Errors in Published Works

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in their own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.

6. Duties of Reviewers

6.1 Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and, through editorial communication with the author, may also assist the author in improving the manuscript.

6.2 Promptness

Any invited 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 themselves from the review process.

6.3 Confidentiality

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

6.4 Standards of Objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

6.5 Acknowledgement of Sources

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

6.6 Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

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

7. Duties of the Publisher / Editorial Board

7.1 Handling of Unethical Publishing Behaviour

The Editor-in-Chief and editorial board, in conjunction with the publisher, will take reasonable responsive measures when ethical complaints are presented concerning a submitted or published manuscript. Every reported act of unethical publishing behaviour will be looked into, even if it is discovered years after publication.

7.2 Investigation Process

NJDTS follows the COPE flowcharts for handling cases of suspected misconduct, including but not limited to: plagiarism, duplicate/redundant publication, fabricated or manipulated data, authorship disputes, and undisclosed conflicts of interest. Editors will:

- Request an explanation from the corresponding author(s);
- Consult with members of the editorial board where appropriate;
- Contact the author's institution if the response is unsatisfactory or the matter is serious.

7.3 Corrections, Clarifications, Retractions, and Apologies

When needed, corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies will be published, following COPE's retraction guidelines. Grounds for retraction may include:

- Clear evidence of unreliable findings, whether due to misconduct (e.g., data fabrication) or honest error;
- Plagiarism or redundant publication;
- Unethical research.

Retractions will be clearly identified as such and linked to the original article.

7.4 Access to Editorial and Peer-Review Records

The journal, editors, and publisher will not encourage such misconduct, or knowingly allow such misconduct to take place, and will always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies when needed.

8. Complaints and Appeals

Any complaints regarding editorial content, alleged misconduct, or an editorial decision should be addressed in writing to the Editor Board at [njds@niet.co.in](mailto:njdts@niet.co.in). Complaints will be acknowledged and investigated in line with COPE guidelines, and the outcome will be communicated to the complainant. Authors who wish to appeal an editorial decision may do so by submitting a written rebuttal with supporting justification; appeals are reviewed by the Editor-in-Chief or a designated member of the editorial board not involved in the original decision.

9. Screening for Plagiarism

NJDTS reserves the right to use plagiarism-detection software to screen submitted manuscripts for textual similarity before and after publication. Manuscripts found to contain plagiarised content will be rejected or retracted, and the matter may be referred to the author's institution.

10. Data Fabrication and Falsification

Fabrication (making up data or results) and falsification (manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing/omitting data or results) are considered serious research misconduct and will result in rejection or retraction of the manuscript and may be reported to the relevant institutional authorities.