



EDITORIAL POLICY



Certificate no. AJA12/16393



Certificate no. AJA12.0690

Philippine Association of Institutions
for Research, an ISO 9001:2008 certified
by the AJA Registrars Inc.

EDITORIAL POLICY

The JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research is open to the global community of scholars who wish to have their researches published in a peer-reviewed journal. The journal is produced using a Quality Management System certified for ISO 9001:2008 by the Anglo Japanese American Registrars, Inc. To facilitate cross referencing, linking and citation tracking, the journal adopts Digital Object Identifier (DOI) for every article. Contributors can access the website: www.ejournals.ph and www.philair.ph.

Articles are contributed by member and non-member researchers of the Philippine Association of Institutions for Research. The frequency of issue is four times a year. The efficiency and effectiveness of the editorial review process are critically dependent upon the actions of both the research authors and the reviewers. An author accepts the responsibility of preparing the research paper for evaluation by independent reviewers. The responsibility includes subjecting the manuscript to evaluation by peers and revising it prior to submission. The review process is not to be used as a means of obtaining feedback at early stages of developing the research paper.

Policy on Retraction

Retraction is an act of the journal publisher to remove a published article from the digital file due to post publication discovery of fraudulent claims by the research, plagiarism or serious errors of methodology which escaped detection in the quality assurance process. Complaints by third party researchers on any of the grounds and validated by the editorial office trigger the retraction but only after the writer has been notified and allowed to present his side in compliance to due process.

Policy on Digital Preservation

Digital Preservation is the process of storing systematically electronic files in multiple formats such as compact discs; cloud computing, Google drive, email accounts, external hard drives, among others. This is to guarantee that in conditions where the website crashes, there is natural calamity, fire and other man made destructions, virus invasions, the files are preserved.

Policy on Handling Complaints

If the Journal receives a complaint that any contribution to the Journal infringes copyright or other intellectual property rights or contains material inaccuracies, libelous materials or otherwise unlawful materials, the Journal will investigate the complaint. Investigation may include a request that the parties involved substantiate their claims. The Journal will make a good faith decision whether to remove the allegedly wrongful material. A decision not to remove material should represent the Journal's belief that the complaint is without sufficient foundation, or if well-founded, that a legal defense or exemption may apply, such as fair use in the case of copyright infringement or truthfulness of a statement in the case of libel. Journal should document its investigation and decision. If found guilty after investigation, the article shall be subject to retraction policy.

Policy on Conflicts of Interest

The Journal will only publish articles after the author(s) have confirmed that they have disclosed all potential conflicts of interest.

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice

The JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research is committed to uphold the highest standards of publication ethics and takes all possible measures against any publication malpractices. All authors submitting their works for publication as original articles attest that the submitted works represent their authors' contributions and have not been copied or plagiarized in whole or in part from other works. The authors acknowledge that they have disclosed all and any actual or potential conflicts of interest with their work or partial benefits associated with

it. In the same manner, the Journal is committed to objective and fair double-blind peer-review of the submitted for publication works and to preventing any actual or potential conflict of interests between the editorial and review personnel and the reviewed material. Any departure from the above-defined rules should be reported directly to the Editor-in-Chief who are unequivocally committed to providing swift resolutions to any of such type of problems.

The Peer Review System

Definition. Peer review (also known as refereeing) is the process of subjecting an author's scholarly work, research or ideas to the scrutiny of others who are experts in the same field. Peer review requires a community of experts in a given (and often narrowly defined) field who are qualified and able to perform impartial review. Peer review refers to the work done during the screening of submitted manuscripts and funding applications. This normative process encourages authors to meet the accepted standards of their discipline and prevents the dissemination of unwarranted claims, unacceptable interpretations and personal views. Peer review increases the probability that weaknesses will be identified, and, with advice and encouragement, fixed. For both grant-funding and publication in a scholarly journal, it is also normally a requirement that the subject is both novel and substantial.

Type. The double-blind review process is adopted for the journal. The reviewer/s and the author/s do not know each other's identity.

Recruiting Referees. The task of picking reviewers is the responsibility of the editorial office. When a manuscript arrives, an editor solicits reviews from scholars or other experts to referee the manuscript. In some cases, the authors may suggest the referees' names subject to the Editorial Office's approval. The referees must have an excellent track record as researchers in the field as evidenced by researches published in refereed journals, research-related awards, and an experience in peer review. Referees are not selected from among the author's close colleagues, students, or friends. Referees are to inform the editor of any conflict of interests that may arise. The Editorial Board often invites research author to name people whom they considered qualified to referee their work. The author's input in selecting referees is solicited because academic writing typically is very specialized.

The identities of the referees selected by the Editorial Board are kept unknown to research authors. However, the reviewer's identity can be disclosed under some special circumstances. Disclosure of Peer Review can be granted under the following grounds: as evidence to prove that the published paper underwent peer review as required by the university for ranking and financial incentives, for regulatory bodies and as required by the Commission on Higher Education, and for accreditation of academic programs. Request for peer review results shall be made in writing.

Reviewers and editors are responsible for providing constructive and prompt evaluation of submitted research papers based on the significance of their contribution and on the rigors of analysis and presentation.

Peer Review Process. The Editorial Board sends advanced copies of an author's work to experts in the field (known as "referees" or "reviewers") through e-mail or a Web-based manuscript processing system. There are two or three referees for a given article. Two are experts of the topic of research and one is an expert in research and statistics who shall review the technical components of the research. These referees return to the board the evaluation of the work that indicates the observed weaknesses or problems along with suggestions for improvement. The board then evaluates the referees' comments and notes opinion of the manuscript before passing the decision with the referees' comments back to the author(s).

Criteria for Acceptance and Rejection. A manuscript is accepted when it is (1) endorsed for publication by 2 or 3 referees, (2) the instructions of the reviewers are substantially complied; (3) the manuscript passed the plagiarism detection test with a score of at least 90 for originality; and, (4) the manuscript obtained a score of 90 percent for grammarly software, otherwise the manuscript is rejected. The referees' evaluations include an explicit recommendation of what to do with the manuscript, chosen from options provided by the journal. Most recommendations are along the following lines:

- Unconditional acceptance
- Acceptance with revision based on the referee's recommendations
- Rejection with invitation to resubmit upon major revisions based on the referees' and editorial board's recommendations
- Outright rejection

In situations where the referees disagree substantially about the quality of a work, there are a number of strategies for reaching a decision. When the editor receives very positive and very negative reviews for the same manuscript, the board will solicit one or more additional reviews as a tie-breaker. In the case of ties, the board may invite authors to reply to a referee's criticisms and permit a compelling rebuttal to break the tie. If the editor does not feel confident to weigh the persuasiveness of a rebuttal, the board may solicit a response from the referee who made the original criticism. In rare instances, the board will convey communications back and forth between an author and a referee, in effect allowing them to debate on a point. Even in such a case, however, the board does not allow referees to confer with each other and the goal of the process is explicitly not to reach a consensus or to convince anyone to change his/her opinions.

Comments

The JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research welcomes submission of comments on previous articles. Comments on articles previously published in the journal will generally be reviewed by two reviewers, usually an author of the original article (to assist the editor in evaluating whether the submitted comment represents the prior article's accuracy) and an independent reviewer. If a comment is accepted for publication, the original author will be invited to reply. All other editorial requirements, as enumerated above, apply to proposed comments.

Technology-based Quality Assurance

English Writing Readability. Readability tests are designed to indicate comprehension difficulty when reading a passage of contemporary academic English. To guide teachers and researchers in the proper selection of articles that suit the comprehension level of users, contributors are advised to use the Flesch Kincaid readability test particularly the Flesch Reading Ease test. The interpretation of the score is as follows:

Score Notes

- 90.0 – 100.00 Easily understandable by an average 11 year old student
- 60.0 – 70.0 Easily understandable by 13 to 15 year old students
- 0.0 – 30.0 Best understood by university graduates

Gunning Fog Index. Developed by Robert Gunning, an American Businessman in 1952, Gunning Fog Index measures the readability of English writing. The index estimates the years of formal education required to understand the text on a first reading. A fog index of 12 requires a reading level of a US high school senior (around 18 years old) or third year college / university in the Philippines.

Plagiarism Detection. Contributors are advised to use software for plagiarism detection to increase the manuscript's chances of acceptance. The editorial office uses licensed software to screen research articles of plagiarism. The standard set is 95 percent original to pass the plagiarism detection test.

Appropriateness of Citation Format. Contributors are advised to use the citation format prescribed by the Harvard System.

Word Count, Spelling and Grammar Checks. Contributors are encouraged to perform word count for the abstract (200) and the full text (about 4000 to 6000). Spelling and grammar checks should be performed prior to submission. The standard set is 90 percent to pass the Grammarly Software.