

PUBLICATION ETHICS AND PUBLICATION STATEMENT

- Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development (MTSRBID) are committed to maintaining the highest ethical standards. Our ethical statements are based on COPE's Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.
- In order to provide our readers with the journal of high quality, MTSRBID is guided by the following principles:

EDITORS

- The editor is responsible for maintaining the integrity of the academic record, for having processes in place to assure the quality of the material they publish and for precluding business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards.
- Editors' decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based on the paper's importance, originality and clarity, and the study's validity and its relevance to the remit of the journal.
- The editor ensures that appropriate reviewers are selected for submissions (i.e. individuals who are able to judge the work and are free from disqualifying competing interests).
- The editor has systems in place to give authors the opportunity to make original research articles freely available.
- The editor has systems to ensure that material submitted to their journal remains confidential while under review.
- MTSRBID employs the double-blind peer review: reviewers are unaware of the identity of the authors, and authors are also unaware of the identity of reviewers. There are at least three or more reviewers for the total number of articles in each issue.

REVIEWERS

- The reviewers of MTSRBID assist the editors in taking the decision of publishing a submitted manuscript. By formulating suggestions to the authors, the reviewers can contribute to the improvement of submitted works.
- Any 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.
- Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.
- The reviewers should comment on the originality of submissions and should be alert to redundant publication and plagiarism.

AUTHORS

- The authors ensure that they have submitted original works and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted.
- Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal is considered an unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

- 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.
- When an author finds error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to notify the journal editor and cooperate with him to retract or correct the paper.

PEER REVIEW PROCESS

- Manuscripts submitted to Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development are subject to peer review to maintain the standards of the journal, promote rigorous research within the fields, and to offer authors constructive feedback on their submissions.
- Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development have a '**double-blind**' review process: Authors are not told who reviewed their paper, and referees do not know the name of the authors whose papers they review. The peer referees' identity remains unknown to the authors.
- Manuscripts are sent out for review electronically, and all correspondence takes place in the journal system or via e-mail. Although the peer-review process is accelerated by the use of electronic communication, traditional, high-quality peer-review standards are applied to all manuscripts submitted to the journal.
- Peer reviewers are asked to give their opinion on a number of issues pertinent to the quality and suitability of a paper and to judge papers on grounds of originality and importance. We pride ourselves on providing constructive and formative feedback to authors.

Reviewer Guidelines Reviewers of the journal are asked to consider the following points during their evaluation:

- Does the paper have clear aims and objectives/research questions that can be achieved within the scope of the journal paper?
- Does the paper make a contribution to knowledge?
- Is the work suitably grounded in the literature to justify its contribution and frame the analysis/evaluation?
- Is the research/evaluation methodology justified, clear, and appropriate? (Including ethical considerations/approval where appropriate)
- Does the analysis/ evaluation have a clear flow and logical argument?
- Does the analysis/evaluation link to an appropriate discussion and conclusions?
- Is it presented in a way that is suitable for the journal's international audience?

Peer reviewers will have five possible options, for any paper:

- Accept manuscript (i.e. no need for any revision).
- Accept after revision (i.e. accepted if the author makes the requested revisions).
- Revise and resubmit (i.e. accepted or rejected after revisions have been made - the paper will be sent out for another peer review round).
- Reject manuscript (i.e. if the manuscript is not sufficiently developed for publication)
- See comments (i.e. if the reviewer cannot choose from any of the above).

- In addition, papers may be returned to authors by the Editors prior to review, if judged to be out of scope, out of the limits of the word length guidance or not sufficiently prepared for publication.
- To facilitate rapid publication, authors are given a maximum of 6 weeks for revision. After 6 weeks, revised manuscripts will normally be considered new submissions.