

Editorial guidelines for initial manuscript assessment

Purpose of This Guide

At the JASPI, we aim to promote inclusive, high-quality, and accessible scholarly research. As a platform that embraces methodological diversity, innovation, and inclusiveness, we welcome a broad spectrum of academic contributions. Our editorial guidelines ensure that manuscripts meet minimum quality standards and align with our journal's scope and ethos before proceeding to full peer review. This document is designed to support editorial board members in making consistent, fair, and constructive preliminary decisions.



Essence of Inclusiveness at JASPI

Inclusiveness is at the heart of JASPI. We recognize that quality research comes in various forms, and we strive to include voices from underrepresented regions, emerging scholars, and diverse academic traditions. Our editorial decisions should reflect this inclusive approach:

- Prioritize clarity, rigor, and relevance over prestige or institutional affiliation.
- Encourage submissions that address regional or local issues with global implications.
- Support methodological diversity—including qualitative, mixed-methods, participatory, and interdisciplinary research.

Role of Editorial Board Members

As an Editorial Board Member, you play a key role in:

- Screening initial submissions for quality and fit.
- Recommending whether a manuscript should proceed to peer review, be revised, or be rejected.
- Offering constructive guidance to authors.

This initial check helps conserve reviewer time and improves the overall quality of our journal.



Criteria for Initial Assessment

Ask the following during the initial screening:

1. **Scope and Relevance:**

- Does the topic align with JASPI's aims and objectives?
- Is the subject of interest to scholars, practitioners, or policymakers in scholarly publishing and innovation?

2. **Scientific and Methodological Rigor:**

- Is the research question clear?
- Are the methods sound and described in enough detail?
- Are the conclusions supported by the data?

3. **Clarity and Organization:**

- Is the manuscript understandable, even if the language needs minor improvement?
- Are tables, figures, and references appropriately used?

4. **Ethical Considerations:**

- Are there any signs of plagiarism, data manipulation, or ethical misconduct?

5. **Inclusiveness and Value:**

- Does the manuscript present a unique perspective, especially from underrepresented communities?
- Is there value in publishing even if the results are negative or confirmatory?

Editorial Decision-Making Guide

Send for Peer Review

- The manuscript is scientifically sound, with appropriate methodology and clear results.
- Replication of previous findings, with proper motivation and citations.
- Presents negative or confirmatory data with academic merit.
- Study is of narrow scope but relevant to a specific academic community.
- Findings have already appeared in preprints, theses, or conference abstracts.

Send for Review with Editorial Notes

- The manuscript is generally strong but includes minor weaknesses (e.g., unclear phrasing or inconsistencies).
- Data are robust, but interpretation requires caution.
- Add notes for reviewers about specific points to consider during their review.



Revise Before Review

- Essential details are missing (e.g., methodology, sample description, or data analysis).
- Conclusions are not adequately supported by the data.
- Writing is unclear or disorganized to the point of impeding evaluation.
- Ethical approval, informed consent, or data permissions are not explicitly mentioned but can potentially be clarified.



Reject Without Review

- The paper lacks scientific rigor or has fundamental methodological flaws.
- Offers only minimal variation on already published work with no new insights.
- Reports local data with no relevance to a broader audience.
- Presents a descriptive pooled analysis without systematic review criteria.
- Case reports that are well-known, repetitive, or suggest therapeutic efficacy without sufficient evidence.
- Manuscript lacks experimental or theoretical contribution or draws no conclusions.
- Plagiarism, duplicate publication, or unethical practices suspected (refer to "Seek Advice").



SEEK ADVICE FROM EDITORIAL OFFICE

- The manuscript raises ethical issues (e.g., plagiarism, data manipulation, consent problems).
- Concerns about research integrity, authorship, or conflict of interest.
- The paper appears significantly out of scope.



Support During Peer Review

- Use your discretion and consult the editorial office when in doubt.
- Peer Review Advisers can help you write constructive decision letters.
- Final decisions rest with editors, but collaboration is encouraged.

ENCOURAGED TYPES OF SUBMISSIONS

JASPI actively welcomes:

- Research from low-resource or non-traditional academic settings.
- Exploratory or pilot studies with clear aims.
- Replication studies and negative results.
- Policy-oriented papers and educational innovations.
- Multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary approaches.
- Work that challenges current academic publishing norms.

We do not reject manuscripts based on predicted impact or niche relevance.

Ethical Oversight and Transparency.

If you encounter possible ethical issues:

- Plagiarism
- Authorship disputes
- Ethical approval lapses
- Data integrity concerns

Contact the editorial office for guidance. We follow COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) recommendations.

Final Thoughts

Your role as an editor is not just gatekeeping—it's mentorship, stewardship, and contribution to a fair and inclusive academic dialogue. Every decision you make shapes the credibility and inclusiveness of the journal. For further clarification, visit the JASPI website to review our aims and objectives. Thank you for being part of a journal that values inclusiveness, innovation, and integrity.