Editorial Policy

The IASPER Interdisciplinary Research Journal is a quarterly journal published by the International Association of Scholarly Publishers, Editors and Reviewers, Inc. It is aggregated by the Philippine e-Journals (www.ejournals.ph).

Articles are contributed by individual member scholars and researchers of IASPER, Inc. Accepted papers undergo two layers of peer review (external and internal) and endorsements of the Editorial Board before its print and online publication. 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.

Aims and Scope

The IASPER Journal of Interdisciplinary Research Journal welcomes articles on interdisciplinary research. Interdisciplinary research is a mode of research by teams or individuals that integrates information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories from two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or area of research practice.

Subscription Policy

The IASPER Interdisciplinary Journal is accessible through institutional subscriptions for libraries at Philippine Electronic Journals.

Policy on Non-Predatory Practices

The journal management adheres to high standards of publishing practices to insure the prevention of predatory practices. There are two indications of predatory practices: lack of transparency and intention to deceive. For transparency, clients are provided with the Journal Publication Process that details the steps from submission to release; copies of peer review reports are provided to clients, so they know exactly the status of the paper; acceptance of publication is issued only after peer review and editorial board's approval; and, receipt of payment, certificate of publication, and hard copy of the journal are mailed to the clients. For absence of intention to deceive, a contract is signed by authors and the publisher that defines the terms of engagement; the links to the online publication is provided; the presence of the article is available at orcid.org, Google Scholar, Google Scholar citations, Mendeley, and Publish or Perish in harzing.com are guaranteed; clients are made to evaluate the publisher for predatory practices; independent parties and regulatory bodies are welcome to examine the electronic databases that contain all documents pertaining to journal publication of every client, among others.

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 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 Archiving of Digital Copies

The final digital copies of the journal shall be deposited at the archives of indexing companies. The layout artist shall send copies of the journal to this email.

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 distribution 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 Use of Human Subjects in Research

The Journal will only publish research articles involving human subjects after the author(s) have verified that they have followed all laws and regulations concerning the protections afforded human subjects in research studies within the jurisdiction in which a research study they describe was conducted. The research protocol must have been approved by the appropriate institutional review board (IRB). In the case of exempt research, the IRB must have deemed the research protocol exempt. A certificate of approval by the IRB must be submitted along with the manuscript.

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.

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.

Review Process Policy. 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 Peer Reviewers. The task of picking reviewers is the responsibility of the editorial board. 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 Board'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 such as the Commission on Higher Education, Accreditation of Academic Programs among others. Request for peer review results shall be made in writing.

Peer Review Process. The Editorial Board sends advance 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. One is an expert 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) ethical standards and protocols are complied for studies involving humans and animals; and (4) the manuscript passed the plagiarism detection test with a score of at least 80 for originality, 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' 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.

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. Readability tests (Flesch Reading Ease and Gunning Fog Index) are computed through http://online-utility.org.

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. The test is administered using a licensed Grammarly Software.

Appropriateness of Citation Format. Contributors are advised to use the citation format appropriate to the discipline and nature of their study.

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

ORCID membership of authors. The journal requires contributors to submit an orcid number as proof of membership from orcid.org or open researcher contributor ID, Google Scholar Citation, Linkedin. Screenshot of the researcher's Mendeley Account should also be submitted.