

MSME Frontier: Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation

Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

The editors, authors, and reviewers are expected to understand their duties and responsibilities based on guidelines stated in the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)'s "Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors."](https://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf) ([https://publicationethics.org/files/Code of conduct for journal editors Mar11.pdf](https://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf))

Guidelines for Authors

1. Submission of a manuscript implies that it contains original and unpublished content that is not under consideration in other publications.
2. The authors should properly cite the materials and references used in the manuscript, and should be responsible for securing permission in using copyrighted materials. The authors should also disclose the source(s) of funding if there is any and make certain that there is no conflict of interest.
3. The authors should make sure that their manuscripts are well-written. It is also advised that the terms, concepts, approaches, and frameworks are explained in a way that can be understood by readers from different backgrounds and disciplines.

Guidelines for Editors

1. The editors must ensure the timely publication process, practicing proper coordination with the authors and reviewers.
2. The editors must make sure of the confidentiality of authors' identities and manuscripts.
3. The editors must allow the authors to explain and argue their views from the reviewers' comments.
4. If there are submissions from the members of the editorial board and staff or from the institute (UP ISSI), the other editors must see to it that the manuscript follow the standard peer-review process.

Guidelines for Reviewers

1. The reviewers must make certain of the confidentiality of the manuscripts during the review process.
2. If there is conflict of interest on the manuscripts for review, the reviewer must raise this concern to the editor.

Review Policy

1. All full-length research articles undergo the double-blind peer review process.

2. The submission for the special section is not subject to the review process but will be assessed by the editorial staff on the basis of quality, originality, and significance.
3. The full-length research articles should pass the preliminary assessment of the editorial staff. Only those papers that pass the first evaluation are subject to the review process of at least 2 experts. The referees are asked to evaluate whether the papers meet the criteria for publication. They are given two weeks to one month to submit the results.
4. The comments and recommendations of the referees are sent to the authors. Revised manuscripts could be returned to the initial referees but this depends on the initial results of the evaluation.
5. The final decisions from the referees to accept (with or without editorial revisions) or reject (outright/encourage revision) the manuscript are the basis for publication.

April 2017