

# Allegations of Research Misconduct Policy

Journal of Liaquat University of Medical & Health Sciences policy for managing allegations of research misconduct is based on the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), available at <https://publicationethics.org/misconduct>.

Authors are required to read the journal's author instruction and ethical policies carefully and to adhere to the terms before submission. While authors are given the option to suggest potential reviewers for the peer-review process, the qualifications and potential conflicts of interest of all reviewers will be carefully checked before they are invited to review.

Report of research misconduct may be related to a published article or a manuscript under peer-review process. The procedure for the application and management of complaints of author misconduct should proceed with sensitivity, tact, in confidence, and in the following manner:

1. The editorial office of the journal receives a complaint that an article submitted to or published in the journal is suspected of containing research misconduct.
2. The complainant needs to clearly indicate the specific manner and detail of misconduct; for example, in a case of plagiarism, the plagiarized paragraph should be clearly highlighted and the original and suspected articles should be referred to clearly.
3. The editorial office will conduct an investigation, during which time the editor of the journal and the corresponding author(s) of the suspected article will be in contact.
4. The corresponding author(s) will be asked to provide an explanation with factual statements and any available evidence.
5. If the author(s) of the suspected article accepts the misconduct complaint, the editorial office will take the following actions depending on the situation:
  - a. If the article has been published, an erratum or retraction may be necessary to remedy the situation. However, there may still be disagreement concerning the appropriate wording of the description.
  - b. If the misconduct is reported during the review process, the review process may continue, with the author(s) making the relevant changes.
6. In the case of nonresponse in the stipulated time or an unsatisfactory explanation, the article may be permanently retracted or rejected. Before making a decision, confirmation will be sought from the experts of the relevant institution or other authorities as required.
7. The complainant will be informed of the outcome once the issue is resolved.
8. The complaint case will there upon be considered concluded.