

UCP Journal of Engineering and Information Technology **Policy Document**

1. Title:

UCP Journal of Engineering and Information Technology (UCP-JEIT)

1. About the Journal

UCP Journal of Engineering and Information Technology (UCP-JEIT) is a multidisciplinary, peer-reviewed, open-access bi-annual journal, jointly published by the Faculty of Engineering and the Faculty of Information Technology & Computer Sciences (FoIT & CS).

1.1. Aims and Scope

UCP Journal of Engineering and Information Technology covers a wide range of topics. The aim is to provide a platform that covers a wide range of topics covering the multidisciplinary emerging engineering and information technology domain. Topics covered will include but are not limited to:

- Big Data Analytics
- Artificial Intelligence (AI)
- Machine Learning (ML)
- Natural Language Processing (NLP)
- Digital Image Processing.
- Internet of Things (IoT)
- Cloud Computing
- Computer Vision
- Power Engineering
- Electronics Engineering
- Telecommunication Engineering
- Computer Engineering
- Mechanical Engineering
- Civil Engineering

1.2. Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief

- Muhammad Amjad Iqbal, Ph.D. (Dean FoIT & CS, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan)

Managing Editor

- Ali Ahmad, Ph.D. (Assistant Professor, Electrical Engineering Department, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan)

Editor

- Muhammad Amjad Iqbal, Ph.D. (Dean FoIT & CS, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan)

Associate Editor

- Ali Ahmad, Ph.D. (Assistant Professor, Electrical Engineering Department, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan)- Managing Editor and Area Editor (Electrical Engineering)
- Ali Saeed, Ph.D. (Associate Professor, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan) - Area Editor (Computer Science and Information Technology)
- Muhammad Babur, Ph.D. (Associate Professor, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan) - Area Editor (Civil Engineering)
- Gulraiz Ahmed, Ph.D. (Associate Professor, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan) - Area Editor (Mechanical Engineering)

1.3. Editorial Board

- Muhammad Amjad Iqbal, Ph.D. (Dean FoIT & CS, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan) – Editor in Chief
- Ali Ahmad, Ph.D. (Assistant Professor, Electrical Engineering Department, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan) - Managing Editor
- Ali Saeed, Ph.D. (Associate Professor, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan)
- Touqeer Ahmed, Ph.D. (Senior Software Engineer, Blackmagic Design, USA)
- Muhammad Babur, Ph.D. (Associate Professor, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan)
- Gulraiz Ahmed, Ph.D. (Associate Professor, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan)

1.4. Advisory Board

National Experts

- Dr. Syed Abdul Rahman Kashif, Chairman, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Engineering and Technology, Main Campus, Lahore
- Dr. Kashif Zafar, Professor, National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan
- Dr. Ayyaz Hussain, Professor, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan
- Dr. Arfan Jaffar, Professor, Dean FOCS&IT, Superior University, Lahore, Pakistan
- Dr. Zahoor Jan, Professor, Vice Chancellor, Dir University, KP, Pakistan
- Dr. Sohail Masood Bhatti, Professor, Superior University, Lahore, Pakistan
- Dr. Kamal Shahid, Assistant Professor, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan
- Dr. Muhammad Yaqoob Javeed, Associate Professor, COMSATS University Islamabad (CUI), Lahore Campus, Pakistan.

International Experts

- Muhammad Saadi, PhD (Nottingham Trent University, UK)
- Muhammad Ramzan, Ph.D. (Saudi Electronic University, KSA)
- Nasir Rajpoot, Ph.D. (University of Warwick, UK)
- Ali Nasir, Ph.D. (King Fahad University of Petroleum and Minerals, KSA)
- Dr. Adnan Qureshi, PhD. (Birmingham Newman University, UK)
- Touseef Tahir, PhD. (University of Roehampton London, United Kingdom, UK)
- Safdar Ali, PhD. (Jeju National University, South Korea)
- Ahmad Usman, Ph.D. (University of New South Wales, Australia)
- Neel Kanwal, Ph.D. (Oslo University Hospital, Norway)

Editorial Policy

Publication Ethical Policy

The journal strictly follows the HEC ethical policy of publications. Journal aims to apply for Cope membership which is committed to educating and supporting editors, publishers and those involved in publication ethics to move the culture of publishing towards one where ethical practice becomes a normal part of the publishing culture.

Protecting Intellectual Property

The journal is committed to the protection of intellectual property. When supplementary materials are requested during the review process, they will be subject to the double-blind review to maintain author's anonymity. Reviewer team members will not use ideas. Sharing of supplementary material is highly prohibited without explicit permission of author through editor-in-Chief or managing editor. Advice regarding specific, limited aspects of the manuscript may be sought from colleagues with specific expertise, providing the author's identity and intellectual property remain secure.

Fair play and Impartiality

Journal follows a prescribed criteria for the selection of the research papers, academically and scientifically sound research manuscripts are selected for editorial review. There will be no discrimination on any basis like gender, race, ethnicity, religious belief, cultural sentiments, political affiliation, seniority and/or institutional association. The editorial team promptly responds to the author(s) of the papers submitted for publication assign a specific number to an article submitted for processing, and pays impartial consideration to all research papers submitted for publication keeping merit at the top.

Publication Ethics

The journal is committed to upholding the integrity of the academic record. Its policies prohibit an author from submitting the same manuscript for consideration by another journal and does not allow publication of a manuscript that has been published in whole or in part by another journal. We encourage authors to refer to the Committee on 'Publication Ethics' International Standards for Authors.

Plagiarism

Journal believe in zero tolerance policy for plagiarism.

Publication Decisions

The Editorial team only shortlists research manuscripts that have relevance to the scope of the Journal. All decisions will be taken by the Editor-in-Chief and Managing Editor as the result of a double-blind peer review process without any personal bias.

Disclosure

The journal will not use any unpublished information/data from the submitted research paper without the permission of the author(s), and Any information received after the peer review process will be kept confidential and not used for personal gains.

Plagiarism Policy

The journal strictly adheres to the Higher Education Commission's (HEC) plagiarism policy. Research articles submitted for publication in journals, go through a rigorous similarity/plagiarism check process. The editorial team authenticates the plagiarism/similarity check process by using Turnitin software. As per HEC policy, the Similarity Score Index (SSI) must not exceed 19%. With reference to using Turnitin to generate originality reports, highlighting the Similarity Score Index (SSI), the *Journal* follows the following policies and procedures:

The editorial team will check a submission for three times only (explained in section 2, 3 and 4 of the HEC plagiarism policy available at their website). Once at the time of initial submission and two more chances — subject to approval for further processing by the Internal Evaluation Committee — provided to improve the quality of research article. A failure to improve the quality of the paper and to meet the HEC criteria, the Internal Evaluation Committee of editorial board may take necessary action including rejection, penalties and reporting of the matter to the HEC.



After the submission of a research article by the researcher, at the internal evaluation stage, an initial comprehensive Similarity Score Index report would be generated without excluding “Quotations, Bibliography and Matches.” This initial report would help editors to verify the overall Similarity Score Index (SSI). Once the committee approves the paper for further processing, the report will also help the researcher to reduce its overall SSI.

A second SSI report would be generated when a researcher submits the revised research article. At that stage, editorial team may generate SSI report by excluding “Quotations, Bibliography and Matches.” A third SSI report would be prepared, if needed, before the paper is sent for peer review and publication process. Editors are responsible for performing all the relevant tasks related to plagiarism check.

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

GUIDELINES ON GOOD PUBLICATION PRACTICE

Why the guidelines were developed?

COPE was founded in 1997 to address breaches of research and publication ethics. A voluntary body providing a discussion forum and advice for scientific editors, it aims to find practical ways of dealing with the issues, and to develop good practice. We thought it essential to attempt to define best practice in the ethics of scientific publishing. These guidelines should be useful for authors, editors, editorial board members, readers, owners of journals, and publishers. Intellectual honesty should be actively encouraged in all medical and scientific courses of study, and used to inform publication ethics and prevent misconduct. It is with that in mind that these guidelines have been produced. Details of other guidelines on the ethics of research and published codes of conduct are listed in the Appendix.

How the guidelines were developed?

The guidelines were developed from a preliminary version drafted by individual members of the committee, which was then submitted to extensive consultation. They address: study design and ethical approval, data analysis, authorship, conflict of interests, the peer review process, redundant publication, plagiarism, duties of editors, media relations, advertising, and how to deal with misconduct.

What they aim to do?

These guidelines are intended to be advisory rather than prescriptive, and to evolve over time. We hope that they will be disseminated widely, endorsed by editors, and refined by those who use them.

1. Study design and ethical approval

Definition

Good research should be well justified, well planned, appropriately designed, and ethically approved. To conduct research to a lower standard may constitute misconduct.

Action

2. Laboratory and clinical research should be driven by protocol; pilot studies should have a written rationale.
3. Research protocols should seek to answer specific questions, rather than just collect data.
4. Protocols must be carefully agreed by all contributors and collaborators, including, if appropriate, the participants.
5. The final protocol should form part of the research record.
6. Early agreement on the precise roles of the contributors and collaborators, and on matters of authorship and publication, is advised.
7. Statistical issues should be considered early in study design, including power calculations, to ensure there are neither too few nor too many participants.

8. Formal and documented ethical approval from an appropriately constituted research ethics committee is required for all studies involving people, medical records, and anonymised human tissues.
9. Use of human tissues in research should conform to the highest ethical standards, such as those recommended by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics.
10. Fully informed consent should always be sought. It may not always be possible, however, and in such circumstances, an appropriately constituted research ethics committee should decide if this is ethically acceptable.
11. When participants are unable to give fully informed consent, research should follow international guidelines, such as those of the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS).
12. Animal experiments require full compliance with local, national, ethical, and regulatory principles, and local licensing arrangements. International standards vary.
13. Formal supervision, usually the responsibility of the principal investigator, should be provided for all research projects: this must include quality control, and the frequent review and long term retention (may be up to 15 years) of all records and primary outputs.

2 Data analysis

Definition

Data should be appropriately analysed, but inappropriate analysis does not necessarily amount to misconduct. Fabrication and falsification of data do constitute misconduct.

Action

1. All sources and methods used to obtain and analyse data, including any electronic pre-processing, should be fully disclosed; detailed explanations should be provided for any exclusions.
2. Methods of analysis must be explained in detail, and referenced, if they are not in common use.
3. The post hoc analysis of subgroups is acceptable, as long as this is disclosed. Failure to disclose that the analysis was post hoc is unacceptable.
4. The discussion section of a paper should mention any issues of bias which have been considered, and explain how they have been dealt with in the design and interpretation of the study.

3 Authorship

Definition

There is no universally agreed definition of authorship, although attempts have been made (see Appendix). As a minimum, authors should take responsibility for a particular section of the study.

Action

1. The award of authorship should balance intellectual contributions to the conception, design, analysis and writing of the study against the collection of data and other routine work. If there is no task that can reasonably be attributed to a particular individual, then that individual should not be credited with authorship.
2. To avoid disputes over attribution of academic credit, it is helpful to decide early on in the planning of a research project who will be credited as authors, as contributors, and who will be acknowledged.
3. All authors must take public responsibility for the content of their paper. The multidisciplinary nature of much research can make this difficult, but this can be resolved by the disclosure of individual contributions.
4. Careful reading of the target journal's "Advice to Authors" is advised, in light of current uncertainties.

4 Conflicts of interest

Definition

Conflicts of interest comprise those which may not be fully apparent and which may influence the judgment of author, reviewers, and editors. They have been described as those which, when revealed later, would make a reasonable reader feel misled or deceived. They may be personal, commercial, political, academic or financial. “Financial” interests may include employment, research funding, stock or share ownership, payment for lectures or travel, consultancies and company support for staff.

Action

1. Such interests, where relevant, must be declared to editors by researchers, authors, and reviewers.
2. Editors should also disclose relevant conflicts of interest to their readers. If in doubt, disclose. Sometimes editors may need to withdraw from the review and selection process for the relevant submission.

5 Peer review

Definition

Peer reviewers are external experts chosen by editors to provide written opinions, with the aim of improving the study. Working methods vary from journal to journal, but some use open procedures in which the name of the reviewer is disclosed, together with the full or “edited” report.

Action

1. Suggestions from authors as to who might act as reviewers are often useful, but there should be no obligation on editors to use those suggested.
2. The duty of confidentiality in the assessment of a manuscript must be maintained by expert reviewers, and this extends to reviewers’ colleagues who may be asked (with the editor’s permission) to give opinions on specific sections.
3. The submitted manuscript should not be retained or copied.
4. Reviewers and editors should not make any use of the data, arguments, or interpretations, unless they have the authors’ permission.
5. Reviewers should provide speedy, accurate, courteous, unbiased and justifiable reports.
6. If reviewers suspect misconduct, they should write in confidence to the editor.
7. Journals should publish accurate descriptions of their peer review, selection, and appeals processes.
8. Journals should also provide regular audits of their acceptance rates and publication times.

6 Redundant publications

Definition

Redundant publication occurs when two or more papers, without full cross reference, share the same hypothesis, data, discussion points, or conclusions.

Action

1. Published studies do not need to be repeated unless further confirmation is required.
2. Previous publication of an abstract during the proceedings of meetings does not preclude
3. subsequent submission for publication, but full disclosure should be made at the time of submission.
4. Re-publication of a paper in another language is acceptable, provided that there is full and prominent disclosure of its original source at the time of submission.
5. At the time of submission, authors should disclose details of related papers, even if in a different language, and similar papers in press.

7 Plagiarism

Definition

Plagiarism ranges from the unreferenced use of others published and unpublished ideas, including research grant applications to submission under “new” authorship of a complete paper, sometimes in a different language. It may occur at any stage of planning, research, writing, or publication: it applies to print and electronic versions.

Action

1. All sources should be disclosed, and if large amounts of other people’s written or illustrative material is to be used, permission must be sought.

8 Duties of editors

Definition

Editors are the stewards of journals. They usually take over their journal from the previous editor(s) and always want to hand over the journal in good shape. Most editors provide direction for the journal and build a strong management team. They must consider and balance the interests of many constituents, including readers, authors, staff, owners, editorial board members, advertisers and the media.

Actions

2. Editors’ decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based only on the paper’s importance, originality, and clarity, and the study’s relevance to the remit of the journal.
3. Studies that challenge previous work published in the journal should be given an especially sympathetic hearing.
4. Studies reporting negative results should not be excluded.
5. All original studies should be peer reviewed before publication, taking into full account possible bias due to related or conflicting interests.
6. Editors must treat all submitted papers as confidential.
7. When a published paper is subsequently found to contain major flaws, editors must accept responsibility for correcting the record prominently and promptly.

9 Media relations

Definition

Medical research findings are of increasing interest to the print and broadcast media. Journalists may attend scientific meetings at which preliminary research findings are presented, leading to their premature publication in the mass media.

Action

1. Authors approached by the media should give as balanced an account of their work as possible, ensuring that they point out where evidence ends and speculation begins.
2. Simultaneous publication in the mass media and a peer reviewed journal is advised, as this usually means that enough evidence and data have been provided to satisfy informed and critical readers.
3. Where this is not possible, authors should help journalists to produce accurate reports, but refrain from supplying additional data.
4. All efforts should be made to ensure that patients who have helped with the research should be informed of the results by the authors before the mass media, especially if there are clinical implications.
5. Authors should be advised by the organisers if journalists are to attend scientific meetings.
6. It may be helpful to authors to be advised of any media policies operated by the journal in which their work is to be published.

10 Advertising

Definition

Many scientific journals and meetings derive significant income from advertising. Reprints may also be lucrative.

Action

1. Editorial decisions must not be influenced by advertising revenue or reprint potential: editorial and advertising administration must be clearly separated.
2. Advertisements that mislead must be refused, and editors must be willing to publish criticisms, according to the same criteria used for material in the rest of the journal.
3. Reprints should be published as they appear in the journal unless a correction is to be added.

Dealing with misconduct

1 Principles

1. The general principle confirming misconduct is intention to cause others to regard as true that which is not true.
2. The examination of misconduct must therefore focus, not only on the particular act or omission, but also on the intention of the researcher, author, editor, reviewer or publisher involved.
3. Deception may be by intention, by reckless disregard of possible consequences, or by negligence. It is implicit, therefore, that “best practice” requires complete honesty, with full disclosure.
4. Codes of practice may raise awareness, but can never be exhaustive.

2 Investigating misconduct

1. Editors should not simply reject papers that raise questions of misconduct. They are ethically obliged to pursue the case. However, knowing how to investigate and respond to possible cases of misconduct is difficult.
2. COPE is always willing to advise, but for legal reasons, can only advise on anonymized cases.
3. It is for the editor to decide what action to take.

3 Serious misconduct

1. Editors must take all allegations and suspicions of misconduct seriously, but they must recognize that they do not usually have either the legal legitimacy or the means to conduct investigations into serious cases.
2. The editor must decide when to alert the employers of the accused author(s).
3. Some evidence is required, but if employers have a process for investigating accusations—as they are increasingly required to do—then editors do not need to assemble a complete case. Indeed, it may be ethically unsound for editors to do so, because such action usually means consulting experts, so spreading abroad serious questions about the author(s).
4. If editors are presented with convincing evidence—perhaps by reviewers—of serious misconduct, they should immediately pass this on to the employers, notifying the author(s) that they are doing so.
5. If accusations of serious misconduct are not accompanied by convincing evidence, then editors should confidentially seek expert advice.
6. If the experts raise serious questions about the research, then editors should notify the employers.
7. If the experts find no evidence of misconduct, the editorial processes should proceed in the normal way.

8. If presented with convincing evidence of serious misconduct, where there is no employer to whom this can be referred, and the author(s) are registered doctors, cases can be referred to the General Medical Council.
9. If, however, there is no organisation with the legitimacy and the means to conduct an investigation, then the editor may decide that the case is sufficiently important to warrant publishing something in the journal. Legal advice will then be essential.
10. If editors are convinced that an employer has not conducted an adequate investigation of a serious accusation, they may feel that publication of a notice in the journal is warranted. Legal advice will be essential.
11. Authors should be given the opportunity to respond to accusations of serious misconduct.

4 Less serious misconduct

1. Editors may judge that it is not necessary to involve employers in less serious cases of misconduct, such as redundant publication, deception over authorship, or failure to declare conflict of interest. Sometimes the evidence may speak for itself, although it may be wise to appoint an independent expert.
2. Editors should remember that accusations of even minor misconduct may have serious implications for the author(s), and it may then be necessary to ask the employers to investigate.
3. Authors should be given the opportunity to respond to any charge of minor misconduct.
4. If convinced of wrongdoing, editors may wish to adopt some of the sanctions outlined below.

5 Sanctions

Sanctions may be applied separately or combined. The following are ranked in approximate order of severity:

1. A letter of explanation (and education) to the authors, where there appears to be a genuine misunderstanding of principles.
2. A letter of reprimand and warning as to future conduct.
3. A formal letter to the relevant head of institution or funding body.
4. Publication of a notice of redundant publication or plagiarism.
5. An editorial giving full details of the misconduct.
6. Refusal to accept future submissions from the individual, unit, or institution responsible for the misconduct, for a stated period.
7. Formal withdrawal or retraction of the paper from the scientific literature, informing other editors and the indexing authorities.
8. Reporting the case to the General Medical Council, or other such authority or organisation which can investigate and act with due process.

Ethical Guidelines for the Reviewers

- The Reviewers should inform the Editor, if they do not have the subject expertise required to carry out the review and s/he should inform the Editor immediately after receiving a request.
- Be responsible to act promptly and submit review report on time.
- Immediately inform the Editor of any possible delays and suggest another date of submission for a review report, and
- Not unnecessarily delay the review process, either by prolonged delay in submission of their review or by requesting unnecessary additional data/information from the Editor or author(s).
- The reviews should be objectively carried out with a consideration of high academic, scholarly and scientific standards.



- All judgments should be meticulously established and maintained in order to ensure the full comprehension of the reviewer's comments by the editors and the author(s).
- The reviewer may justifiably criticize a manuscript but it would be inappropriate to resort to personal criticism on the author(s), and
- The reviewers should ensure that their decision is purely based on the quality of the research paper and not influenced, either positively or negatively, by any personal, financial, or other conflicting considerations or by intellectual bias.
- The data included in the research paper is confidential and the reviewer shall not be allowed to use it for his/her personal study.
- A reviewer must declare any potentially conflicting interests (e.g., personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious). In such situation, s/he will be required to follow the journal's policies.
- If the reviewer feels unqualified to separate his/her bias, s/he should immediately return the manuscript to the Editor without review, and justify to him/her about the situation.
- Reviewers should consider the research paper as a confidential document and must not discuss its content on any platform.
- If the reviewer suspects that the research paper is almost the same as someone else's work, s/he will ethically inform the Editor and provide its citation as a reference.
- If the reviewer suspects that results in the research paper to be untrue/unrealistic/fake, s/he will share it with the Editor,
- If there has been an indication of violating ethical norms in the treatment of human beings (e.g., children, female, poor people, disabled, elderly, etc.), then this should be identified to the Editor.
- For evaluating originality, the reviewers should consider the following elements:
- Does the research paper add to existing knowledge?
- Are the research questions and/or hypotheses in line with the objective of the research work?
- The reviewers should read the "Methodology" section in detail and make sure that the author(s) has demonstrated the understanding of the procedures being used and presented in the manuscript.
- Further questions to be addressed are whether: the organization of the research paper is appropriate or deviates from the standard or prescribed format?
- The reviewer must explicitly write his/her observations in the section of 'comments' because author(s) will only have access to the comments reviewers have made,
- For writing a review report, the reviewers are requested to complete a prescribed form (s).
- It is helpful for both the Editor and author(s) if the reviewer writes a brief summary in the first section of the review report. This summary should comprise the reviewer's final decision and inferences drawn from a full review.
- Any personal comments on author(s) should be avoided and final remarks should be written in a courteous and positive manner.
- Indicating any deficiencies is important. For the understanding of the Editor and author(s), the reviewers should highlight these deficiencies in some detail with specificity. This should help justify the comments made by the reviewer.
- When a reviewer makes a decision regarding the research paper, it should be clearly indicated as 'Reject', 'Accept without revision', or 'Need Revision' and either of the decisions should have justification.

Ethical Guidelines for the Editor

The Editor of a research journal should be responsible for:

- Establishing and maintaining quality of the journal by publishing quality papers in his/her journal.
- Promotion of freedom of expression within the cultural, constitutional/legal framework.
- Providing integrity and credibility of the research contributions.
- Maintaining ethical standards of their journal.
- Providing corrigendum for any correction, clarification and apologies where required.
- Encourage new ideas and suggestions of authors, peer reviewers, members of editorial board and readers for improving quality of his/her journal.
- The Editor should only shortlist research papers which have relevance to the scope of the journal clearly stated in the Journal, using his /her judgment, but without any personal bias.
- Apply the process of blind peer review in true letter and spirit.
- Promote innovative findings in respective field and publishing them on priority.
- Promote anti plagiarism policy.
- Educate contributors (authors) about ethical practices in research, and implement the journal's policy without institutional pressure and revise the policy from time to time.
- The Editor must ensure that the Editorial Advisory Board of the Journal comprises prominent scholars of the field who can adequately promote the journal and may appoint members for a prescribed duration and add or revise constitution of the Board if required.
- The Editor should inform new board members about ethical guidelines and their expected role and update the Editorial Board members about development, challenges and any changes made in the journal policy.
- The criteria for the selection of research papers must be impartial and the Editor should select academically and scientifically sound articles.
- The Editor should disregard the discriminating factors, e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, religious belief, cultural sentiments, political affiliation, seniority and/or institutional association of the author(s) while selecting articles for publication.
- The Editor must ensure confidentiality of the author(s) and reviewers during the process of double-blind peer review,
- Information pertaining to a research paper should not be disclosed by the Editor to anyone except the author(s) and reviewer(s).
- The Editor should prepare clear guidelines about preparing and formatting of a paper and print these guidelines in each issue of the journal.
- The Editor should encourage reviewers to comment on the validity of submitted research paper and identify 'subtle (simply copy-paste)' and/or 'blatant (paraphrasing)' type of plagiarism, if, practiced by the author(s).
- The Editor should confirm plagiarism (carry out objective check through Turnitin) and/or searching for similar titles to the submitted research paper, and
- The Editor should be prepared to publish a corrigendum, remove and retract a plagiarized article if it comes to his/her knowledge subsequent to its publication.
- The Editor must not use any unpublished information/data from the submitted research paper without the permission of the author(s).
- Any information received after the peer review process must be kept confidential and not used for personal gains.

Copyright

All articles published in the UCP Journal of Engineering and Information Technology open access and freely available for anyone to read, download, copy, distribute, and share. The journal operates under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Authors retain copyright of their work and grant the journal and publisher the right of first publication, along with the right to publish, distribute, and archive the article in all forms and media.

This policy ensures that:

- Authors retain ownership of their intellectual work.
- Readers and researchers are free to share and build upon the work under the CC BY license.
- The journal complies with open-access best practices recommended by organizations such as Directory of Open Access Journals and Committee on Publication Ethics.

Submission

- Conform to rigorous methodological standards as understood by the intellectual traditions within which they operate.
- Establish the significance of their analyses not just to those working on their specific topic.
- Engage with work outside of their immediate area of research and approach to scholarly inquiry.
- Specify the theoretical framework used for analysis, reference the necessary literature(s), and spell out the implications of any findings for further research.
- All manuscripts must be submitted electronically on the website.
- For further queries, contact the Managing Editor of the Journal.

Authors Guidelines

All manuscripts must be prepared in Microsoft Word or LaTeX formats and submitted online. All papers submitted to UCP Journal of Engineering and Information Technology are checked for compliance before being sent for review. This journal follows IEEE Access Templates with some modifications. The template for manuscript preparation must be strictly followed and can be downloaded from <http://ojs.ucp.edu.pk/index.php/ucpjeit/TF>

Ethical Guidelines for the Author(s)

The following ethical guidelines are obligatory for all author(s) violation of which may result in application of penalties by the editor, including but not limited to the suspension or revocation of publishing privileges.

Reporting Standards:

- It is the author(s)' responsibility to ensure that the research report and data contain adequate detail and references to the sources of information in order to allow others to reproduce the results.
- Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

Originality and Plagiarism:

- It is the author(s)' responsibility to ascertain that s/he has submitted an entirely original work, giving due credit, by virtue of proper citations, to the works and/or words of others where they have been used.



- Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is not acceptable.
- Material quoted verbatim from the author(s)' previously published work or other sources must be placed in quotation marks.
- As per HEC's policy, in case the manuscript has a similarity index of more than 15%, it will either be rejected or left at the discretion of the Editorial Board for the purposes of a conditional acceptance.

Muhammad Amjad Iqbal, Ph.D.
Editor-in-Chief
UCP Journal of Engineering &
Information Technology

Dr. Hammad Naveed
Pro-Rector
University of Central Punjab, Lahore,
Pakistan

Pro-Rector
University of Central Punjab
Lahore.