

UCP Journal of Business Perspectives

Policy Document

1. Title:

UCP Journal of Business Perspectives

1. About the Journal

1.1. Aims and Scope

Aims and Scope:

The *UCP Journal of Business Perspectives* is a multidisciplinary platform dedicated to advancing knowledge across prominent business management domains, including general management, finance, human resource management, marketing, economics, and emerging areas such as business analytics, entrepreneurship, and sustainability. The journal values interdisciplinary research and welcomes submissions employing diverse qualitative, quantitative, theoretical, and empirical methodologies to explore contemporary issues and innovative concepts. We ensure high-quality contributions that meet global standards through a rigorous double-blind peer review process involving local and international scholars. In addition to original research articles, we encourage submissions of case studies, which can offer practitioner insights to promote actionable knowledge. Serving as a bridge between academia, business practitioners, and policymakers, the journal disseminates research findings, provides expert analyses of current theoretical and practical debates, and offers comprehensive reviews of relevant literature. We aim to contribute meaningfully to scholarly discourse by addressing critical challenges and opportunities and informing practical decision-making across diverse sectors and regions.

1.2. Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Muhammad Athar Siddiqui
Dean, Faculty of Management Sciences

Managing Editor

Dr. Jawad Abbas
Associate Professor

Editor

Dr. Waseem Hassan
Associate Dean

Associate Editor

Dr Knawal Zahra
Dr Imran Shahzad
Dr Abdul Waheed
Dr Raja Irfan Sabir
Dr Sami Ullah
Dr Zahid Ahmad

1.3. Advisory Board National Experts

Dr. Imran Shafique
Dr Munazza Saeed
Dr Muhammad Zia Aslam
Dr Hamad Raza
Prof Dr Rizwana Bashir
Dr Rab Nawaz Lodhi
Prof Dr Saman Attiq

International Experts

Dr Serife Zinhi Eyupoglu
Dr Luigi ALDIERI
Dr Joanna Kurowska-Pysz
Dr Abdul Ghafoor
Dr Saadia Irfan
Dr Susana Alvrez otero
Dr DeepanRaaj
Dr Fiza Qureshi
Dr Ahmed Samour
Dr Samira Ben Belgacem
Dr Awais Gulzar
Dr Shuja Iqbal

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 dedicated to protecting intellectual property. When supplementary materials are requested during the review process, they will undergo double-blind review to preserve the author's anonymity. Review team members will not use ideas from these materials. Sharing supplementary material is strictly prohibited without explicit permission from the author through the editor-in-chief or managing editor. Advice on specific, limited aspects of the manuscript may be sought from colleagues with relevant expertise, provided the author's identity and intellectual property remain protected.

Fair play and Impartiality

The journal follows specific criteria for selecting research papers, choosing academically and scientifically sound manuscripts for editorial review. There will be no discrimination based on gender, race, ethnicity, religious beliefs, cultural sentiments, political affiliation, seniority, or institutional ties. The editorial team promptly responds to authors of submitted papers, assigns a unique number to each submission, and considers all research papers fairly, prioritizing merit.

Publication Ethics

The journal is dedicated to maintaining the integrity of the academic record. Its policies prohibit an author from submitting the same manuscript to another journal and do not permit publication of a manuscript that has been published fully or partially elsewhere. We encourage authors to refer to the Committee on 'Publication Ethics' International Standards for Authors.

Plagiarism

Journal believes in a zero-tolerance policy for plagiarism.

Publication Decisions

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

Disclosure

The journal will not use any unpublished information or data from the submitted research paper without the author's permission, and any information received after the peer review process will be kept confidential and not used for personal gain.

Plagiarism Policy

The journal strictly follows the Higher Education Commission's (HEC) plagiarism policy. Research articles submitted for publication undergo a rigorous similarity/plagiarism check process. The editorial team verifies this process using Turnitin software. According to HEC policy, the Similarity Score Index (SSI) must not exceed 19%. Regarding the use of Turnitin to generate originality reports and highlight the Similarity Score Index (SSI), the journal adheres to the following policies and procedures.

The editorial team will review a submission up to three times, as explained in sections 2, 3, and 4 of the HEC plagiarism policy available on their website. The first review occurs at the initial submission, and two additional chances are provided—pending approval for further processing

by the Internal Evaluation Committee—to improve the quality of the research article. If the paper does not meet the HEC criteria or if the quality does not improve, the Internal Evaluation Committee of the editorial board may take necessary actions, including rejection, penalties, and reporting the matter to HEC.

After a researcher submits a research article, an initial comprehensive Similarity Score Index (SSI) report will be generated during the internal evaluation stage, without excluding “Quotations, Bibliography, and Matches.” This report helps editors verify the overall SSI. Once the committee approves the paper for further processing, the report also assists the researcher in reducing the overall SSI.

A second SSI report will be generated when the researcher submits a revised version of the research article. At this stage, the editorial team may generate the SSI report by excluding “Quotations, Bibliography, and Matches.” A third report may be prepared, if necessary, before the paper proceeds to peer review and publication. Editors are responsible for performing all tasks related to plagiarism checks.

Publication Timeline

The journal is published biannually through the following timeline:

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

GUIDELINES ON GOOD PUBLICATION PRACTICE

Why were the guidelines developed?

COPE was founded in 1997 to address breaches of research and publication ethics. As a voluntary organization offering discussion forums and advice for scientific editors, it aims to find practical solutions and promote good practices. We believed it was essential to define best practices in the ethics of scientific publishing. These guidelines should be helpful for authors, editors, editorial board members, readers, journal owners, and publishers. Intellectual honesty should be actively promoted in all medical and scientific education, serving as a foundation for publication ethics and preventing misconduct. With that goal, these guidelines have been created. Additional guidelines on research ethics and published codes of conduct are listed in the Appendix.

How were the guidelines developed?

The guidelines were created from an initial draft by individual committee members, followed by extensive consultation. They cover: study design and ethical approval, data analysis, authorship, conflicts of interest, peer review, redundant publication, plagiarism, editors' responsibilities, media relations, advertising, and misconduct management.

What do they aim to do?

These guidelines are meant to be advisory rather than strict rules and will evolve over time. We hope they will be widely shared, endorsed by editors, and refined by their users.

1. Study design and ethical approval

Definition

Good research should be well justified, well planned, properly designed, and ethically approved. Conducting research below these standards may be considered 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 upon 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 anonymized 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 analyzed, 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 analyze 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 that 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 the light of current uncertainties.

4 Conflicts of interest

Definition

Conflicts of interest include those that may not be immediately obvious and could influence the judgment of authors, reviewers, and editors. They are described as situations that, if revealed later, might lead a reasonable reader to feel misled or deceived. These conflicts can be personal, commercial, political, academic, or financial. "Financial" interests may encompass employment, research funding, stock or share ownership, payments 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 reviews

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 are 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 are informed of the results by the authors before the mass media, especially if there are clinical implications.
5. Authors should be advised by the organizers 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 the 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 organization 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 a 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 organization which can investigate and act with due process.

Appendix

The Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry. Facilities for non-patient volunteer studies. London:APBI, 1989.

The Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry. Guidelines for medical experiments in non-patient human volunteers. London:ABPI, 1990.

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 for acting promptly and submitting a 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 of 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 a 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 the citation as a reference.
- If the reviewer suspects that the results in the research paper are 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, females, poor people, disabled, elderly, etc.), then this should be reported 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) have demonstrated an 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 the 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 the 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 corrections, clarifications, and apologies where required.
- Encourage new ideas and suggestions of authors, peer reviewers, members of the editorial board, and readers for improving the quality of his/her journal.
- The Editor should only shortlist research papers that have relevance to the scope of the journal, as 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 the respective field and publish 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 the 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 the 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 an objective check through Turnitin) and/or search 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 gain.

Copyright

All articles published in UCP Journal of Languages & Literature (UCPJLL) are open access and free for everyone to read, download, copy, and distribute. UCP JLL protects the work of our researchers, defined by the License Agreement under Creative Commons Attribution License. Upon acceptance of an article, authors agree to transfer the copyright of their work to the journal and its publisher. This transfer allows the publisher to hold full rights to publish, distribute, and archive the work in all forms and media.

Articles are published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

This policy ensures that:

- The journal and publisher hold copyright over published content.
- Readers and researchers are free to share and build upon the work under the CC BY license.
- The journal complies with best practices recommended by DOAJ and COPE.

Call for Papers

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

- **Title:** The title of the article should be bold, centered, and typed in capital letters (in 14 point) Times New Roman Font.
- **Author(s) Details:** Author(s) details include full name (bold), affiliations, and contact details should be in (12 point) Times New Roman Font and should be centered below the title.
- **Abstract:** All manuscripts must be accompanied by a brief abstract. Abstract should not exceed 150-200 words. It should be properly formatted as justified in italicized text in Times New Roman Font (10 point). It should highlight the Research Background, Methodology, Major Finding(s), and Conclusion in brief.
- **Key Words:** Authors must mention 5-7 key words. Key words should be listed alphabetically, separated by commas, and full stop at the end.
- **Page Setup:** The Size of the page should be 7 inches in Width and 9.5 inches in Height with a 1-inch margin on all four sides. Header and Footer Layout should be 0.5 inches from the edge.
- **Manuscript:** Manuscripts must be between 4000 and 6000 words (all inclusive). It should be double-spaced, using Times New Roman font at 12.
- **Tables and Figures/Images:** All important tables and figures/images should be included in the body of the paper. The table headings should be in Times New Roman, bold, 12 points, and indented 0.25 inches on the left. Figure/Image headings should follow the same formatting as tables, placed below the image or figure, and should be center-aligned.
- **References:** All references should be listed alphabetically at the end of the article using APA 7 reference style only.
- **Citations in the Text:** Kindly make sure that every reference cited in the text should also be presented in the reference list and vice versa. Authors should avoid using citations in the abstract of the manuscript.
- **Author(s) Biography:** Every author must submit a brief biography, a photograph, and the Copyright Agreement form. Footnotes should be numbered consecutively.
- All manuscripts must be submitted electronically via email.

Ethical Guidelines for the Author(s)

The following ethical guidelines are obligatory for all authors (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 have 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.



Dr. Muhammad Athar Siddiqui
Editor-in-Chief
UCP Journal of Business Perspectives

Pro-Rector
University of Central Punjab
Lahore.



Pro-Rector
Prof. Dr. Hammad Naveed