

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

All Editors, Reviewers, and Authors must comply with the JGBAT Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement.

Responsibilities of Authors

- Submission of a manuscript implies that it is not under consideration elsewhere and has not been published elsewhere, either in part or in whole. Overlapping materials must be cited in the manuscript. Authors who examine data from others must cite the contribution from the researchers.
- JGBAT follows a double-blind review process so the manuscript should not include any information that would reveal the identity of an author.
- Conflicts of interest that would make the reader feel misled must be avoided. Financial support and any conflicts of interest should be disclosed in an Acknowledgements section in the manuscript.
- Authors are ultimately responsible for everything included in a manuscript submitted to JGBAT so if an inaccuracy is discovered, it is the Author's responsibility to promptly make the correction. Authors must not exclude data that is relevant to the research questions. The paper should contain enough detail and references to allow others with access to the same data to repeat the work.
- JGBAT holds the copyright to all published papers so if an author wants to publish their paper somewhere else, permission must be sought from JGBAT.
- Consent must be secured from everyone that participates in the research. Permission is needed to use photos, quotations, and tables from previous publications.

Responsibilities of Reviewers

- Review Forms should be in English.
- Reviewers should provide qualitative comments and suggestions of at least 100 words as they help immensely in improving the quality of the scholarly works. For suggested improvements, please list suggestions that could help strengthen the work in a revision.
- Treat the authors the way you would want to be treated. Specifically, comments and tone should be professional and courteous. Avoid any personal, unnecessary, or hostile remarks. Note that the Editor-in-Chief may remove any language deemed as inappropriate.
- A reviewer can refuse to review a paper if they feel the paper is not within their expertise or if the reviewer has a conflict of interest.
- Reviewers should refuse a review if they know the identity of the author.
- Reviewers must avoid writing anything that could identify the reviewer to the author.

- Review comments should be devoid of personal bias.
- Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments and references.
- Reviewers should discuss suspected misconduct with the Editor-in-Chief only.

Responsibilities of Editors

- Editors make the final decision regarding acceptance or rejection. The Editor-in-Chief reserves the right to refuse any manuscripts, whether an invitation or otherwise.
- Editors make their decisions devoid of personal bias.
- The Editor-in-Chief cannot publish a paper in the journal. The Editor-in-Chief can publish non-refereed materials such as the Editorial. The Editor-in-Chief will handle editorial responsibility for any submission by a JGBAT Editor.
- Editors should only discuss information about a submission with the reviewers and authors.
- At least two reviewers are invited to blind review each manuscript.
- If a reviewer provides evidence to an Editor that the conclusion of a submission is incorrect, the Editor must promptly inform the Author. If evidence is provided to an Editor that the conclusion of a published manuscript is incorrect, the Editor must promptly inform the Author and publish a correction.
- JGBAT is committed to diverse geographical representation of reviewers. Editors are encouraged to take this into consideration when selecting reviewers.
- JGBAT Editors follow the rules recommended by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) available at <https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>

Violation Review Process and Consequences

- The Editor-in-Chief is ultimately responsible for enforcement of the Ethics and Malpractice Statement. The Editor-in-Chief will review any instance of suspected violation of the Ethics and Malpractice Statement and make the final decision. Penalties for violation will be determined by the Editor-in-Chief and can range from asking an author to rephrase parts of a paper to retracting a paper and labeling as such to denying future submissions to JGBAT.
- A review of suspected malpractice can be started by an Author, Reviewer, or Editor. All ethical violations must be reported to the Editor-in-Chief. If an Editor, Reviewer, or Author suspects an ethical violation, they may seek guidance from COPE.