Editorial Guidelines – Indian Society of Artificial Intelligence and Law [Authors]

The length of the following kinds of submissions are as follows:

- Technical and Legal Articles (Long Articles)/Discussion Papers: 4,000-10,000 words
- Case Comments: 2,000-2,500 words
- Book/Article Reviews: 2,000-2,500 words
- Policy Analyses – 800-3,000 words
- The object and clarity of the manuscript decide its selection and publication process.
- Co-authorship is allowed to a maximum of 5 authors.
- All references should be done in the format of in-text citations following the **ISO 690:2010 (First Element & Date) standard**. No references are allowed whether in the format of endnotes or footnotes. However, footnotes providing further information or subjective notes are allowed. **Use Springer LNCS** for the format of the manuscript draft.
- Also, kindly provide a Bibliography of List of References as well.
- Provide your ORCiD (you can register for ORCiD for free at orcid.org)
- Ensure the originality of the research work submitted. The work has to be fully referenced, and all authors should be accurately represented. Kindly get acknowledgment letters from co-authors before the submission for no objection, if your paper is accepted for publication.
- Our team will contact you after your paper selection for the due submission of your ORCiD.
- The submission must be exclusive. It must not be published or submitted anywhere else, all, or in part. In case of submission anywhere else, the author should intimate the team clearly on this and get clearance from the Editorial Board if the same is approved based on the circumstances.
- Disclose sources of all data and third-party material, including previously unpublished work by the authors themselves.
- Strictly avoid fabrication of research data as well as manipulation of existing data.
- Openly declare any conflicts of interest – for example, if the research work was intended to benefit any particular service or institute in which the author's interest lies. If the submitted work contains a significant conceptual or textual reproduction

of the research work undertaken by/for such an institution, then kindly submit an acknowledgment letter from the relevant authority.

- Expect accurate plagiarism checking measures. Submissions will be scrutinized for plagiarism of words, ideas, writings, information, illustration, graphic representations, printed and electronic materials, and any other original work. The correct citation is essential.
- Do proper referencing in the submission by strictly following the recommended citation style. At any stage of the editorial/review process, the author(s) will be directed to undertake this themselves if the submission has not used proper referencing styles. Maintain good communication and cooperate fully with the editorial team.

We will follow the principles of research integrity, ie:

- honesty in all aspects of research;
- scrupulous care, thoroughness and excellence in research practice;
- transparency and open communication;
- care and respect for all participants in and subjects of research. In addition to the general principles above, we expect our journal and book editorial teams to provide specific guidelines and policies for authors on research integrity and ethics appropriate to their subject matter and discipline

We are committed to editorial independence and strive in all cases to prevent this principle from being compromised through conflicts of interest, fear, or any other corporate or political influence. Our editorial processes reflect this commitment to editorial independence.

Where no other criteria are specified, authorship should be based on the below principles. These should apply to all fields of research:

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; and
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and
3. Final approval of the version to be published; and
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved. Our default position is that the corresponding author has

the authority to act on behalf of all co-authors, and we expect the corresponding author to confirm this at the beginning of the publication process.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as 'submitting as one's own work, irrespective of intent to deceive, that which derives in part or in its entirety from the work of others without due acknowledgement. It is both poor scholarship and a breach of academic integrity.'
Examples of plagiarism include

- copying (using another person's language and/or ideas as if they are one's own), by:
- quoting verbatim another person's work without due acknowledgement of the source;
- paraphrasing another person's work by changing some of the words, or the order of the words, without due acknowledgement of the source;
- using ideas taken from someone else without reference to the originator;
- cutting and pasting from the Internet to make a pastiche of online sources;
- submitting someone else's work as part of one's own without identifying clearly who did the work.

For example, not attributing research contributed by others to a joint project. Plagiarism might also arise from colluding with another person who has not been declared or acknowledged (i.e. where collaboration is concealed or has been forbidden).
Work should include a general acknowledgement where it has received substantial help, for example with the language and style of a piece of written work.
Plagiarism can occur in respect to all types of sources and media, including:

- text, illustrations, musical quotations, mathematical derivations, computer code, etc.;
- material downloaded from websites or drawn from manuscripts or other media;
- published and unpublished material, including lectures, presentations and grey literature.

We do not tolerate plagiarism in any of our publications, and we reserve the right to check all submissions through appropriate plagiarism checking tools. Submissions containing suspected plagiarism, in whole or part, will be rejected. exert an undue influence on the presentation, review and publication of a piece of work. These may be financial, non-financial, professional, contractual or personal in nature.
We also expect that anyone who suspects undisclosed conflict of interest regarding a work published or under consideration by Indian Society of Artificial Intelligence and Law should inform the relevant editor or email.

Duplicate and Redundant Publication

Duplicate or redundant publication, or 'self-plagiarism', occurs when work, or substantial parts of a work, is published more than once by the author(s) of the work. This can be in the same or a different language. The redundant publication can occur when there is substantial overlap between two or more publications without appropriate cross-referencing or justification for the overlap.

We do not support duplicate or redundant publication, unless:

- it is felt that editorially this will strengthen the academic discourse, and
- we have clear approval from the original publication, and
- we include citation of the original source. We expect our readers, reviewers and editors to raise any suspicions of duplicate or redundant publication, either by contacting the relevant editor or by email to the concerned editors.

Libel, Defamation and Freedom of Expression

Freedom of expression is critical to us as academic publishers, but we do not support publishing false statements that harm the reputation of individuals, groups, or organisations. Our legal team can advise on pre-publication libel reviews, and will also address allegations of libel in any of our publications.

Journal editors will consider retractions, corrections or expressions of concern in line with COPE's Retraction Guidelines. If an author is found to have made an error, the journal will issue a corrigendum. If the journal is found to have made an error, they will issue an erratum. Retractions are usually reserved for articles that are so seriously flawed that their findings or conclusions should not be relied upon. Journals that publish Accepted Manuscripts may make minor changes such as those which would likely occur during typesetting or proofreading, but any substantive corrections will be carried out in line with COPE's Retraction Guidelines.

Transparency

We strive to follow COPE's Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing and encourage our publishing partners to uphold these same principles.

Prioritizing Manuscripts

Notwithstanding the rest of the guidelines, and in no conflict with the guidelines as such, we can prioritize certain manuscripts on the basis of the following outcomes we can have from the Peer Review Board or the Editorial Board:

1. **Redundancy of Thematic Area of the Manuscript**: If the thematic area of a Manuscript is unreasonable or redundant, it can be rejected by an Editorial Board Member, provided the affirmation to reject is approved by Either the Editor(s) in Chief or the Chief Managing Editor/a Managing Editor (in case of a Managing Editor approving the same, the ground of rejection must be justified by one of the Associate Editors). Also, the redundancy of the thematic area can be decided by either of the two means, which will be treated as the means of evidence to affirm rejection, which are:
    a. That the abstract of the manuscript fails to provide a reason to believe and be convinced that the work is authoritative or reasonable to be either accepted, reviewed or even proofread, or
    b. That the contents of the Manuscript fail to provide a reason to believe and be convinced that the work is authoritative or reasonable to be either accepted, reviewed or even proofread in accordance with the COPE Guidelines.
2. **Grammar, Vocabulary, Semantics and Formatting Issues**: If there are any grammar, vocabulary, semantic or formatting issues in a Manuscript, then these are the following grounds that can be taken into full consideration to prioritize the manuscript:
    a. That the contents of the Manuscript provide a reason to believe and be convinced that the work is authoritative or reasonable to be accepted, reviewed or even proofread in accordance with the COPE Guidelines.
    b. That by a proper rectification of the contents of the Manuscript to remove or alleviate any grammar, vocabulary, semantic or formatting issues in the Manuscript, the Manuscript is tenable or authoritative or reasonable to be accepted, reviewed or even proofread in accordance with the COPE Guidelines.

3. **Content Value, Reasonability, Originality and Purposive Construction**: If the Manuscript does have certain issues such as the value of the academic research or scholarship enumerated, it lacks academic reasonability, does face stringent issues pertinent to the originality of the content or/and there exist any convictions with respect to the purposive constructions in the assertions or arguments proposed in the Manuscript, then based on these grounds only, the Manuscript can be prioritized

with any prejudice barred by law or which violates basic sense or prudence or the international guidelines related to publishing ethics.

PR/Media

We recommend Academic colleagues who are involved in media or publicity familiarise themselves with and follow the International Public Relations Association's Code of Conduct, and observe these standards in any press releases or other media communications. Where we solicit or encourage media activities concerning one of our authors, editors or publishing partners, we strive to keep them informed.

Peer Review Guidelines

The manuscripts which have been submitted for inclusion in a Volume of a Book or for publication as a monograph in the form of a book or for publication in a report or as an independent paper will go through the following stages:

- **Stage of Receipt**: The Manuscript is Received
- **Stage of Similarity Check**: The similarity index of the Manuscript is derived using proofreading devices and applications.
- **Stage of Academic Plagiarism Review**: The Manuscript's academic credentials, that is how the submission references to any academic precept or concept or model according to the basic morphology of the thematic area of the Manuscript.
- **Stage of Peer Review**: The Manuscript will now be reviewed by a member of the Peer Review Board. The Peer Review Board is constituted of External and Independent Reviewers and the Publisher has no governance over them.
- **Stage of Final Proofreading or Interim Scrutiny**: The Manuscript will now be reviewed for its semantic and vocabulary issues by the Managing Editors and one of the Members of the Editorial Board.
- **Stage of Publication**: The Manuscript is published.
- **Stage of Indexing**: The Manuscript is indexed with a **Digital Object Identifier** (DOI) using the ORCiD ID(s).
- **Stage of Inclusion in Academic Repository**: The Manuscript is included in various Academic Repositories.

Guidelines for Duration of Peer Review

The duration of Peer Review of a Manuscript will be decided on the basis of certain characteristics of the Manuscript:

- **Page Length/Word Count**: The categorization attested is provided as follows -
    - For Word Count - 2,000-4,000 words or Page Length - 3-5 pages: 5 days (hereinafter Category A)
    - For Word Count - 4,000-7,000 words or Page Length - 6-12 pages: 10 days (hereinafter Category B)
    - For Word Count - 7,000-10,000 (and beyond words or Page Length - 13-26 (beyond) pages: 20 days (hereinafter Category C)
- **How Many Manuscripts Can be Reviewed Per Editor**: The categorization attested is provided as follows -
    - For A - At least 3 manuscripts- average duration remains the same provided that the Editor or Peer Reviewer can review every article in consecutive order (means 5+5 days)
    - For B - At least 2 manuscripts- average duration remains the same provided that the Editor or Peer Reviewer can review every article in consecutive order (means 10+10 days)
    - For C - Only 1 manuscript - average duration remains the same
- The External and Independent Reviewer may take at most 3 manuscripts whether they are a pure or impure combination of categories A, B and C. They can prioritize reviewing of articles based on the Special Guidelines of Indian Society of Artificial Intelligence and Law. Unless the review is completed, the Managing Editors are advised not to send new submissions to the Peer Reviewer

  For example: If an Editor or a Peer Reviewer gets 1 manuscript from each of the categories, i.e., A, B & C, then it means that as per the rule, the Editor or Peer Reviewer gets 5+10+20 days to review the combination.
- If the External and Independent Reviewer feels that after he wishes to review more manuscripts, then he can request for more manuscripts under the A, B and C categories under the following limitations asserted:
    - For A: He can request not more than 3 manuscripts
    - For B: He can request not more than 1 manuscript
    - For C: Unless he completes a review of the manuscript, he is not eligible to request a fresh manuscript for the purpose of review.

Role of the Editors, Authors and Publishers

Role of Editors: The role of the editors is to evaluate the suitability of submitted manuscripts for the journal, including (a) the quality of the manuscript, (b) whether it meets the Aims and Scope of the journal, and (c) the originality of the work. The editors will not disclose information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers or potential reviewers, or other members of the editorial board. Editors will ensure the prompt handling of the review process. Editors will evaluate the merit of manuscripts for intellectual content without regard to race, gender, country of origin, ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation.

Role of Authors: Authors of original research (not previously published or under consideration for publication elsewhere) should be an accurate presentation of the work carried out, a discussion of the significance of the work in context with previous works, and should contain sufficient experimental detail to allow others to replicate the work. Appropriate citation of previously published works must always be included. Authors should disclose any financial or other conflicts of interest that may be construed as influencing the data or interpretation. All sources of financial support should be disclosed. Authorship should be limited to those persons who have made a significant contribution to the work in terms of conception, design, experimental implementation, and data analysis and interpretation. All persons making significant contributions should be included as co-authors. If an author discovers a significant error in the published work, the author is obligated to inform the journal editor in order to either correct or retract the paper.

Role of the Publisher: In cases of proven scientific misconduct, plagiarism, or fraudulent publication, the publisher, in collaboration with the editorial board, will take appropriate action to clarify the situation, publish an erratum, or retract the work in question.

The Head of Publishing of Indian Society of Artificial Intelligence and Law, the Chief Managing Editors and the Editors In Chief of respective books can veto any administrative decision provided the decision does not violate the basic ethics and propensity of the Special Guidelines issued. The concurrent discretion to exercise the Veto can only be emanated through approval given by the Head of Publishing to a formal request made by the concerned Chief Managing Editor and the Editor(s) In Chief of the respective Book.

Guidelines for Similarity Check, Academic Plagiarism, Academic Peer Review and Scrutiny

The Editorial Board employs the double-blind peer review process, where both reviewers and authors remain anonymous throughout the review process.
Reviewers could judge any manuscript on the basis of the following criteria:

- **Format of the Article**: Any major divergence from the standard manuscript format should be indicated.
- **Technical Presentation**: The research article should be technically presented instead of being presented as a story. Mere repetition of past work should not be accepted. You can look for conceptual advancement over previously published work. Any major omission of the previously published findings on the similar problem must be checked.
- **Interpretation**: The discussion should hover around the result and should not include irrelevant and unachievable statement.
- **Summary**: Pinpoint the strength and weakness of the article considering the potential importance of the work in the context of present and future.
- **Conclusion**: At the end reviewer(s) can recommend necessary corrections needed to accept the paper, if they are actually required, else recommend it for publication. If found unsuitable the paper should be declared as unacceptable for publication.

Special and suggestive tips

1. Kindly use Grammarly for grammar-checking, provide comments and track changes using Google Drive or Microsoft Word. Provide a PDF version of the file along with the DOC version of the file to the author for the purpose of review.
2. Provide comments which are lucid, understandable and reasonable.

Similarity Check

- Any manuscript which surpasses the range of 9-15% similarity is not eligible for publication. The Managing Editors can opt a policy to share the similarity check report with the author(s) to rectify their similarity issues.
- Similarity essentially is not equivalent to academic plagiarism.

Plagiarism (Academic)

Plagiarism is defined as 'submitting as one's own work, irrespective of intent to deceive, that which derives in part or in its entirety from the work of others without due acknowledgement. It is both poor scholarship and a breach of academic integrity.
Examples of plagiarism include:

- copying (using another person's language and/or ideas as if they are one's own), by:
- quoting verbatim another person's work without due acknowledgement of the source;
- paraphrasing another person's work by changing some of the words, or the order of the words, without due acknowledgement of the source;
- using ideas taken from someone else without reference to the originator;
- cutting and pasting from the Internet to make a pastiche of online sources;
- submitting someone else's work as part of one's own without identifying clearly who did the work.

For example, not attributing research contributed by others to a joint project. Plagiarism might also arise from colluding with another person who has not been declared or acknowledged (i.e. where collaboration is concealed or has been forbidden).
Work should include a general acknowledgement where it has received substantial help, for example with the language and style of a piece of written work.
Plagiarism can occur in respect to all types of sources and media, including:

- text, illustrations, musical quotations, mathematical derivations, computer code, etc.;
- material downloaded from websites or drawn from manuscripts or other media;
- published and unpublished material, including lectures, presentations and grey literature.

We do not tolerate plagiarism in any of our publications, and we reserve the right to check all submissions through appropriate plagiarism checking tools. Submissions containing suspected plagiarism, in whole or part, will be rejected. exert an undue influence on the presentation, review and publication of a piece of work. These may be financial, non-financial, professional, contractual or personal in nature.
We also expect that anyone who suspects undisclosed conflict of interest regarding a work published or under consideration by Indian Society of Artificial Intelligence and Law should inform the relevant editor or email.

Scrutiny

In the stage of academic scrutiny of a Manuscript, the stipulated duration will be decided on the basis of certain characteristics of the Manuscript received by the Managing Editors:

- **Page Length/Word Count**: The categorization attested is provided as follows -
    - For Word Count - 2,000-4,000 words or Page Length - 3-5 pages: 2 days (hereinafter Category A)
    - For Word Count - 4,000-7,000 words or Page Length - 6-12 pages: 5 days (hereinafter Category B)
    - For Word Count - 7,000-10,000 (and beyond words or Page Length - 13-26 (beyond) pages: 7 days (hereinafter Category C)
- **How Many Articles Can be Reviewed Per Editor**: The categorization attested is provided as follows -
    - For A - At least 5 manuscripts- average duration remains the same provided that the Editor or Peer Reviewer can review every article in consecutive order (means 5+5 days)
    - For B - At least 3 manuscripts- average duration remains the same provided that the Editor or Peer Reviewer can review every article in consecutive order (means 10+10 days)
    - For C - Only 2 manuscript - average duration remains the same
- The Editor may take at most 5 manuscripts whether they are a pure or impure combination of categories A, B and C. They can prioritize reviewing of articles based on the Special Guidelines of Indian Society of Artificial Intelligence and Law. Unless the review is completed, the Managing Editors are advised not to send new submissions to the Associate Editor.

  For example: If an Editor gets 1 manuscript from each of the categories, i.e., A, B & C, then it means that as per the rule, the Editor or Peer Reviewer gets 2+5+7 days to review the combination.
- If the Editor feels that after he wishes to review more manuscripts, then he can request for more manuscripts under the A, B and C categories under the following limitations asserted:
    - For A: He can request not more than 3 manuscripts
    - For B: He can request not more than 1 manuscript
    - For C: Unless he completes a review of the manuscript, he is not eligible to request a fresh manuscript for the purpose of review.

The guidelines and implementation of scrutiny are optional if the Peer Review Process is deemed to be sufficient at the discretion of the Editor(s) in Chief, provided that the discretion to opt-out of or opt-in the Scrutiny is advised by either the External and Independent Peer Reviewer(s) or the Associate Editor(s).