

## **General Policies**

Submitting an article implies that the work described has not previously been considered for publication in another journal. The publication of the article must be approved by all authors participating in the writing of the article. If the article is accepted, it will not be published anywhere else in the same form in English or any other language. The editors reserve the right to edit and publish according to the set standards. Before publication, authors will approve the edited article after final check. The article will not be published without the author's consent after editing the article. Editors may request payment from authors for editing tables, photographs, images or drawings. If it is necessary to pay for the editing of the article in the publication standard, the authors will be informed. Authors retain copyright for articles published in HRR Journal. In general, in order to be acceptable, the paper should represent progress in the field, which should advance the existing literature thematically and problematically. There should be a discernible reason why the paper deserves publication visibility in Human Research in Rehabilitation.

## **Review Policy-Review Process**

*General rule:* All received articles are read by members of the article selection committee, which changes periodically. Papers to be of insufficient general interest or otherwise unsuitable for publication in HRR are rejected without external review (decisions on this may be based on informal advice from experts in the field). Only those papers that seem most likely to meet the editorial criteria of the journal HRR are sent for review to the Editor-in-Chief. The Editor-in-Chief makes a decision on the acceptance of the article after consulting with the independent reviewers he chooses to review the article. The editor-in-chief respects the opinion of the reviewers and the authors must respect the suggestions of all members of the independent review board. The Journal uses a unique blind system. Reviewer identities remain anonymous to authors, reviewers cannot see author identities. Two external reviewers and the Editor-in-Chief are involved in reviewing the article. The review process usually takes 2 months from the time of submission. All materials published by HRR reflect the opinions and work of the authors and do not necessarily correspond to the opinions of the Editors, Editorial Board or members of affiliated organizations. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of their manuscripts including all data and references.

*Procedure:* Initial screenings are screened by the Editor-in-Chief and the Associate Editors to determine if they are original contributions and within the journal's scope. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for the decision to reject or to recommend the article for full peer review. Authors of manuscripts that are rejected at this point will be informed within 3-4 weeks of submission. The Editor-in-Chief will assign two reviewers to each paper based on their availability and expertise. Authors may be asked to suggest suitable reviewers for the subject of their paper during the electronic submission process. Reviewers are asked to evaluate the manuscript for: Originality and scientific contribution to improving knowledge in the field; Internal validity (including review of the literature, methods, analysis, and interpretation); Organization and writing style (clear, concise, jargon-free writing) Reviewers will provide anonymous comments meant for the authors and confidential comments to the Editors if needed. The anonymous comments meant for the authors are made available to the other reviewer. Reviewers are not expected to correct or copy edit manuscripts as this will be done by editorial staff. Typically, the peer review process will take about 4 weeks. However, if there is a controversy, the Editor-in-Chief may assign additional reviewers and this will lengthen the process. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for the final decision to reject or recommend the manuscript for publication. The decision will be sent to the

author(s) along with reviewer recommendations. Authors may be asked to revise their manuscript in keeping with reviewer comments. Revised manuscripts may be returned to the original reviewers or to alternate reviewers. The Editor-in Chief may request more than one revision of a manuscript.

### **What do you need to know about the peer review process?**

Peer review follows a number of stages, beginning with submitting your article to a journal. At this first, the journal editor will decide if it's suitable for the journal, asking questions such as: Has the author followed the journal's guidelines? Is this the right journal for this article? Will the journal's readers find it interesting and useful?

The editor might reject the article immediately, or will move to the next step, and into peer review. The editor will find and contact two other researchers or academics who are experts in your field. They will be asked to read your article, and advise the editor whether to publish your paper in that journal.

So what are they looking for?

Your work is original or new; Your study design and methodology are appropriate and described so that others could replicate what you've done; You've presented your results clearly and appropriately; Your conclusions are reliable and significant.

You'll then be given feedback about your article, telling you if any changes need to be made before it can be published. Reviewers' comments can be extremely helpful, ensuring that the article is of a high quality. Please note the final editorial decision on a paper and the choice of who to invite to review is always at the editor's discretion. You can then amend your article based on the reviewers' comments, resubmitting it with the changes made. If you decide you don't want to accept all the reviewers' comments, you can include a brief explanation of why you disagree.

Every research article published in a HRR journal has been through peer review as outlined in the journal's aims and scope information; its quality, validity, and relevance assessed by independent peers within the relevant field.

All published research articles in this journal have undergone rigorous peer review, anonymous refereeing by independent expert referees, and consequent revision by article authors when required. The published article constitutes the final, definitive, and citable Version of Scholarly Record.

*Errors in Published Works:* When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper. If the editor or the publisher learns from a third party that a published work contains a significant error, it is the obligation of the author to promptly retract or correct the paper or provide evidence to the editor of the correctness of the original paper.

*Duties of Editors:* The editor of a peer-reviewed journal is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published. The validation of the work in question and its importance to researchers and readers must always drive such decisions. The editor may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. An editor should evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors. The editor staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, or other editorial advisers.

*Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest:* Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Editors should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

Authors sign a declaration of conflicting interests of the following content. *Declaration of Conflicting Interests:* The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article. This article has no conflicts of interests and has never been published before. *Open Access:* I agree that my article may be of interest to all interested people to use for reading and citation without charge. *Funding:* The author received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article. *Declaration of plagiarism:* I agree that the Journal is not liable for any form of plagiarizing, and the sole responsibility for such actions lies upon the author of the articles. *Involvement and Cooperation in Investigations:* An editor should take reasonably responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper, in conjunction with the publisher.

Such measures will generally include contacting the author of the manuscript or paper and giving due consideration of the respective complaint or claims made, but may also include further communications to the relevant institutions and research bodies, and if the complaint is upheld, the publication of a correction, retraction, expression of concern, or other note, as may be relevant even if it is discovered years after publication. *Duties of Reviewers:* Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper. Peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication, and lies at the heart of the scientific method. *Promptness:* Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process. *Confidentiality:* Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor. *Standards of Objectivity:* Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. *Acknowledgement of Sources:* Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge. *Disclosure and Conflict of Interest:* Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in a reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

## **Ethics Policy**

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the study. The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others, that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. Authors should be prepared to provide public access to such data. Authors of reports of original research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. The accountability of the research matter published in HRR is entirely of the author(s) concerned. The views expressed in the research papers/articles may not essentially correspond to the views of the publisher/editor. The publisher/editor will not be liable for any mistake or consequences arising from the exercise of information contained in it.

## ***Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement***

It is very important to agree upon standards of expected ethical behavior for all parties involved in the act of publishing: the author, the journal editor, the peer reviewer and the publisher. (These guidelines are based on existing Elsevier policies and COPE's Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.)

The International Journal for interdisciplinary studies Human Research in rehabilitation (HRR) is a Half-Yearly, open access, peer reviewed international journal which Calls for Unique, Unpublished research papers in various subjects of rehabilitation. International Journal for interdisciplinary studies Human Research in rehabilitation (HRR) is known for the publication of unique and authentic research articles which truly considers the copyright guidelines and to protect the rights of our authors. The research papers are written by scholars after in-depth study and wish to protect the rights of use. Most of the authors represent some institutions or are guides to budding scholars and their original research work will be the base for further studies. Infringing on the content of knowledge or work of other scholars will be harmful to the community of education.

The International Journal for interdisciplinary studies Human Research in rehabilitation (HRR) set quality standards for the acceptance of appropriate and most effective research articles. It expects from authors that they will check their compositions for a written falsification test and determine they are submitting just extraordinary content for publication.

## ***Responsibility of Authors***

It is advised to the authors to avoid copy and paste tactic of writing articles. Articles should maintain its durability and excelling ability to attract its target intellectuals to refer it for further studies. Articles must showcase novelty in thoughts and content. Creditability and reliability of the content establishes the best publication ethics. Formatting standards should be maintained in piece of publication so that it could be sufficient informative about the research and profile of authors. Appropriate Citations, referencing of individual articles, authors and publications are expected while writing articles.

International Journal for interdisciplinary studies Human Research in rehabilitation (HRR) provides sufficient foundation for the timely publication of high quality and standard pieces of research articles. Novelty and Plagiarism: Authors are expected to present the entirely original article and should cite or mention in references if content or words of other articles are used. Every author will be held responsible for the performance and fulfillment with the policy to avoid malpractices and breach of

ethical standards of publication. Authors should assure that the piece of knowledge ready for publication is the original copy and has not been published anywhere earlier and is not in consideration for publication anywhere else.

### ***What does plagiarism mean?***

This text is downloaded from <https://www.elsevier.com/> as a recommendation for the Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK) for editors. Useful link is (<https://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk/plagiarism-complaints>)

### ***Literal copying***

Literal copying is reproducing a work word for word, in whole or in part, without permission and acknowledgment of the original source. Literal copying is obvious plagiarism and is easy to detect by comparing the papers in question.

### ***Substantial copying***

Substantial copying is reproducing a substantial part of a work, without permission and acknowledgment of the original source. In determining what is “substantial,” both the quantity and the quality of the copied content are relevant. Quality refers to the relative value of the copied text in proportion to the work as a whole. Where the essence of a work has been reproduced, even if only a small part of the original work, plagiarism may have occurred. For example, a relatively short extract from a piece of music may be instantly recognizable and may constitute a substantial part.

In addition to judging the quantity and quality of the copied content, you should consider the following question: Has the author benefited from the skill and judgment of the original author? The degree to which the answer to this question is “yes” will indicate whether substantial copying has taken place.

### ***Paraphrasing***

Copying may take place without reproducing the exact words used in the original work, i.e. without literal or substantial copying. This type of copying is known as paraphrasing, and it can be the most difficult type of plagiarism to detect.

To determine whether unacceptable paraphrasing has occurred, you should apply a test similar to that for substantial copying: Look at the quantity and quality of what has been taken and also at whether the second author has benefited from the skill and judgment of the first author. If it seems clear, on a balance of probabilities, that the second author has taken without permission or acknowledgment all or a substantial part of the original work and used it to create a second work, albeit expressed in different words, then such use amounts to plagiarism.

### **Open Access Policy**

This journal provides immediate open access to its content on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge. By agreeing with the immediate Open Access policy of paper publications, the author gives permission for making the final version of paper available online to readers without any embargo period.

### **Plagiarism Policy**

Every author will have to sign the Declaration of Conflicting Interests in order to be considered for publication. All authors are advised not to use any kind of Plagiarism content in their article. Use of content containing any kind of Plagiarism, hatred speech and unlawful material leads to rejection of the article.

## **Accessibility Policy**

We have done our best to make our website as accessible as possible for our readers. If you have problems with the accessibility of this page or suggestions for improvement, please feel free to contact us. We will try to do everything we can to make this site clear and accessible for searching articles.

## **Conflict of Interest Policy**

HRR requires authors to declare any competing financial or other interest in relation to their work. All competing interests that are declared will be listed at the end of published articles. Where an author gives no competing interests, the listing will read 'The author(s) declare that they have no competing interests'. (A conflict of interest exists when an author (or the author's institution), reviewer, or editor has financial or personal relationships that unduly influence (bias) his or her actions (such relationships are also known as dual obligations, competing interests, or competing loyalties). These relationships vary from those with negligible potential to those with high potential to influence judgment. Not all relationships present a true conflict of interest. The potential for a conflict of interest may exist regardless of whether the individual believes the relationship affects his or her scientific judgment. Financial relationships are the easiest conflicts of interest to recognize). All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript.

## **Human and animal rights policies**

When reporting on human experiments, authors should indicate whether the applied procedures were in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee for human experiments (institutional and national). If there is doubt as to whether the research was conducted outside ethical norms, the authors must explain the reasons for their approach and demonstrate that the institutional review body has expressly approved the questionable aspects of the study (In the event that the entities from the research sample are patients or persons exposed to rehabilitation treatments, they have the right to privacy that may not be violated without informed consent. Identifying information, including patient names, initials, or hospital numbers, may not be published in written descriptions, photographs, etc., unless the information is essential for scientific purposes and the patient (or parent or guardian) has given written informed consent for publication. Informed consent for this purpose requires that an identifiable person be shown the manuscript to be published).

When reporting animal experiments, authors should be asked to indicate whether institutional and national guidelines for the care and use of laboratory animals have been followed. If the work involves chemicals, procedures or equipment that have any unusual hazards inherent in their use, the author must clearly identify these in the manuscript. If the work involves the use of animal or human subjects, the author should ensure that the manuscript contains a statement that all procedures were performed in compliance with relevant laws and institutional guidelines and that the appropriate institutional committee(s) has approved them. Authors should include a statement in the manuscript that informed consent was obtained for experimentation with human subjects. The privacy rights of human subjects must always be observed.

## **Copyright Infringement**

All complaints regarding copyright infringement should be sent to the Editor at [hrr@human.ba](mailto:hrr@human.ba) with the title "Copyright infringement".

The request must be supported by documentary evidence supporting the same version that was published or copyrighted or patented by the injured party prior to the date of publication of the HRR article in question. Upon receipt of the complaint, the HRR Management, if it considers it respected, informs the author of the HRR in order to provide an explanation; a discussion about which will be transparent for both parties.

HRR reserves the sole right to decide on the validity of such requests. After consideration, if the request is found to be justified, the manuscript in question will be removed from all HRR archives and servers. All subsequent printed copies of that issue will not contain the article.

All copyright claims will be handled with the highest priority. Return mail will be sent within 10 days provided the request is supported by documentary evidence.

The rights to articles belong to the authors of those articles without restriction.

## **Copyright Infringement Claims**

The website is copyright protected and any claim for infringement of copyright should be addressed to [hrr@human.ba](mailto:hrr@human.ba) The Journal Board reserves the sole rights to decide the validity of any such claims.