

## Authors Guidelines

### **Research / Review article**

#### **Criteria**

Research/review articles should report on original primary research, but may report on systematic reviews of published research provided they adhere to the appropriate reporting guidelines which are detailed in our editorial\_policies. Please note that non-commissioned pooled analyses of selected published research will not be considered.

MAJ strongly encourages that all datasets on which the conclusions of the paper rely should be available to readers. We encourage authors to ensure that their datasets are either deposited in publicly available repositories (**where available and appropriate**) or presented in the main manuscript or additional supporting files whenever possible. Please see Springer Nature's [information on recommended repositories](#). Where a widely established research community expectation for data archiving in public repositories exists, submission to a community-endorsed, public repository is mandatory. A list of data where deposition is required, with the appropriate repositories, can be found on the Editorial Policies page

Once you access your MS, you will be directed to your page; dashboard, where you can access COMMENTS. Please add your response/reply to the reviewer's/editor's comments. Since it is an interactive review system, the author may also take part in the review process and respond to the reviewer's/editor's comments. Once you fully address all the comments, the reviewer and chief editor make a decision on your article as per the available options.

If you are asked to submit the revised submission, you may submit the corrected MS by changing the file name by prefixing "R1A" upload it the platform. Together with the revised submission, responses/rebuttal to the reviewer's/Editor's comments should also to be sent.

Once the author fully addresses all your comments, the reviewer make decisions as per the available options. You will be informed about the final decision by the Chief Editor.

### **Preparing your manuscript**

The information below details the section headings that you should include in your manuscript and what information should be within each section.

#### **Title page**

The title page should:

- The first page of the manuscript should include title, name(s) of the author(s), affiliation, and mailing address including e-mail of the corresponding author. In the title, the first letter of each work should be in capital letter except for prepositions.

- list the full names and institutional addresses for all authors
- if a collaboration group should be listed as an author, please list the Group name as an author.
- indicate the corresponding author with their email id and a \*(suffix) symbol

### **Main page**

The main page should contain only the title and followed by the

### **Abstract**

A brief informative abstract should follow on the second page of the manuscript. It should clearly bring out the scope of the work and its salient features. It should be a single paragraph of not more than 250 words.

- **Results and Discussion** : the main findings
- **Conclusions**: a brief summary and potential implications

### **Keywords**

The abstract should be followed by the important words of the article, which can be included in various indexes.

### **Introduction**

MAJ supports the author to publish both research and review article.

- **RESEARCH** articles should focus on original investigations and innovative research contributions relevant to the agriculture domain.
- **REVIEW** articles should focus on in-depth explorations or review on previously conducted research by laboratory or research experts.

It should be brief, crisp and introduce the work in clear terms. During the time of paper submission, the data collected should be less than 3 years. Proper citations must be provided for the key references of the article. A certificate signed by all authors indicating the originality of research work should be produced during submission of the manuscript.

Article/s submitted to MAJ must not be submitted to any other journals and it should not be in possible consideration for publications with any other publishers. No part of a paper published by MAJ should be reproduced or published elsewhere without a written permission from the publisher. The content of the manuscript must not include information whose disclosure will be prejudicial to the national interest.

The articles submitted to MAJ will be given utmost priority for publication. However, if the article is not relevant to the scope of our journal and if the quality of the paper is not satisfactory, the article submission may be directly rejected. If the article comes under the scope of our journal, then

it is sent for review to three reviewers relevant to the article subject. Usually, it takes about one month for the first round of the review report. If the reviewers are satisfactory, then there are more chances for the article to be accepted. Papers are accepted on the basis that the contributions in the article are original and have not been published elsewhere and that the authors have acquired necessary authorization for publication of any secondary data or material submitted.

### ***Template Specifications***

MAJ template is used for formatting the article style and format. The author must not alter the pre-defined margins, column widths, line spaces, and text fonts assigned. Please do not revise any of the current template design.

### ***Template Usage***

After preparing the article, fit the article content into the MAJ template carefully. While copy-pasting the content from source file to designation file, ensure that the designation formatting is followed. Make sure that the integrity of the template is retained.

## **Material and Methods**

The standard and already reported method must be clearly given or cited. Any modification of the original method must be duly highlighted. This section may be subtitled for clarity. Use standard abbreviations of the various units. ISI units should be used for measurements.

The methods section should include:

- the aim, design and setting of the study
- the characteristics of participants or description of materials
- a clear description of all processes, interventions and comparisons. Generic names should generally be used. When proprietary brands are used in research, include the brand names in parentheses
- the type of statistical analysis used, including a power calculation if appropriate
- 

## **List of abbreviations**

If abbreviations are used in the text they should be defined in the text at first use, and a list of abbreviations can be provided.

## **Declarations**

All manuscripts must contain the following sections under the heading 'Declarations':

- Funding and Acknowledgment

- Ethics statement
- Originality and plagiarism
- Data availability
- Consent for publication
- Competing interests
- Authors' contributions

Please see below for details on the information to be included in these sections.

If any of the sections are not relevant to your manuscript, please include the heading and write 'Not applicable' for that section.

### **Funding and Acknowledgment**

The authors acknowledge the financial support provided to SU by DBT, GoI, through Indo-Russian collaboration (No.DBT/IC2/Indo-Russia/2014-16).

### **Ethics statement**

No specific permits were required for the described field studies because no human or animal subjects were involved in this research.

### **Originality and plagiarism**

Authors should ensure that they have written and submit only entirely original works, and if they have used the work and/or words of others, that this has been appropriately cited. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

### **Consent for publication**

All the authors agreed to publish the content.

### **Competing interests**

There were no conflict of interest in the publication of this content

### **Data availability**

All the data of this manuscript are included in the MS. No separate external data source is required. If anything is required from the MS, certainly, this will be extended by communicating with the corresponding author through corresponding official mail; [usiva@tnau.ac.in](mailto:usiva@tnau.ac.in).

## Author contributions

Research grant	- US
Idea conceptualization	- US
Experiments	- GM, MVR, ST
Guidance	- US, ST,IM
Writing-original draft	- GM, MVR, IM, ST
Writing- reviewing & editing	- US, IM , ST

## Results and Discussion

This should include the findings of the study including, if appropriate, results of statistical analysis which must be included either in the text or as tables and figures.

This section can also be subtitled for clarity. Salient results must be highlighted and discussed with related works. A brief conclusion of the research finding and future line of work may be given at the end.

## Conclusions

Relevant references shall be quoted under each section and must be cited in full in the reference section. References to unpublished work and the abstract citation may be avoided. The following style should be adopted. References need not be numbered but should be arranged alphabetically in chronological order.

## References

### Examples

Fageria, N. K., Dos Santos, A. B. and T. Cobucci. 2011. Zinc nutrition of lowland rice. *Commun. Soil Sci.*

*Plant Analysis.*,**42**: 1719-1727.

Ingle, S. N., Borkar, D. K., Chaphale, S. D. and S. K. Thakre. 1997. Effect of sources and levels of zinc on

yield and nutrient uptake by rice. *J. Soilsand Crops.*,**7(2)**: 157-159.

Kumawat, S. R. and B. L. Yadav. 2013. Sodicity tolerance of Fenugreek as influenced by application of zinc

andvermicompost.*Legume Res.*, **36**: 312-317.

## **Reviewer Instructions**

### **Online submission system (CMT)**

All reviews must be submitted via the <http://masujournal.org/auth/login.php>. You may visit the site multiple times and revise your reviews as often as necessary. If you are both an author and a reviewer, please use the same email address for both roles but as a author you need to login in via Author Login panel. And if you are a reviewer you need to login via Editors/Admin panel with the required password. During the reviewing process, you will receive many emails from MAJ (MASU). Such emails are sometimes accidentally marked as spam. Please check your spam folder regularly and if you find such an email in there, please white list the MAJ (MASU) email address so that you will receive future emails from MAJ (MASU).

### **Confidentiality**

You must keep everything relating to the review process confidential. Do not use ideas and results from submissions in your own work until they become publicly available (e.g., via a technical report or a published paper). Do not to talk about or distribute submissions (or the ideas and results described in them) to anyone without prior approval from the program chairs.

### **Double-blind reviewing**

Articles submitted for publication in MAJ has to undergo rigorous peer review process based on initial editor screening and refereeing by two referees. The ultimate purpose of peer review is to sustain the originality and quality of research work and filtration of poor quality and plagiarized articles. Peer review assures research quality

The reviewing process will be double blind at the level of reviewers .Authors are responsible for anonymous of their submissions. In particular, they should not include author names, author affiliations, or acknowledgements in their submissions and they should avoid providing any other identifying information (even in the supplementary material). If you are assigned a submission that is not adequately anonymous (e.g., includes author names, author affiliations, acknowledgements, or other identifying information) then the article has been rejected without any deviations.

Once you access <http://masujournal.org> and login through admin, you will be directed to your page; dashboard, where you can access the assigned MS. At this stage, if you feel that the MS is unfit, you may reject it. Alternatively, if the MS eligible to be considered for review, you may click on the “view comments.”

Adding your remarks to the questions asked about the MS in the review pages is self-explanatory. Since it is an interactive review system, the author may also take part in the review process and respond to the reviewer's/editor's comments. Once the author fully addresses all your comments, you can make your decisions as per the available options. You are also requested to submit a confidential comments to the chief Editor about your decision for publishing the article in MAJ.

## **Formatting instructions**

Submissions are limited to eight content pages, including all figures and tables, in the NeurIPS “submission” style; additional pages containing only references are allowed. Authors must use the MAJ specified template style file.

## **Dual submissions**

Submissions that are identical or substantially similar to papers that are in submission to, have been accepted to, or have been published in other archival conferences, journals, workshops, etc. should be deemed dual submissions. Submissions that are identical or substantially similar to other MAJ submissions should also be deemed dual submissions; submissions should be distinct and sufficiently substantial. Slicing contributions too thinly may be sufficient for submissions to be deemed dual submissions. If you suspect that a submission that has been assigned to you is a dual submission or if you require further clarification, please contact the corresponding MAJ .

## **Review content**

We know that serving as a reviewer for MAJ is time consuming, but the community needs outstanding people like yourself to uphold the scientific quality of MAJ. Review content is the primary means by which Chief Editor and Board of Member make decisions about submissions. Please make your review as detailed and informative as possible; short, superficial reviews that venture uninformed opinions or guesses are worse than no review since they may result in the rejection of a high-quality submission.

Review content is also the primary means by which authors understand their submissions’ decisions. Reviews for rejected submissions help authors understand how to improve their work for other conferences or journals. Reviews for accepted submissions help authors understand how to improve their work for the camera-ready versions.

## **Author response**

Authors will be given the opportunity to respond to their reviews before decisions are made. This is to enable them to address misunderstandings, point out parts of their submissions that were overlooked, or disagree with the reviewers’ assessments. In previous years, some authors felt that their responses were ignored. As a reviewer, it is your responsibility to read and (if appropriate) respond to each author response. It is not fair to ignore any author response, even for submissions that you think should be rejected. Although it is possible that an author response will not change your assessment of a submission, you must convey to the authors that you have carefully considered their comments. As you read each author response, keep an open mind. Have you overlooked something? Please update each review to indicate that you have read the author response and whether you agree or disagree with it. You should be more specific than “I have read the author response and my opinion remains the same.” If that is the case, you should explain why it remains the same, what the author response failed to address, etc.

## **Discussion**

After the author response phase, the AC for each submission will initiate a discussion via CMT to encourage the reviewers to come to a consensus. If the reviewers do come to a consensus, the program chairs will take it seriously; only rarely are unanimous assessments overruled. The discussion phase is especially important for borderline submissions and submissions where the reviewers' assessments differ; most submissions fall into one or another of these categories, so please take this phase seriously. When discussing a submission, try to remember that different people have different backgrounds and different points of view. Ask yourself, "Do the other reviewers' comments make sense?" and do consider changing your mind in light of their comments, if appropriate. That said, if you think the other reviewers are not correct, you are not required to change your mind. Reviewer consensus is valuable, but it is not mandatory.



## **Duties and responsibilities of authors**

### **Publication and Submission fee**

No fees or charges are required from authors for manuscript processing. Authors pay neither submission nor publication fee beyond eventual conference registration fee. Full information about fees must be clearly stated on the journal's website before authors begin preparing their manuscript for submission.

### **Open Access Policy**

The journal is freely available online. Authors are required to agree with this open access policy which enables unrestricted access and reuse of all published articles. The articles are published under the Creative Commons copyright license policy CC-BY. Users are allowed to copy and redistribute the material in printed or electronic format and build upon the material, without further permission or fees being required, provided that appropriate credit is given.

### **Reporting standards**

Authors of papers should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the paper. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the work. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable. Review and professional publication articles should also be accurate and objective, and editorial opinion works should be clearly identified as such.

### **Data access and retention**

Authors may be asked to provide the raw data in connection with a paper for editorial review, and should be prepared to provide public access to such data (consistent with the ALPSP-STM Statement on Data and Databases), if practicable, and should in any event be prepared to retain such data for a reasonable time after publication.

### **Originality and plagiarism**

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. Plagiarism takes many forms, from „passing off“ another's paper as the author's own paper, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), to claiming results from research conducted by others. Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

### **Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication**

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behaviour. In general, an author should not submit for consideration in another journal a previously published paper.

The copyright remains with the authors (CC-BY), thus they can decide about eventual republication of their text. The primary reference must be cited in the secondary publication.

### **Acknowledgement of sources**

Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, must not be used or reported without explicit, written permission from the source. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, must not be used without the explicit written permission of the author of the work involved in these services.

### **Authorship of the paper**

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be acknowledged or listed as contributors. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors and no inappropriate co-authors are included on the paper, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

### **Disclosure and conflicts of interest**

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. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. Examples of potential conflicts of interest which should be disclosed include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, and grants or other funding. Potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed at the earliest stage possible. Readers should be informed about who has funded research and on the role of the funders in the research.

### **Fundamental 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 and responsibilities of reviewers**

### **Contribution to editorial decisions**

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. Authors who wish to contribute to publications have an obligation to do a fair share of reviewing.

### **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 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.

## PUBLICATION ETHICS AND MALPRACTICE STATEMENT

This Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement is based on the Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors (Committee on Publication Ethics, 2011).

### Editors' Duties

1. **Publication Decisions:** The editor is responsible for deciding on accepting, rejecting or requesting modifications to the manuscript. In some instances, the editors may require multiple rounds of reviews and modifications. The editors communicate review result in a timely fashion. The editor reserves the right to edit, clarify or shorten the manuscript as deemed necessary.
2. **Fair Review:** The editor must ensure that each manuscript submitted to *Architecture\_MPS* is reviewed for its intellectual content without regard to the author's race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship or political philosophy. The decisions will be based on the paper's importance, originality, clarity, and relevance to the journal's scope.
3. **Confidentiality:** The editor and editorial staff must ensure that information regarding manuscripts submitted by the authors is kept confidential.
4. **Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest:** The editor and members of the editorial board of this journal shall not use unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript for his/her own research without the author's explicit written consent.

### Authors' Duties

1. **Publication guidelines:** Authors must follow the submission guidelines of the journal.
2. **Originality, Plagiarism and Acknowledgement:** Authors must ensure that the work they are submitting as theirs is entirely original. Authors must certify that the manuscript has not previously been published elsewhere. Authors will appropriately cite or quote the work and/or words of others. Authors sign a declaration stating that the manuscript and the illustrations within are original, or that he/she has taken all the necessary steps to avoid breach of copyright.
3. **Multiple Submissions:** Authors must certify that the manuscript is not currently being considered for publication elsewhere. Submitting the same paper to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behavior.
4. **Authorship of the Paper:** All authors mentioned in the paper must have significantly contributed to the research. The author submitting the manuscript to the journal ensures that all contributing co- authors and no uninvolved person(s) are included in the author list.
5. **Conflict of Interest:** Authors must notify the editors of any conflicts of interest that may be construed to influence the manuscript.
6. **Fundamental Errors:** Authors are obliged to provide retractions or corrections of mistakes at any point in time if the author(s) discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in submitted manuscript.

## **Reviewers' Duties**

1. **Confidentiality:** Reviewers must keep all manuscripts received confidential.
2. **Acknowledgement of Sources:** Reviewers must ensure that authors have cited all relevant published work referred to in the paper in the endnotes and bibliography. Reviewers will bring to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript and any other published paper they are aware of.
3. **Standards of Objectivity:** Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate.
4. **Supporting Argument:** Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.
5. **Conflicts of Interest:** Reviewers should not review 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 associated with the paper(s).
6. **Promptness:** In the event that a reviewer feels it is not possible for him/her to complete review of manuscript within the stipulated time he/she should notify the editor in a timely manner and withdraw from the review process.

## **COPE**

As with all UCL Press journals, architecture\_MPS follows the high standards of peer review as set out in the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers.

All research articles and other article types are subjected to thorough peer-review, usually by at least 2 external peer-reviewers. After initial assessment by the journal Editor for suitability in the journal, the Editor will invite appropriate independent reviewers with sufficient and specific area of expertise. The Editor's decision is made based on these reviewer reports, which are made available to the authors upon decision. Where the Editor of the journal is an author in the submission, adequate steps are taken to ensure blinding the Editor from the submission during peer-review. Further information about journals specific model of peer-review is found on the journals information pages