

Supporting Publication Integrity Policies

A. Research Misconduct Policy

AJRH takes allegations of research and publication misconduct seriously, whether concerns arise before or after publication.

Research misconduct may include fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, inappropriate manipulation of data or images, duplicate publication, inappropriate authorship, manipulation of peer review, failure to obtain required ethical approval, undisclosed conflicts of interest, and other practices that compromise research integrity.

When a credible concern is received, the editor will conduct an initial assessment and may request an explanation or supporting documentation from the authors.

Where the concern requires formal investigation, AJRH may refer the matter to the relevant author's institution or other appropriate body.

The journal may take editorial action while an institutional investigation is underway where necessary to protect the integrity of the published record.

Possible outcomes include:

- rejection of a manuscript;
- correction;
- withdrawal before publication;
- publication of an Expression of Concern;
- retraction;
- removal from consideration for future publication; or
- other appropriate action.

AJRH will distinguish between honest error and deliberate misconduct. The appropriate response will depend on the nature, seriousness, and effect of the concern on the reliability of the scholarly record.

B. Corrections, Retractions and Expressions of Concern Policy

AJRH is committed to maintaining an accurate and reliable published record.

Corrections

A correction may be published where an error affects the article but does not invalidate its principal findings or conclusions.

Retractions

An article may be retracted where evidence indicates that its findings are unreliable or invalid, including because of serious errors, fabricated or falsified data, substantial plagiarism, serious ethical violations, or other circumstances that materially compromise the publication.

A retraction notice should identify the article, explain the reason for retraction, and remain associated with the original publication where technically possible.

Expressions of Concern

AJRH may publish an Expression of Concern where substantial questions exist about a published article but available evidence is insufficient to reach an immediate final conclusion.

An Expression of Concern may subsequently be followed by a correction, retraction, or conclusion that no further action is necessary.

AJRH will not use an Expression of Concern merely as a substitute for a retraction where sufficient evidence for retraction is already available.

These procedures are consistent with COPE guidance that corrections should be used for limited errors, while articles should generally be retracted when their findings are unreliable. ([Publication Ethics](#))

C. Conflict of Interest Policy

AJRH requires authors, reviewers, editors, and editorial board members to disclose conflicts of interest that could influence, or reasonably appear to influence, their work or decisions.

Conflicts may be financial, professional, personal, academic, institutional, or otherwise relevant to the manuscript.

Authors should disclose relevant conflicts at submission.

Reviewers must decline assignments where a conflict could compromise impartiality.

Editors must not make decisions on manuscripts where they have a significant conflict of interest.

Where a previously undisclosed conflict is identified after publication, AJRH may publish an appropriate correction or disclosure.

D. Complaints and Appeals Policy

AJRH welcomes legitimate complaints concerning editorial processes, peer review, publication ethics, conflicts of interest, or other aspects of journal administration.

Complaints should be submitted through the journal's official editorial communication channel and should clearly identify the concern and provide supporting information where available.

Complaints will be assessed objectively and confidentially.

Authors may appeal an editorial decision where they identify a substantive procedural or factual error.

An appeal should:

1. identify the manuscript concerned;
2. explain the specific grounds for appeal;
3. identify any relevant factual or procedural error; and
4. provide supporting information where appropriate.

An appeal will not normally be considered merely because an author disagrees with the scholarly judgment of the editors or reviewers.

Where a complaint concerns an editor personally, the matter should be referred to an appropriate senior editorial or journal authority who is independent of the original decision where practicable.

E. Artificial Intelligence and Generative AI Policy

Authors

Authors remain fully responsible for the content of manuscripts submitted to AJRH.

Generative AI tools must not be listed as authors.

Where generative AI has been used substantively in preparing a manuscript, authors should disclose its use in an appropriate statement.

Authors must verify AI-assisted content and remain responsible for:

- factual accuracy;
- originality;
- references;
- quotations;
- data;
- analysis;
- interpretation; and
- compliance with ethical requirements.

AI tools must not be used to fabricate data, results, references, citations, participant information, or research evidence.

Reviewers

Reviewers must protect the confidentiality of manuscripts.

Reviewers should not upload confidential manuscripts or unpublished manuscript content into generative AI systems where doing so could compromise confidentiality, intellectual property, or the authors' rights.

Editors

Editors must protect confidential manuscript information and must ensure that the use of AI-assisted tools does not compromise the integrity, confidentiality, or fairness of editorial decision-making.

F. Research Data and Transparency Policy

Authors are responsible for the accuracy and integrity of research data reported in their manuscripts.

Where appropriate and ethically permissible, authors are encouraged to make supporting data, materials, protocols, or other research resources available.

Data involving confidential or identifiable participant information must not be made publicly available where doing so would violate ethical, legal, privacy, or consent requirements.

Where substantial concerns arise concerning the validity of published data, AJRH may request supporting information from the authors or their institution and may take corrective or retraction action where warranted.

G. Post-Publication Discussion Policy

AJRH recognises that scholarly evaluation continues after publication.

The journal may consider letters, comments, responses, corrections, and other appropriate post-publication communications concerning published articles.

Substantive concerns about published work will be assessed by the editors.

Where a post-publication concern raises questions about the reliability or integrity of an article, AJRH may initiate an investigation and may publish a correction, Expression of Concern, or retraction as appropriate.

Policy review

These policies will be reviewed periodically and updated where necessary to reflect developments in research integrity, publishing standards, ethical requirements, and technological developments.