

ISSN 2790-7139
E-ISSN 2958-082X

Journal of **Aerospace & Security Studies**

Policy Document

President 
CASS, Islamabad

The *Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies* (JASS) is the flagship annual publication of the Centre for Aerospace & Security Studies (CASS), Islamabad

Policy document is prepared by Sarah Siddique Aneel and Mashal Shahid, 2025

Contents

1. ABOUT THE JOURNAL	4
2. OPEN ACCESS / OPEN ARCHIVING POLICY	4
3. SCOPE OF THE JOURNAL	4
4. PEER REVIEW PROCESS	5
Step 1: Initial Screening for Similarity.....	5
Step 2: Desk Review.....	5
Step 3: Double-Blind Peer Review.....	5
Step 4: Final Decision	6
5. CONTRIBUTOR GUIDELINES	6
Submission Deadlines.....	7
Word Limit.....	7
Editorial and Peer Review Process	7
Submission Procedure.....	7
Citation Format.....	8
Miscellaneous	8
6. ETHICAL GUIDELINES	8
6.1 Ethical Guidelines for Editors.....	8
6.2 Ethical Guidelines for Authors.....	12
6.3 Ethical Guidelines for the Reviewers.....	15
7. PLAGIARISM POLICY	18
8. PEER REVIEW POLICY	19
9. PUBLICATION PROCESSING / PUBLICATION CHARGES POLICY	19
10. TIMELINE OF PUBLICATION ISSUES	19
11. INDEXING & ABSTRACTING	20
Appendix.....	21

1. ABOUT THE JOURNAL

The *Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies* (JASS) is an annual, peer-reviewed scholarly publication advancing strategic thinking at the nexus of technology, security, and policy. As the flagship publication project of the Centre for Aerospace & Security Studies (CASS), Islamabad, JASS delivers a high-impact platform for rigorous, future-facing research and follows a robust double-blind peer review policy. Its primary focus spans aerospace and emerging technologies, security and defence strategies, and cyber and space security, while also engaging critically with international relations and political economy. The Journal is published in both print and digital formats (ISSN 2790-7139; eISSN 2958-082X) once a year and aims to shape informed debate, influence policy discourse, and set the benchmark for innovation-led AeroSec scholarship.

2. OPEN ACCESS / OPEN ARCHIVING POLICY

The *Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies* (JASS) is an open-access journal committed to the wide and unrestricted dissemination of scholarly research. All published articles are freely available online immediately upon publication, without subscription or access fees. The journal operates under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license, which permits users to read, download, copy, distribute, adapt, and reuse the content, provided appropriate credit is given to the original authors and the journal.

3. SCOPE OF THE JOURNAL

The *Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies* (JASS) is a peer-reviewed academic platform dedicated to advancing high-quality research across its core areas of focus:

Primary Themes

- Aerospace and Emerging Technologies
- Security and Defence Strategies
- Cyber and Space Security

Secondary Themes

- International Relations
- Political Economy

The journal invites submissions from national and international scholars, encouraging diverse and interdisciplinary perspectives as it aims to become a leading voice from Pakistan on aerospace and security issues. The objective of JASS is to publish high quality, original, and innovative research, while encouraging scholars to explore aerospace and security issues from a multidisciplinary, policy-driven lens. The journal particularly values original research manuscripts that set future research agendas and policy analysis.

Submissions should demonstrate methodological soundness, conceptual depth, and policy relevance, especially in relation to developments affecting Pakistan and the broader international

environment. In alignment with the journal's commitment to objective and evidence-based analysis, all manuscripts are expected to uphold neutrality, academic integrity, and rigour.

4. PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Step 1: Initial Screening for Similarity

All submissions are screened using similarity detection software to ensure compliance with the journal's zero-tolerance plagiarism policy. Submissions with a similarity index above 19% are automatically rejected.

A duly filled and e-signed *Authorship, Conflict of Interest & Originality Declaration Form* must be submitted by the author(s) before the manuscript proceeds to further review.

If accepted in JASS, the manuscript will not be published elsewhere in the same form or in any language without the publisher's prior consent.

Withdrawal: Manuscript withdrawal may be requested within seven days of submission, subject to the Editorial Board's discretion and formal confirmation. A withdrawal request becomes effective only upon receipt of an official letter/email from the Editor/Editor-in-Chief. To safeguard workflow integrity, withdrawal is strictly prohibited once the manuscript has entered the peer-review stage.

Step 2: Desk Review

Submissions passing the similarity proceed to a thorough desk review.

Manuscripts are evaluated for clarity, conciseness, and adherence to academic writing standards. They must include sections (but not necessarily limited to) such as:

- Introduction
- Methodology
- Conceptual Framework/Background
- Findings
- Analysis/Discussion
- Policy Proposals
- Conclusion (including broader impacts and implications of findings).

This review also assesses whether the manuscript falls within the thematic scope of the journal, and adheres to the journal reference standardisation and syntax requirements.

Step 3: Double-Blind Peer Review

Shortlisted manuscripts are subjected to a double-blind peer review by at least two anonymous subject experts. Reviewers evaluate the manuscript based on:

- Originality of the work
- Importance of the research question and identified gap
- Soundness of the conceptual and methodological framework
- Quality of analysis and discussion

- Contribution to existing literature
- Academic writing quality

Common desk review issues include:

- Lack of theoretical integration: Citing theories without proper application does not constitute a theoretical contribution.
- Replication or summary of prior work: Manuscripts must provide novel insights rather than restate existing knowledge. While replication studies hold value, JASS prioritises originality and innovation.

Reviewers may recommend acceptance, rejection, or revisions (major or minor).

Where revisions are required, the reviewers' evaluations are shared with the authors, who must incorporate all suggested changes. Authors are required to resubmit the revised manuscript with track changes enabled, together with a detailed response letter outlining how each reviewer comment has been addressed.

The editorial team evaluates the revised submission to confirm that all required modifications have been satisfactorily implemented. Manuscripts requiring revision may be subject to multiple review rounds to ensure compliance with the journal's quality standards.

Once all revisions are approved, the manuscript proceeds to final proofreading, formatting, and layout by the editorial team. Following completion of all technical checks, the final version is scheduled for publication in the relevant issue of the journal.

Step 4: Final Decision

Decision of publication rests with the journal's Editorial Board based on the recommendations of the peer review evaluations. However, CASS Islamabad reserves the right to reject a submission at any stage from being published.

Note: CASS Islamabad encourages authors to ensure their manuscripts:

- Are well-structured, concise, and written in an academic style.
- Follow the journal guidelines.
- Offer original, high-quality, and forwarding-looking research.
- Include all required sections and a strong conclusion highlighting the broader implications of the findings.

5. CONTRIBUTOR GUIDELINES

Research scholars and practitioners are invited to submit **original, unpublished manuscripts that are not under consideration for publication elsewhere** to the annual *Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies (JASS)*.

Submission Deadlines

Rolling Submissions. End of February & End of August.

Word Limit

- Articles should be between 5000-7000 words, inclusive of an abstract of 150-200 words, 5-6 key words, and footnotes.
- Reviews of recent books by scholars of standing in aerospace, security, or related fields should be approximately 1000 words.

Note:

1. Abstract: A concise narrative (in italics) summarising the title, theme, objectives, data sources, and major findings.
2. Include keywords capturing the paper's main aspects.

Editorial and Peer Review Process

- Only original and unpublished papers are accepted for consideration.
- All submissions undergo initial Desk Review, where they are screened using a Similarity detection software. Referenced/cited content should not exceed 19% of the paper. The journal has a zero-tolerance plagiarism policy for plagiarism. Articles shortlisted by the Editorial Board undergo **two double-blind peer reviews**. During this stage, articles may not be approved for publication by the referees. However, if they are found suitable for the Journal, reviewers may recommend either major or minor changes in the manuscript. The revision process might comprise multiple rounds. Peer review timelines vary depending on reviewer availability, area expertise and responsiveness. **Authors of published articles are given a modest honorarium.**
- The Journal permits limited use of AI tools for language editing, formatting, and research support. AI must not generate core arguments, analysis, or conclusions, and cannot be credited as an author. Authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of their work.
- Authors submitting manuscripts in the first submission cohort (end of February) whose papers are not selected or shortlisted for publication will be notified by the end of April. Similarly, authors submitting in the second cohort (end of August) will be informed by the end of October.

Submission Procedure

JASS does not have Article Processing Charges (APCs) nor submission charges. It offers no waiver support. Author(s) are required to email soft copies in MS Word format, along with their 30-word introduction, complete contact details, and electronically signed *Authorship, Conflict of Interest & Originality Declaration* form (see Appendix, also downloadable from website).

Submission Email: jass.journal@casstt.com.

Citation Format

The Chicago Manual of Style, 17th Edition (Full Note).

Example of footnotes:

- **Book:** John Smith, *Aerospace and Security* (Chicago: University Press, 2020), 45.
- **Journal Article:** Jane Doe, "The Evolution of Cybersecurity," *Journal of Technology* 15, no. 3 (2021): 213, <https://doi.org/10.xxxx>.
- **Online Source:** United Nations, "Global Development Report," Accessed January 25, 2025, <https://www.un.org/report>.

Miscellaneous

- British English should be used. Dates should be written as 18 August 2013.
- Acronyms should be written within brackets after writing the words in full on first use.
- "Per cent" should be used in the text, instead of % sign; USD instead of \$ sign.
- Complete references of all figures, graphs, images, maps and tables need to be provided.
- Use auto-numbered footnotes for all citations and references.
- Images/maps should have a resolution of 300–600 dpi and sent as .tiff, .jpeg, or .bitmap.
- Acknowledgments may be included at the end of the paper (maximum 30 words).
Authors may mention grants, funding bodies, or donors supporting the research.

Note: The Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies (JASS) is committed to fostering high-quality academic work and holds the right to accept or reject a paper or book review at any stage of the publication process. The Journal has zero tolerance for plagiarism.

6. ETHICAL GUIDELINES

CASS strictly follows the HEC's Ethical Guidelines for Journals prepared by Prof. Dr. Rukhsana Kausar, Director Institute of Applied and Clinical Psychology, University of Punjab, Lahore.

6.1 Ethical Guidelines for Editors

The Editor plays a central role in upholding the journal's professional and ethical standards. Each published article reflects the scholarly quality of its author(s) and affiliated institution, i.e. CASS. Accordingly, the Editor is responsible for overseeing all stages of the publication process, from manuscript submission to final publication, and adapting the following guidelines becomes the prime responsibility of the editor in this process.

Editor's Responsibilities

- To uphold the academic quality of the journal in accordance with international norms
- To promote freedom of expression within applicable cultural, constitutional, and legal frameworks
- To ensure the integrity, credibility, and transparency of published research,
- To address the needs of authors, reviewers, and readers,
- To maintain and enforce the journal's ethical and publication standards,

- To issue corrigendum for any correction, clarification and apologies where required to preserve the scholarly record.

Quality practices include, to:

- Encourage constructive ideas and suggestions from authors, reviewers, editorial board members, and readers to enhance journal quality
- Apply the double-blind peer review process rigorously and in its true spirit
- Prioritise the publication of high-quality, innovative research within the journal's scope
- Enforce a robust anti-plagiarism policy to safeguard academic integrity
- Educate authors on ethical standards and best practices in research and publication
- Implement editorial policies independently, free from institutional influence, and review them periodically to ensure ongoing relevance and rigour

Formation of Editorial Board

- JASS maintains an Editorial Board comprising nationally and internationally recognised scholars with established expertise in their respective fields.
- Editorial Board members are appointed for a defined tenure, with the Board's composition reviewed and revised as required.
- The Editor regularly communicates with the Editorial Board regarding developments, challenges, circulation status, submission trends, and the peer-review process.
- The journal endeavours to maintain approximately 75% contributions from local authors while actively encouraging submissions from international scholars.
- All new Editorial Board members are formally briefed on ethical guidelines and role expectations, with periodic updates provided to existing members.
- Quality of the paper and its smooth functioning requires to conduct the meetings of the Editorial Board on regular basis (at least twice a year) by the Editor.

Fair play and Impartiality

- Manuscripts submitted to JASS are selected based on academic merit, scientific rigour, originality, and relevance, and are evaluated fairly and without bias.
- Receipt of manuscripts is acknowledged promptly, each submission is assigned a unique reference number, and decisions are communicated to the author(s) in a timely manner.
- Discriminatory factors, including gender, race, ethnicity, religious belief, cultural background, political affiliation, seniority, or institutional association of the author(s), are strictly disregarded.

Confidentiality

- The Editor maintains confidentiality of authors and reviewers during double blind peer review process.
- Manuscript information is shared only with authors, reviewers, and the editorial board.

- The Editor protects research participants' personal information and provides confidentiality guidelines to authors.
- Manuscript content remains confidential before publication; neither Editor nor reviewers share or use it.

Editing and Formatting Guidelines

Each issue of the JASS includes clear and detailed guidelines on the content, structure, and formatting of research papers. These guidelines specify the journal's preferred manual of style, formally adopted as a policy decision, and require all submissions to comply with the prescribed standard.

Review Process

- The journal clearly declares details of its peer review process on its website and policy document
- The Editor ensures that all published manuscripts undergo a double-blind peer review
- The Editor ensures that peer review is fully masked in both directions by removing all author-identifying information from manuscripts prior to review.
- The Editor provides reviewers with clear guidelines, including information on the review process, and a standard reviewer evaluation form.
- The Editor ensures that the peer review process is timely, non-discriminatory, objective, and conducted to high professional standards.
- The Editor maintains a robust system to ensure the confidentiality of manuscripts under review.
- The Editor communicates reviewers' comments to authors promptly and ensures that required revisions are addressed faithfully and comprehensively by the authors.
- The Editor regularly evaluates peer review practices and implements improvements where necessary.
- The Editor maintains and updates a database of qualified and competent reviewers, drawing on multiple sources beyond personal contacts.
- The Editor refers complex or disputed cases, such as conflicting reviewer recommendations, to the Advisory Board for fair and amicable resolution.

Dealing with Misconduct

- The Editor encourages reviewers to comment on ethical considerations and any potential research or publication misconduct, including inappropriate research design, insufficient information on participants' consent, data manipulation, or misleading presentation.
- The Editor encourages reviewers to assess the scholarly validity of the submitted manuscript and to identify both subtle plagiarism (direct copy-paste) and blatant plagiarism (paraphrased reproduction), where present.
- The Editor verifies suspected plagiarism by conducting an objective similarity check using Turnitin and by reviewing closely related or overlapping titles.

- The Editor takes appropriate corrective action when plagiarism is identified, including the publication of a corrigendum or the removal and retraction of the article, whether identified before or after publication.

Transparency

- The Editor ensures that a maximum of one article per author appears in an issue, whether as principal author (first or corresponding) or as co-author.
- The Editor prohibits publication of articles authored by Editors or Editorial Board members.
- Authorship should only be given to those individuals who have substantially contributed to the research.

Conflict of Interest

In case of any author(s) and/or institution against which the Editor shares the conflict of interest (e.g. resulting from competitive, collaborative and/or professional standing), the author holds the priority as per JASS policy. Similarly, the Editor applies the same policy while giving guidelines to the reviewers and Editorial Board members.

Since HEC does not allow the work of the Editor or any member of the Editorial Board, a clear cut policy is followed by JASS. In fact, the Editor publishes an updated version of the list of common interests from time to time (e.g. financial, academic and/or any other type) for all Editorial Board members and editorial staff.

Disclosure

- The Editor cannot use any unpublished data or information from submitted manuscripts without the author(s)' permission.
- The Editor keeps all information received during and after the peer review process confidential and does not use it for personal gain.

Publication Decisions

- The Editor shortlists research papers based on relevance to the journal's scope, applying professional judgment without personal bias.
- The Editor accepts or rejects manuscripts after peer review, revision, and assessment of quality and validity.
- Acceptance or rejection is based solely on merit, academic standards, and the journal's professional requirements.
- The Editor may also provide clear reasons for rejection, including:
 - Out of Journal's scope
 - Insufficient depth
 - Major design, analysis, writing, or formatting errors

- Misconduct or conflicts (e.g., plagiarism, copyright infringement, legal issues, fabricated data, authorship disputes)
- The Editor communicates editorial decisions to authors in a timely manner.
- The Editor should not reverse decisions independently in favour of or against authors.

Establishing a Procedure for Appeal

- The Editor is responsible for establishing a proper mechanism for appeals launched against:
 - The rejection of a research paper.
 - Objections to publications causing harm to any party.
 - Infringement of Ethical boundaries in any manner.

6.2 Ethical Guidelines for Authors

The following ethical guidelines are obligatory for all author(s); violations may result in penalties imposed by the Editor, including but not limited to the suspension or revocation of publishing privileges.

Reporting Standards

- It is the author(s)' responsibility to ensure that the research report and data contain adequate detail and references to the sources of information in order to allow others to reproduce the results.
- Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

Originality and Plagiarism

- It is the author(s)' responsibility to ascertain that s/he has submitted an entirely original work, giving due credit, by virtue of proper citations, to the works and/or words of others where they have been used.
- Plagiarism in all its forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is not acceptable.
- Material quoted verbatim from the author(s)' previously published work or other sources must be placed in (single) quotation marks.
- As per HEC's policy, in case the manuscript has a similarity index of more than 19%, it will either be rejected or left at the discretion of the Editorial Board for the purposes of a conditional acceptance.

Declaration

- Authors are required to provide an undertaking / declaration stating that the manuscript under consideration contains solely their original work that is not under consideration for publishing in any other journal in any form.

- Manuscript withdrawal may be requested within seven days of submission, subject to the Editorial Board's discretion and formal confirmation. A withdrawal request becomes effective only upon receipt of an official letter/email from the Editor/Editor-in-Chief. To safeguard workflow integrity, withdrawal is strictly prohibited once the manuscript has entered the peer-review stage.
- Authors may submit a manuscript previously published in abstracted form, for example, in the proceedings of an annual meeting, or in a periodical with limited circulation and availability such as reports by the Government agencies or a University.
- A manuscript that is co-authored must be accompanied by an undertaking explicitly stating that each author has contributed substantially towards the preparation of the manuscript in order to claim right to authorship.
- It is the responsibility of the corresponding author that s/he has ensured that all those who have substantially contributed in the manuscripts have been included and they have agreed to the order of authorship.

Multiple, Redundant and Current Publication

- Authors should not submit manuscripts describing essentially the same research to more than one journal or publication except it is a re-submission of a rejected or withdrawn manuscript.
- Authors may re-publish previously conducted research that has been substantially altered or corrected using more meticulous analysis or by adding more data.
- The authors and editor must agree to the secondary publication, which must cite the primary references and reflect the same data and interpretation of the primary document.
- Concurrent submission of the same manuscript to more than one journal is unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

Acknowledgment of Sources

- A paper must always contain proper acknowledgment of the work of others, including clear indications of the sources of all information quoted or offered, except what is common knowledge.
- The author(s) must also acknowledge the contributions of people, organisations and institutes who assisted the process of research, including those who provided technical help, writing assistance or financial funding (in the acknowledgement).
- It is duty of the author(s) to conduct a literature review and properly cite the original publications that describe closely related work.

Authorship Credit

- Authorship of the work may only be credited to those who have made a noteworthy contribution in conceptualisation, design, conducting, data analysis and writing up of the manuscript.

- It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to include the name(s) of only those co-authors who have made significant contributions to the work.
- The corresponding author should ensure that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication. Others who have participated in certain substantive aspect of the research should be acknowledged for their contribution in an "Acknowledgement" section.

Privacy of Participants

- Authors must respect the privacy of the participant of research and must not use any information obtained from them without their informed consent.
- Authors should ensure that only information that improves understanding of the study is shared.
- Authors must ensure that in instances where the identity of the participant needs to be revealed in the study, explicit and informed consent of the concerned party is obtained.
- In the case of the demise of a participant, consent must be obtained from the family of the deceased.

Data Access and Retention

- If any question arises about the accuracy or validity of the research work during the review process, the author(s) should provide raw data to the Editor.

Images

- The author(s) should ensure that images included in an account of research performed or in the data collection as part of the research are free from manipulation,
- The author(s) must provide an accurate description of how the images were generated and produced.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

- The potential and relevant competing financial, personal, social or other interest of all author(s) that might be affected by publication of the results contained in the manuscript must be conveyed to the editor.
- The author(s) should disclose any potential conflict of interest at the earliest possible stage, including but not limited to employment, consultancies, honoraria, patent applications/registrations, grants or other funding.
- All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed alongside a brief overview of the role played, if any by the responses during various stages of the research.

Copyright

- Authors may have to sign an agreement allowing the journal to reserve the right to circulate the article and all other derivative works such as translations.

Manuscript Acceptance and Rejection

- The review period can last between 1-2 months or longer and during this period the author(s) reserve the right to contact the Editor to ask about status of the review.
- Once the review process has been completed, the author will be informed about the status of the manuscript which could either be an acceptance, rejection or revisions. In the case of rejection, the author(s) reserves the right to publish the article elsewhere.
- In case of revisions, the author(s) must provide an exposition of all corrections made in the manuscript and the revised manuscript should, then, go through the process of affirmation of revisions and be accepted or rejected accordingly.
- In case of dissatisfaction over the decision of rejection, the author can appeal the decision by contacting the Editor.

6.3 Ethical Guidelines for the Reviewers

Preamble:

Review of the manuscript by reviewers is not only an essential component of formal scholarly engagement, but is also a fundamental step in the publication process as it aids Editor in the editorial decision-making. It also allows author(s) to improve their manuscript through editorial communications. Scholars accepting to review a research paper have an ethical responsibility to complete this assignment professionally. The quality, credibility and reputation of a journal also depend on the peer review process. The peer review process depends on the trust, and demands that a reviewer is supposed to fulfill ethically. These professionals are the momentum arm of the review process, but they may be performing this job without any formal training. As a consequence, they may be (especially young professionals) unaware of their ethical obligations. Following are the guidelines for the reviewers to ensure they provide their valuable services in a standardised manner.

Suitability and Promptness

The Reviewers should:

- Inform the Editor, if they do not have the subject expertise required to carry out the review and s/he should inform the Editor immediately after receiving a request.
- Be responsible to act promptly and submit review report on time.
- Immediately inform the Editor of any possible delays and suggest another date of submission for a review report, and
- Not unnecessarily delay the review process, either by prolonged delay in submission of their review or by requesting unnecessary additional data/information from the Editor or author(s).

Standards of Objectivity

- The reviews should be objectively carried out with a consideration of high academic, scholarly and scientific standards.

- All judgments should be meticulously established and maintained in order to ensure the full comprehension of the reviewer's comments by the editors and the author(s).
- Both reviewers and author(s) in rebuttal should avoid unsupported assertions,
- The reviewer may justifiably criticise a manuscript but it would be inappropriate to resort to personal criticism on the author(s), and
- The reviewers should ensure that their decision is purely based on the quality of the research paper and not influenced, either positively or negatively, by any personal, financial, or other conflicting considerations or by intellectual bias.

Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

- A reviewer should not, for the purpose of his/her own research, use unpublished material disclosed in a submitted manuscript, without the approval of the Editor.
- The data included in the research paper is confidential and the reviewer shall not be allowed to use it for his/her personal study,
- A reviewer must declare any potentially conflicting interests (e.g. personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious). In such situation, s/he will be required to follow the journal's policies.
- A reviewer should be honest enough to declare conflicts of interest, if, the research paper under review is the same as to his/her presently conducted study.
- If the reviewer feels unqualified to separate his/her bias, s/he should immediately return the manuscript to the Editor without review, and justify to him/her about the situation.

Confidentiality

- Reviewers should consider the research paper as a confidential document and must not discuss its content on any platform except in cases where professional advice is being sought with the authorisation of the Editor, and
- Reviewers are professionally and ethically bound not to disclose the details of any research paper prior to its publication without the prior approval of the Editor.

Ethical Considerations

- If the reviewer suspects that the research paper is almost the same as someone else's work, s/he will ethically inform the Editor and provide its citation as a reference.
- If the reviewer suspects that results in the research paper to be untrue/unrealistic/fake, s/he will share it with the Editor,
- If there has been an indication of violating ethical norms in the treatment of human beings (e.g. children, female, poor people, disabled, elderly, etc.), then this should be identified to the Editor, and
- If the research paper is based on any previous research study or is replica of an earlier work, or the work is plagiarised for example, the author has not acknowledged/referenced others' work appropriately, then this should be brought in the Editor's knowledge.

Originality

For evaluating originality, the reviewers should consider the following elements:

- Does the research paper add to existing knowledge?
- Are the research questions and/or hypotheses in line with the objective of the research work?

Structure

If the layout and format of the paper is not according to the prescribed version, the reviewers should discuss it with the Editor or should include this observation in their review report. On the other hand, if the research paper is exceptionally well written, the reviewer may overlook the formatting issues. At other times, the reviewers may suggest restructuring the paper before publication. The following elements should be carefully evaluated:

- If there is serious problem of language or expression and the reviewer gets the impression that the research paper does not fulfill linguistic requirements and readers would face difficulties reading and comprehending the paper. The reviewer should record this deficiency in his/her report and suggest the editor to make its proper editing. Such a situation may arise when the author(s)' native language is not English.
- Whether the data presented in the paper is original or reproduced from previously conducted or published work. The papers which reflect originality should be given preference for publication.
- The clarity of illustrations including photographs, models, charts, images and figures is essential to note. If there is duplication then it should be reported in the review report. Similarly, descriptions provided in the "Results" section should correspond with the data presented in tables/figures, if not then it should be clearly listed in the review report.
- Critically review the statistical analysis of the data. Also check the rational and appropriateness of the specific analysis.
- The reviewers should read the "Methodology" section in detail and make sure that the author(s) has demonstrated the understanding of the procedures being used and presented in the manuscript.
- The relationship between "Data, Findings and Discussion" requires a thorough evaluation. Unnecessary conjecture or unfounded conclusions that are not based on the presented data are not acceptable.
- Further questions to be addressed are whether: the organisation of the research paper is appropriate or deviates from the standard or prescribed format?
- Does the author(s) follow the guidelines prescribed by the journal for preparation and submission of the manuscript?
- Is the research paper free from typographical errors?

Review Report

- The reviewer must explicitly write his/her observations in the section of 'comments' because author(s) will only have access to the comments reviewers have made,
- For writing a review report, the reviewers are requested to complete a prescribed form.
- It is helpful for both the Editor and author(s) if the reviewer writes a brief summary in the last section of the review report. This summary should comprise the reviewer's final decision and inferences drawn from a full review.
- Any personal comments on author(s) should be avoided and final remarks should be written in a courteous and positive manner,
- Indicating any deficiencies is important. For the understanding of the Editor and author(s), the reviewers should highlight these deficiencies in some detail with specificity. This should help justify the comments made by the reviewer,
- When a reviewer makes a decision regarding the research paper, it should be clearly indicated as 'Reject', 'Accept without revision', or 'Need Revision' and either of the decisions should have justification.
- The reviewers should indicate the revisions clearly and comprehensively, and show willingness to confirm the revisions submitted by the author(s), if Editor wishes so, and
- The final decision about publishing a research paper (either accept or reject) rests with the Editor and it is not reviewer's job to take part in this decision. The editor will surely consider reviewer's comments and have a right to send the paper for another opinion or send it back to the author(s) for revision before making the final decision.

7. DISCLAIMER

The Centre for Aerospace & Security Studies (CASS), Islamabad makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the content (information) contained in JASS. However, the views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the policy and position of CASS, Islamabad its executive body or the Editorial Team.

8. PRIVACY STATEMENT

JASS ensures the confidentiality of all personal information submitted by authors, reviewers, and readers. Any names, email addresses, or personal data shared will be used exclusively for the stated purposes of the journal, such as managing submissions, facilitating the peer-review process, and communicating editorial decisions. The journal does not share, sell, or distribute personal information to any third party or organisation. All data is handled securely and in accordance with ethical publishing standards. Users may contact the editorial office for any concerns regarding the use or protection of their information.

9. PLAGIARISM POLICY

The *Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies* strictly adheres to the Higher Education Commission's (HEC) Plagiarism Policy:
<https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/policies/Documents/Plagiarism-Policy.pdf>

Research articles submitted for publication go through a rigorous similarity check using Turnitin. Similarity Score Index (SSI) must not exceed 19%.

10. PEER REVIEW POLICY

JASS maintains a double-blind peer review policy, in which both the reviewers and the author(s) are anonymous. To facilitate this, authors have to anonymise their manuscripts to ensure that their identity has not been given away in the manuscript's content.

Timely Reviews: Reviewers are requested to submit peer review reports within the stipulated timeframe to support the journal in delivering a high-quality publishing service.

11. PUBLICATION PROCESSING / PUBLICATION CHARGES POLICY

No Publication or Article Processing Charges (APC): There are no fees for submitting, processing, or publishing articles in the *Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies*. This policy ensures equal opportunities for authors from diverse backgrounds and institutions, promoting inclusivity and accessibility.

Open Access Policy: All articles published in the journal are open access and immediately available online upon publication at no cost to readers. The journal adheres to the principles of free and unrestricted access to knowledge, ensuring maximum visibility and impact for authors' work.

Sponsorship and Support: The journal's operational costs are fully supported through institutional funding from the Centre for Aerospace & Security Studies (CASS), Islamabad, allowing authors to publish without financial barriers. It does not follow any business model (e.g., author fees, advertising, reprints). Authors of published scholarly articles are paid a modest honorarium.

Commitment to Accessibility: The journal ensures accessibility to global audiences by maintaining an intuitive, user-friendly website for browsing and downloading. Articles are indexed in relevant academic databases and directories to maximise dissemination.

Transparency and Fairness: There are no hidden charges or fees throughout the submission, review, or publication process. The journal is committed to transparent communication regarding policies, ensuring authors and readers are fully informed.

12. TIMELINE OF PUBLICATION ISSUES

JASS is an annual publication, with one issue published each year. Article submissions are accepted on a rolling basis, with submission deadlines at the end of February and the end of August.

Authors submitting manuscripts in the first submission cohort (end of February) whose papers are not selected or shortlisted for publication will be notified by the end of April. Similarly, authors submitting in the second cohort (end of August) will be informed by the end of October.

13. INDEXING & ABSTRACTING

The *Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies* (JASS) is indexed & abstracted by:



Appendix

**Journal
of
Aerospace
& Security
Studies**

ISSN 2790-7139
E-ISSN 2958-082X

Authorship, Conflict of Interest & Originality Declaration
*The submission will not be considered without completion,
electronic signature and return of this.*

I/we hereby certify that the Research Article / Book Review titled

sent for publication is:

- the author/s' own original, previously unpublished work,
- is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

The author/s confirm that there are no known conflicts of interest associated with this submission.

The manuscript has been read carefully and approved by all named author/s.

I/we further confirm that the order of authors listed in the manuscript has been approved by all parties involved.

I/we understand that the Corresponding Author is the sole contact for the editorial process. He/she is responsible for communicating with the other authors about progress, submissions of revisions and final approval of proofs (if required).

I/we confirm that the provided contact details are current and accurate as given below:

1st Authors with Dated Signatures Alongside:

1st Author Complete Name:

Designation:

Complete Contact Details:

Signature:

2nd Author Complete Name:

Designation:

Complete Contact Details:

Signature:

3rd Author Complete Name:

Designation:

Complete Contact Details:

Signature:

4th Author Complete Name:

Designation:

Complete Contact Details:

Signature:

Corresponding Author Complete Name:

Designation:

Complete Contact Details:

Signature:

¹ Request of authorship change during review process should be made to the Editor-in-Chief/Editor in a separate form titled 'Authorship Change Request'.

Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies
Volume 10, Number 1, 2017
ISSN 2224-6460

Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies
Volume 10, Number 1, 2017
ISSN 2224-6460

Journal of Aerospace & Security Studies
Volume 10, Number 1, 2017
ISSN 2224-6460



***Authors of published papers will
be awarded an honorarium
upon publication.***

***Deadline:
Rolling Submissions
End of February & August***

***Email:
jass.journal@casstt.com***



CASS www.casstt.com
**CENTRE FOR AEROSPACE
& SECURITY STUDIES, ISLAMABAD**
Independence | Analytical Rigour | Foresight

