



The Ugandan Journal of Management and Public Policy Studies (UJMPPS)

ISSN (Print): 2078-7049 ISSN (Online): 2959-4316

Published by Uganda Management Institute

Plot 44-52, Jinja Road

P.O Box 20131, Kampala Uganda

Website: <http://www.ujmpps.com>

Email: admin@ujmpps.com /

editor@ujmpps.com

Our Editorial Process

These guidelines outline the process used by **The Ugandan Journal of Management and Public Policy Studies (UJMPPS)** from manuscript submission through publication. They are intended to guide authors on submission requirements, editorial screening, peer review, revision, responding to reviewers, acceptance, production, and publication.

1. Manuscript Submission

Authors should submit manuscripts through the official journal submission platform or any other official submission channel indicated by the journal. Manuscripts submitted to UJMPPS must be original, unpublished, and not under consideration by another journal or publisher.

At submission, authors should upload the required documents, including:

- i. Title page with author details;
- ii. Anonymized manuscript for peer review, where required;
- iii. Tables, figures, appendices, or supplementary files, where applicable;
- iv. Ethical approval evidence, where applicable;
- v. Copyright permissions for third-party materials, where applicable;
- vi. Funding, conflict of interest, data availability, and AI-use declarations, where applicable.

Submission of a manuscript implies that all authors have approved it and agree to comply with the journal's author guidelines, peer-review procedures, publication ethics policy, and editorial decisions.

2. Acknowledgment of Receipt

Upon successful submission, the corresponding author will receive an acknowledgment of receipt from the editorial office within 48 hours. This acknowledgment confirms receipt of the manuscript and its submission to preliminary editorial screening.

The acknowledgment of receipt does not imply that the manuscript has been accepted for peer review or publication.

3. Preliminary Editorial Screening

All submitted manuscripts undergo preliminary editorial screening before peer review. At this stage, the editorial team assesses whether the manuscript:

- i. Fits the journal's aims and scope;
- ii. Meets the journal's formatting and submission requirements;
- iii. Demonstrates sufficient scholarly quality;
- iv. Contains appropriate ethical declarations;
- v. Shows originality and relevance;
- vi. Meets basic language and presentation standards;
- vii. Complies with publication ethics requirements.

Manuscripts may be returned to authors for technical corrections, declined without external review, or advanced to peer review. Manuscripts that are outside the journal's scope, poorly prepared, plagiarised, unethical, incomplete, or unsuitable for scholarly review may be rejected at this stage.

4. Peer Review Process

Manuscripts that pass editorial screening are normally sent for peer review by qualified experts in the relevant field. Reviewers assess the manuscript's originality, relevance, theoretical contribution, methodological quality, literature engagement, ethical compliance, clarity, interpretation of findings, and contribution to knowledge, policy, and practice.

The peer review process normally takes **8 to 12 weeks**, depending on reviewer availability, manuscript complexity, and the need for additional expert assessment.

Possible editorial decisions include:

- i. Accept;
- ii. Accept with minor revisions;
- iii. Major revisions required;
- iv. Revise and resubmit;
- v. Reject.

The Editor-in-Chief or the designated handling editor makes the final editorial decision based on reviewer reports, editorial assessment, ethical considerations, and the manuscript's contribution to the journal.

5. Revision and Response to Reviewers

When revisions are requested, authors must carefully address all comments from reviewers and editors. Revision is an important part of the scholarly publishing process and does not guarantee acceptance.

Authors should note that reviewer and editor feedback may require more than one round of revision. A manuscript may be returned to authors several times until all substantive, methodological, ethical, analytical, formatting, or presentation issues have been adequately addressed.

When submitting a revised manuscript, authors must upload the following documents through the journal submission platform:

- a) **Clean revised manuscript:** This version should incorporate all approved revisions without visible tracked changes.
- b) **Tracked-changes manuscript:** This version should clearly show all changes made in response to reviewer and editor comments.
- c) **Detailed response to reviewers and editors:** This document should provide a point-by-point response to every comment raised by reviewers and editors. Authors should indicate exactly how and where each comment has been addressed in the revised manuscript. Where authors disagree with a comment, they should provide a respectful, scholarly, and evidence-based explanation.

The response document should be organized clearly, preferably using a table with the following columns:

- a) Reviewer/editor comment;
- b) Author response;
- c) Action taken;
- d) Page, paragraph, or section where the change was made.

6. Timeline for Submitting Revisions

Authors are expected to submit their revised manuscript and a response to reviewer comments within four weeks of receiving the editorial decision.

If authors need more time, they must request an extension from the editorial office before the deadline. Extension requests should briefly explain the reason for the delay and state the expected submission date.

If a revised manuscript and response to reviewers are submitted more than 60 days after the initial submission without an approved extension, the manuscript may be treated as a new submission. In such cases, the manuscript may undergo a new editorial screening and peer review process.

7. Requirements for a Good Response to Reviewers

Authors should ensure that their responses to reviewers are complete, respectful, clear, and evidence-based.

A good response should:

- a) Address every reviewer and editor comment individually;
- b) Avoid general statements such as “corrected” without explanation;
- c) Clearly indicate where changes were made in the manuscript;
- d) Provide justification where no change was made;
- e) Maintain a professional and respectful tone;
- f) Ensure consistency between the clean version, tracked-changes version, and response document;
- g) Correct all related sections affected by a reviewer’s comment;
- h) Check that revised tables, figures, references, citations, and appendices are accurate and complete.

Incomplete responses, missing tracked changes, failure to submit a clean version, or failure to address major comments may delay the review process or lead to rejection.

8. Further Review After Revision

After the revised manuscript is submitted, the editor will assess whether the authors have adequately addressed the reviewer and editorial comments. Depending on the nature of the revisions, the manuscript may be:

- a) Assessed by the handling editor;
- b) Returned to the original reviewers;
- c) Sent to additional reviewers;
- d) Returned to authors for further revision;
- e) Accepted;
- f) Rejected.

Authors should understand that multiple rounds of review may be necessary, especially when methodological, theoretical, ethical, analytical, or presentation issues remain unresolved.

9. Acceptance

A manuscript is accepted for publication only after the editor is satisfied that it meets the journal's scholarly, ethical, methodological, and editorial standards. Acceptance may also depend on the successful completion of all required declarations, permissions, revisions, formatting corrections, and publication checks.

The acceptance decision will be communicated to the corresponding author in writing.

10. Copyediting and Proof Preparation

After acceptance, the manuscript may undergo copyediting, formatting, layout, reference checking, and proof preparation. The journal may make minor editorial changes to improve clarity, grammar, consistency, formatting, referencing style, and conformity with house style.

Such changes shall not alter the author's meaning, argument, data, interpretation, or scholarly contribution.

11. Author Proof Review

The corresponding author may be asked to review the final proof before publication. Proof corrections should be limited to typographical errors, formatting issues, missing details, or minor factual corrections.

Major rewriting, new data, major changes to analysis, restructuring, or substantial additions are not normally allowed at the proof stage unless approved by the editor.

Authors should return corrected proofs by the timeline provided by the editorial office to avoid publication delays.

12. Publication

Once the final proof is approved, the article is scheduled for publication in the appropriate issue of the journal. Published articles become part of the scholarly record and may be changed only through formal correction, retraction, or update procedures.

Each published article should include relevant metadata such as title, author names, affiliations, abstract, keywords, references, publication dates, DOI where available, funding statement, conflict-of-interest statement, copyright and license information, and other required declarations.

13. Post-Publication Corrections

Authors must promptly notify the journal if they discover a significant error in their published article. If necessary, the journal may issue a correction, an expression of concern, or a retraction in accordance with its publication ethics and correction policy.

Minor typographical errors that do not affect meaning, interpretation, or the scholarly record may not require formal correction.

14. Summary of the Submission-to-Publication Process

The normal manuscript pathway is as follows:

- i. Manuscript submission;
- ii. Acknowledgment of receipt within 48 hours;

- iii. Preliminary editorial screening;
- iv. Similarity and ethics checks;
- v. Peer review;
- vi. Editorial decision;
- vii. Author revision and response to reviewers;
- viii. Further review, where required;
- ix. Final editorial decision;
- x. Acceptance;
- xi. Copyediting and proof preparation;
- xii. Author proof review;
- xiii. Publication;
- xiv. Post-publication correction, where necessary.

UJMPPS is committed to a fair, transparent, rigorous, and constructive editorial process that supports the publication of high-quality research.