**Manuscript evaluation guidelines**Title: **University Grants Commission Regulations, 2018: Can it tackle scientific misconduct?**  
  
  
1. Importance of the paper  
  
           Does it address issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries?

**The paper speaks about academic ethics in general, particularly about UGC’s regulations published in 2018.**  
  
2. Is it topical?  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

**NO**

         Will it influence practice or policy?

**NO**  
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal?  
  
3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new?

**NOT NEW**

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?  
  
  
4. Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

**The interpretation is not well developed.**   
  
           Does the article contain loose generalisations?

**Yes. The paper contains loose generalisations.**   
  
           Are there any important omissions?

**The paper is very vague**

5. Other comments

The paper has no substantial information. The paper does not speak about specific problems in UGC regulations and how to address them. Instead, the paper makes wild generalizations such as “seed of plagiarism is sown at an exceedingly early stage of a child’s life, and for this, the educational system in India needs a serious relook”.  
  
  
6. Recommendation  
  
 **The paper is not acceptable in the present form**  
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