



EDITORIAL POLICY FOR THE RWANDA MEDICAL JOURNAL

AIMS AND SCOPE OF JOURNAL

The Rwanda Medical Journal (RMJ), is a Not-For-Profit scientific, medical, journal that is published entirely online in open-access electronic format ([click here](#)). The RMJ was first published in 1967 and intends to be published indefinitely.

The RMJ is an interdisciplinary research journal for publication of original work in all the major health disciplines. Through a rigorous process of evaluation and peer review, the RMJ strives to publish original works of high quality for a diverse audience of healthcare professionals. The Journal seeks to deepen knowledge and advance scientific discovery to improve the quality of care of patients in Rwanda and internationally.

INDEXING

Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) ([Click here](#))

Scopus ([Click here](#))

African Journals Online (AJOL) ([Click here](#))

SUBMISSIONS

The Rwanda Medical Journal (RMJ) is an open-access, peer-reviewed, scientific medical journal. All authors and articles published should meet the standards documented in this editorial policy. The RMJ accepts submissions from any country and is not limited to authors and researchers solely from Rwanda or Africa. All articles are submitted without charge (free) and will be subject to type-editing and peer review before publication. Submission language is English.

PUBLICATION FREQUENCY

The journal is published quarterly

OPEN ACCESS POLICY

The RMJ provides immediate open access to its content on the principle that making scientific research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge. Users have the right to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles free of charge.



RESPONSIBILITIES OF EDITORIAL TEAM AND JOURNAL

Timelines

The aim is for authors to receive a response within eight to twelve weeks of submission.

Type-editing and copy-editing

Articles may be sent to “type editors” at the discretion of the editorial team. Type editors are proficient/native English speakers who will amend the manuscript to enhance the grammar and spelling, without modifying the methodology/results or academic content/meaning of the article. Type-edited amendments are sent to the authors in tracked changes format. Type editing does not incur a charge on the authors.

Peer-reviewers are also asked to copy-edit feedback into the manuscript to improve the quality of the manuscript. The amended manuscript will be given to authors with anonymous tracked changes

Selection of Articles

1. Articles are initially screened for plagiarism.
2. A senior editor screens articles to assess if they are appropriate to be sent for peer review. Articles should meet the aims of the journal and have sufficient quality in order to progress not to overburden peer reviewers.

Articles that do not meet these basic criteria may, therefore, be rejected at this point without peer review.

3. Peer-review. Peer review is sought from a minimum of two reviewers.
4. Senior Editor decision. Based on the opinions given by the peer reviewers, the senior editorial team makes the final decision regarding acceptance of articles.
5. Articles may then be accepted in current form, or revisions may be sought from authors before acceptance,.

Integrity

As per ICMJE guidance: Editorial decisions should be based on the relevance of a manuscript to the journal and the manuscript's originality, quality, and contribution to evidence about important questions. Those decisions should not be influenced by commercial interests, personal relationships or agendas, or findings that are negative or that credibly challenge accepted knowledge.

As per ICMJE guidance: The RMJ does not exclude from consideration studies with findings that are not statistically significant, or studies that have inconclusive findings but give an appropriate appraisal of limitations, and thoughtful discussion of implications of the study. Such studies may provide evidence which, combined with data from other studies through meta-analysis, might still help answer important questions. The public dissemination of such negative or inconclusive findings may prevent unwarranted replication of effort, and may otherwise be valuable for other researchers considering similar work.

Confidentiality

“Manuscripts submitted to academic journals are privileged communications which are the authors’ private, confidential property, and authors may be harmed by premature disclosure of any or all of a manuscript’s details.”



Only once the article is accepted and published does the copyright ownership change (see below). ICMJE guidelines are strictly followed ([click here](#)) concerning manuscript confidentiality.

COPYRIGHT

Ownership of content

Authors retain full copyright, ownership and publishing rights of their articles without restrictions. As of October 2018, the RMJ uses the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) license ([click here](#)). By submitting to the RMJ authors are deemed to be giving a license to publish to the RMJ, whilst maintaining their own copyright ownership.



Reproduction of Articles

Articles and accompanying materials published by the RMJ, unless otherwise indicated, are licensed by the respective authors for use and distribution by you subject to citation of the original source in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC-ND) license.

Any article published in RMJ can be cited as a scientific reference in future articles by third parties, either in RMJ or any other journal, without prior permission from the author or the RMJ.

Content within materials

The staff and editorial board of the RMJ make a concerted effort to ensure that the journal does not publish material that infringes copyright or includes libelous or defamatory content. However, the content of the articles remains the responsibility of the authors. All opinions are the views of the authors and not the editorial board. If during review a manuscript is perceived to deviate from this policy, the Editor, with assistance from the expert editorial board if required, will work with authors to achieve a mutually satisfactory outcome, and ensure that no manuscripts are published in RMJ that are defamatory, libelous, or infringe copyright.

Regardless of these efforts by the staff and editorial board, the journal and editorial board is not ultimately liable for the content of articles published in RMJ; authors are the only responsible parties. Given this consideration, and in the context of fast-paced medical research, the editor recommends that all authors stay current concerning the latest medical literature that may relate to submitted manuscripts.

Ownership of websites

Unless otherwise indicated, the RMJ websites are the property of the RMJ.

Advertising

The RMJ does not currently include any advertising in any of its content.

ROLES OF EDITORIAL BOARD



The editorial board are collectively responsible for the following duties.

- Take responsibility for ensuring the quality of the journal content.
- Ensure the peer review process is carried out properly.
- Appoint or advise on Editorial Board members.
- Liaise with authors regarding acceptance decisions.
- Raise any problems with the journal owner as appropriate.
- Work within the COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) guidelines.
- Demonstrate a duty of care to ensure that the journal does not publish any plagiarized or illegal (e.g. libelous, infringing copyright, etc.) content.
- Work within the publication schedule to ensure (as far as possible) that the appropriate amount of content is ready for each issue.
- Work with the publisher to help promote the journal.

Chief editor:

- To implement and ensure application of the editorial policy
- To lead on decision-making processes related to articles selection, appeals, and complaints

Deputy chief editors:

- To support the chief editor with her/his responsibilities
- To monitor submissions and identify peer-reviewers

Medical editor and editorial assistant:

- To provide administrative support to ensure the prompt peer-review and publication of submitted articles.

Associate editors:

Associate editor role will involve leading on particular areas of editorial work and to make decisions on:

- Initial submissions – making a decision on manuscripts should be immediately rejected or sent for peer-review
- First Submissions – making decision on manuscripts based on peer-review
- Resubmissions – making decision on whether manuscripts have been sufficiently improved enough to be accepted for publication

BIAS

The editorial board should make all steps to eliminate the following forms of bias from editorial decisions:

- Gender
- Language – badly phrased language should not be deemed as a sign of bad science or poor-quality research.
- Country or region – bias towards (and against) specific regions of the world – either because of politics, or because they believe that good research is more likely to come from some regions and not from others.
- Institute – bias to believe good research comes from some institutions and not from others
- Challenging viewpoints – a viewpoint that conflicts with, or challenges the beliefs and research of the editorial board member and/or the reviewers
- Subject of article
- Known authors
- Negative results – disinclined to publish articles that report negative results

EDITORIAL EXPERT BOARD (EEB)

The EEB support the editorial board and have the following duties:



- To support the editorial board in achieving the above tasks
- To peer-review articles related to her/his area of medical expertise
- To support the board in identifying peer-reviewers
- To advocate for the journal in the wider field

PEER REVIEW POLICY

Peer-review is an objective process found at the heart of high-quality scholarly publishing and is undertaken by all reputable scientific journals. The practice of peer review is to ensure that only good science is published.

All original articles, case reports, and review articles are sent for peer review. Commissioned articles are also subject to standard peer-review procedures. Peer review aims to ensure that all authors receive feedback as well as the decision regarding their submission. A minimum of two experts review submitted manuscripts. The RMJ employs a double-blind peer review process meaning that reviewers are not given any identifying features of the authors of the manuscript. Authors are provided with feedback from the peer review, and this is anonymized. Acceptance of articles for publication is dependent on the following: originality of the work, quality of the methodology, clarity of presentation of results, the accuracy of statistical analysis, insightfulness of the discussion, comprehensibility of the writing, appropriate appraisal of limitations, and thoughtful presentation of implications of the study.

Peer reviewers have five possible options for the outcome of the article:

1. Accept in current form
2. Accept after minor revision (by the journal editorial team)
3. Reject initial submission for minor revision: asking the author(s) to make minor revisions and resubmit
4. Reject initial submission for major revision: asking the author(s) to make significant revisions and resubmit
5. Reject initial submission entirely: with no opportunity for resubmission.

“Some people believe that true scientific peer review begins only on the date a paper is published.” ([click here](#)) In that spirit, the RMJ accepts letters to the editor for readers to submit comments, questions, or criticisms about published articles, and authors have a responsibility to respond appropriately and cooperate with any requests from the journal for data or additional information should questions about the paper arise even after publication (as per International Committee of Medical Journal Editors - [ICMJE](#)).

Responsibilities of Peer Reviewers

Expectations of peer reviewers are described by International Committee of Medical Journal Editors ([Click here](#)) or the Council of science editors ([Click here](#)) and the Committee of Publication Ethics ([Click here](#))

The journal uses a double-blind peer review process for the review of manuscripts submitted for publication in the journal. Manuscripts submitted to journals are privileged communications that are authors' private, confidential property, and authors may be harmed by premature disclosure of any or all of a manuscript's details.

Reviewers, therefore, should keep manuscripts and the information they contain strictly confidential. Reviewers must not publicly discuss authors' work and must not appropriate authors' ideas before the manuscript is published. Reviewers must not retain the manuscript for their personal use and should destroy copies of manuscripts after submitting their reviews.

Reviewers are expected to respond promptly to requests to review and to submit reviews within the time agreed. Reviewers' comments should be constructive, honest, and polite. When a manuscript outcome is given to the authors, the reviewers' comments are provided in an anonymous format. This is to provide feedback to the submitting author on how to improve the manuscript for future submission.



Reviewers should declare to the Chief Editor, any conflict of interest and recuse themselves from the peer-review process.

Basic principles to which peer reviewers should adhere (as per Committee of Publication Ethics, COPE)

Peer reviewers should:

- only agree to review manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner
- respect the confidentiality of peer review and not reveal any details of a manuscript or its review, during or after the peer-review process, beyond those that are released by the journal
- not use information obtained during the peer-review process for their own or any other person's or organization's advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others
- declare all potential conflicting interests, seeking advice from the journal if they are unsure whether something constitutes a relevant interest
- not allow their reviews to be influenced by the origins of a manuscript, by the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, or by commercial considerations
- be objective and constructive in their reviews, refraining from being hostile or inflammatory and from making libelous or derogatory personal comments
- acknowledge that peer review is largely a reciprocal endeavor and undertake to carry out their fair share of reviewing and in a timely manner
- provide journals with personal and professional information that is accurate and a true representation of their expertise
- recognize that impersonation of another individual during the review process is considered serious misconduct

In addition to these standards from COPE, the RMJ expects that peer-reviewers have the duty to:

- Not include personal criticisms of authors
- Use clear and supported arguments and reliable references (not defamatory or libellous) during the review
- Address ethical aspects:
 - Plagiarism, data fabrication, or manipulation
 - Duplication / redundant article
 - Ethical approval, informed consent
- Declare any conflicts of interests:
 - Competitive
 - Collaborative
 - Any relationships or connections with authors, companies, or institutions connected to the manuscript.

Policy for the review of articles authored by editors and editorial board members

All articles, irrespective of authorship, are sent for peer-review anonymized. Articles authored by editors and editorial board members go through the same double-blinded review process as all articles.

RETRACTIONS, CLARIFICATIONS, AMENDMENTS, APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS:

The journal has the obligation and duty to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions, and apologies when needed.



Appeals: Authors who wish to appeal a rejection of a manuscript submitted to RMJ should contact the Editor-in-Chief of the journal. Please include the specific reason for the appeal, and if possible support the argument with evidence, in the form of attached journal articles or scientific references.

Complaints: Authors or readers who would like to register a complaint about the RMJ should contact the Editor-in-Chief directly. If the complaint pertains to a specific article, please include the year, volume, and issue, along with the author and title of the article.

Retractions: the editorial team will consider retracting articles, using the guidance from Committee of Publication Ethics COPE ([click here](#)).

Clarifications: If a reader writes to the journal (informally) or as a “letter to the editor”, then the authors of the original article can provide a “clarification” which can be added to the article, in the form of “additional information”. This is done if this is felt to enhance the readability and understanding of the article, without the addition of additional results.

Timeline: We aim for a response to appeals and complaints within four weeks.

Notification of retractions: Whenever an article is retracted or amended, the following COPE guidelines will be employed

- Be linked to the retracted article wherever possible (ie, in all online versions)
- Clearly identify the retracted article (eg, by including the title and authors in the retraction heading or citing the retracted article)
- Be clearly identified as a retraction (ie, distinct from other types of correction or comment)
- Be published promptly to minimise harmful effects
- Be freely available to all readers (ie, not behind access barriers or available only to subscribers)
- State who is retracting the article
- State the reason(s) for retraction.
- Be objective, factual and avoid inflammatory language

In addition to this, whenever retracting or correcting an article, the reason for retraction will be classified as being one of 1. Publisher Correction (formerly Erratum), 2. Author Correction (formerly Corrigendum), 3. Retraction (e.g. Notification of invalid results) or 4. Addendum (i.e. notification of additional information).

The journal would appoint an independent ombudsman for unresolved internal issues.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF AUTHORS

Submission of articles

All manuscripts must be submitted online.

Once an author has prepared a manuscript according to the RMJ author instructions, they should visit the online submission website ([click here](#)). Submitting to the journal is deemed as giving consent from all authors for the submission of the manuscript. All illustration materials (e.g., pictures, radiology images, etc) utilized in the article submitted should be accompanied with a written permission/consent from the original authors.

Submission of an article to RMJ indicates consent for the journal to use, reproduce, or disseminate *all “published articles”* without any modification. The authors keep the right to modify (for their own use), use, reproduce or

disseminate their articles at their wish regardless of the peer review outcome and/or process as per the copyright policy above.

Duplicate submission:

Authors should not submit the same manuscript, in the same or different languages, simultaneously to more than one journal. The rationale for this standard is the potential for disagreement when two (or more) journals claim the right to publish a manuscript that has been submitted simultaneously to more than one journal, and the possibility that two or more journals will unknowingly and unnecessarily undertake the work of peer review, edit the same manuscript, and publish the same article. By submitting a manuscript online, the author is confirming that it is an original work, and it has not been submitted to or published by another journal, even under the form of a conference proceeding.

Duplicated publication or Re-print:

Manuscripts should not be submitted to the RMJ if they have previously been published in another journal., unless the author obtains written permission from that journal for re-print. Submission of conference abstracts, pending or confirmed, is acceptable.

Final peer-review process decision

Based on the decision of the Editorial team, the following processes will apply:

1. **Accepted in current form:** The author will not be asked to review the manuscript. Small typographical changes may be made by the editorial team.
2. **Accepted with minor revision:** The RMJ Editorial team will make minor changes to the text for clarity and length, but will not substantially alter the content of the piece. Once the revised manuscript has been reviewed and approved by the author, the manuscript will be submitted as “a fully revised/approved article”, and will not be again subject to peer review.
3. **Rejected initial submission for minor revision.** The initial submission is rejected, and the author(s) are asked to make minor revisions (tracking the changes in the previous submission) and resubmit. After the author completes the revisions, he resubmits the manuscript as a “revised/re-submitted article.” Any comment from the editorial or peer-review team should be addressed IN THE WORD FILE OF THE MANUSCRIPT (a separate file addressing the comments should NOT be provided). It is then reviewed by a member of the editorial board, and If accepted in this form, it will go directly to publication. Minimal typographic changes and small edits for length and clarity can be suggested by the editor and approved by the author at this time. If, however, at this point the manuscript is rejected for further significant revision, it will be non-publishable, as stated in section 4a below.
4. **Rejected initial submission for major revision.** The initial submission is rejected, and the author(s) are asked to make significant (major) revisions (tracking the changes in the previous submission) and to resubmit if they wish to pursue publication of the revised manuscript. After the author completes the revisions, he resubmits the manuscript as a “revised article.” It is then reviewed by a member of the editorial board, and if accepted in this form, it will go directly to publication. Minimal typographic changes and small edits for length and clarity can be suggested by the editor and approved by the author at this time. If, however, at this point the manuscript is rejected again for further significant revision, it will be considered non-publishable and “fully rejected” Any manuscript rejected on two occasions will not be accepted for re-submission. This is deemed as non-publishable work.
5. **Fully rejected** initial submission with no opportunity for revision nor resubmission.

Revision of articles during the submission process

Revisions of articles during the submission/review process aims to achieve three goals:

- To improve the arguments based on the existing data
- To identify where more data are needed



- To improve the clarity and coherence

On re-submission, authors should submit two copies: 1) a "clean" copy, that includes no comments or tracked changes, and 2) a copy that clearly shows every revision made from the original version (e.g., with tracked changes).

The approved articles in their revised format will be sent to the author for immediate (<1 week) final approval before publication.

The full-text of articles accepted for publication are immediately and permanently archived in the journal central database.

Authorship

Authorship matters. The RMJ concurs with the recommendations of the ICMJE (International Committee of Medical Journal Editors) in respect to "Defining the Role of Authors and Contributors" ([click here](#))

Authorship is based on the following four criteria:

- A substantial contribution to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

All those designated as authors must meet all four criteria for authorship, and all who meet the four criteria should be identified as authors. Those who do not meet all four criteria should be acknowledged in the manuscript. Submissions should be signed by all authors involved. All the authors share legal responsibility for the content of the manuscript. The RMJ does not hold legal responsibility for the content of the manuscript. The authors keep the full copyright of the material. For more details on inappropriate types of authorship have been described, including guest authorship, honorary or gift authorship, and ghost authorship see the guidance from the Council of Science Editors ([click here](#)).

The RMJ editorial team will not engage in author disputes. These should be resolved by either the authors themselves or their employers

Consent for submission

The core mission of the RMJ is to publish articles of originality and authenticity. Among the journal's aims and objectives is to maintain constant performance improvement in this regard.

Submission of a manuscript implies that all authors have read and given consent to its submission and publication. In doing so, all authors are bound by the internal rules of the RMJ and are in "agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved" as per ICMJE guidelines.

The RMJ is not responsible for violations of accuracy and integrity that may be perpetrated by authors before and during the publication process. The RMJ editorial group does not independently verify the accuracy and integrity of the data reported to the journal by the authors. Legal responsibility for the veracity of the data and the accuracy of statistical analysis falls upon the authors of each journal article, who bear shared legal liability for the truthfulness of the content submitted to the RMJ.



Protection of Research Participants

The editorial board follows the guidance of the ICMJE concerning the protection of research participants ([click here](#))

Ethical standards for all manuscripts should follow internationally recognized ethical standards and guidelines, namely:

- The Helsinki Declaration ([click here](#))
- AERA, BERA for educational researchers
- WHO guidelines
- Local and national guidelines issued by regulatory authorities from the country of submission

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval

For experimental studies, the author should report the Institutional Review Board (IRB) reference code in the manuscript.

If the scientific project involves human subjects or animals, authors must state in the manuscript that the protocol has been approved by the Ethics Committee of the institution within which the research was undertaken. Experiments on human subjects or animal must be in accordance with institutional and national guidelines or regulations for human subject and animal research. Research should be in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008 ([click here](#)). If doubt exists whether the research was conducted in accordance with institutional and national guidelines or with the Helsinki Declaration, the authors must explain the rationale for their approach, and demonstrate that the institutional review body explicitly approved the doubtful aspects of the study.

Registration of clinical trials

For clinical trials, registration with a suitable public registry is not a requirement but is encouraged. The name of the registry and any applicable registration number should be included with the submission of the article. The publication of unregistered scientific work is permissible but may be subject to a more rigorous verification and review process.

Among the acceptable registries to which trials should be reported include:

- Rwanda: <http://www.rnecrwanda.org/>
- ICJME
- WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform: <http://www.who.int/ictrp/network/primary/en/index.html>
- NIH: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/>

The trial registration number should be included as the last line of the manuscript abstract.

Data sharing

Researchers, are being increasingly encouraged, or even mandated, to make research data available in the public domain, and for this data to be accessible, discoverable and usable. Research data generally refers to the results of observations or experiments that validate research findings. These can cover a range of useful materials associated with a research project, such as; raw or processed data files, software, code, models, algorithms, protocols and/or methods. It is important to note that research data does not include the text in a manuscript or the final published article, or data or other materials submitted and published as part of a journal article.



The RMJ has a policy to not-mandate data-sharing. Despite this, we acknowledge that data-sharing is good practice and we would not decline submissions where data has been appropriately published in the public-domain.

Consent

All studies should describe the processes of consent from human subjects. The ICMJE give guidance on consent studies ([click here](#))

For studies in which research subjects spoke a language other than English, the authors should confirm that they provided consent forms in the subjects' primary language. If a majority of research subjects were illiterate, the authors should specifically address how consent was obtained in these cases.

For case reports where the identification of the patient may be possible, written consent of the patient must be provided. If all reasonable steps have been taken to remove potential identification of the patient, then consent is not necessary.

Plagiarism

The editorial team takes plagiarism seriously and uses plagiarism software (Grammarly) to screen all submitted articles. The position of the RMJ is that any plagiarism destroys the entire credibility of an article. As such, if the journal detects even a small amount of plagiarism, the result will be an immediate and full rejection of the article. In cases where significant plagiarism is identified, the editorial team may, at their discretion, inform the Chair of the Department of the lead author of the article. The Committee of Publication Ethics (COPE) plagiarism flowchart is used for decision making regarding plagiarism ([click here](#))

Duplicate publication: Duplicate publication is publication of a paper that overlaps substantially with one already published, without clear, visible reference to the previous publication ([ICMJE](#)). When authors submit a manuscript reporting work that has already been reported in large part in a published article or is contained in or closely related to another paper that has been submitted or accepted for publication elsewhere, the letter of submission should clearly say so and the authors should provide copies of the related material to help the editor decide how to handle the submission. Duplicate publications that may infringe on copyright of another peer-reviewed journal cannot be accepted.

Conflicts of Interest

Public trust in the scientific process and the credibility of published articles depend in part on how transparently conflicts of interest are handled during the planning, implementation, writing, peer review, editing, and publication of scientific work.

A conflict of interest exists when professional judgment concerning a primary interest (such as patients' welfare or the validity of research) may be influenced by a secondary interest (such as financial gain). Perceptions of conflict of interest are as important as actual conflicts of interest.

Financial relationships (such as employment, consultancies, stock ownership or options, honoraria, patents, and paid expert testimony) are the most easily identifiable conflicts of interest and the most likely to undermine the credibility of the journal, the authors, and of science itself. However, conflicts can occur for other reasons, such as personal relationships or rivalries, academic competition, and intellectual beliefs. Authors should avoid entering into agreements with study sponsors, both for-profit and non-profit, that interfere with authors' access to all of the



study's data or that interfere with their ability to analyze and interpret the data and to prepare and publish manuscripts independently when and where they choose." (ICMJE, 2017)

Authors are required to declare any conflicts of interest, including disclosure of any competing financial or other interest during online submission. It is the responsibility of the authors to remain informed of the conflict of interest regulations and abide by them. The RMJ is not responsible for ethical conflict of interest violations that may be perpetrated by authors before and during the publication process. Legal responsibility for the veracity of the conflict of interest statements published in the RMJ fall upon the authors of each journal article.

Authors who wish to publish with RMJ are required to complete a conflict of interest form, declaring (ICMJE):

- Authors' conflicts of interest
- Sources of support for the work, including sponsor names along with explanations of the role of those sources, if any, in study design, data collection, data analysis, manuscript preparation, and the decision to submit for publication (If the funding source had no role in these decisions, the author must submit a statement declaring so)
- Whether the funding source had access to the study data, with an explanation of the nature and extent of access, including whether access is on-going

Editorial freedom

As per ICMJE guidance, the Editor-in-Chief has "full authority over the entire editorial content of the journal and the timing of publication of that content." ([click here](#))

RMJ Funding mechanisms

Since its creation in 1967, the RMJ has been supported by a number of different public organizations. It was hosted by the University of Rwanda, Faculty of Medicine until 1994. Then after the 1994 genocide against the tutsi, the journal did not recover until 2007 when it restarted to publish under the management of independent Rwandan researchers.

Since 2009, it has been hosted by the Ministry of Health - Rwanda Health Communication Center (the Rwanda Biomedical Centre) which provided financial and technical support to pay the salary of a permanent secretary (2011-2013) and publisher. The financial support was also used for printing the RMJ journal in hard format until the RMJ moved to the online platform (Bioline).

In 2010, the Niyikiza Foundation provided \$4000 to award the best two authors. In addition, in 2011, the RMJ received a fund of \$7000 from the Belgian Technical Cooperation. This fund continues to be used to cover the cost of desktop publishing and layout design up to now by supporting 1/8th salary of the designer for every issue.

The RMJ is open-access and all articles are submitted without charge (free), there is no publishing charge and full texts of articles are available at bioline free of charge.



Policy Timeline:

Reviewed by editorial board: 14th April 2022

Approved: 13th May 2022

Review date: 13th April 2024