

The SPL Journal of Literary Hermeneutics

A Biannual International Journal of Independent Critical Thinking

Double-blind, Peer-reviewed, and Open Access Journal in English

Vol. 6 Issue 2 Monsoon Edition 2026 e-ISSN 2583-1674 Page no. 145-158



www.literaryherm.org
www.cavemarkpublications.com
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.64846/SPLJLH.2026.6242>
ORCID <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1095-199X>



Unstuck in Time: Metafiction, Fragmentation, Absurdity, and the Collapse of Grand Narratives in Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse-Five*

Hariom Singh

Corresponding Author: Hariom Singh, Assistant Professor of English at Hindu College, Moradabad, singhhariom402@gmail.com

Research Article

Keywords: Vonnegut; metafiction; postmodernism; trauma narrative; grand narratives; absurdism

Article History

Received: June 12, 2026

Revised: June 22, 2026

Accepted: July 1, 2026

Impact Factor
SJIF 3.975



ISSN 2583-1674 (SPLJLH)



Abstract

Kurt Vonnegut's Slaughterhouse-Five (1969) keeps informing its readers that it cannot do the one thing it was written to do: describe the destruction of Dresden. This article takes that admission seriously. Reading the novel alongside Jean-François Lyotard's account of the postmodern condition as "incredulity toward metanarratives" (xxiv), I argue that Vonnegut's metafictional intrusions, his scrambled chronology, and his flat comic refrain are not stylistic flourishes layered over a war story, but the only honest response available to a writer confronting an event that resists the shape conventional narrative wants to give it. Drawing on Linda Hutcheon's historiographic metafiction, Patricia Waugh's theory of self-conscious fiction, Cathy Caruth's work on trauma and narrative, and Albert Camus's philosophy of the absurd, the article traces how the novel's form, not just its content, dismantles the grand narratives of heroism, historical progress, and rational agency that ordinarily organise stories about war. Particular attention goes to the novel's autobiographical first chapter, its treatment of Tralfamadorian time, the recurring line "So it goes," and its ironic use of real wartime documents.

***Correspondence:** Hariom Singh, singhhariom402@gmail.com © (2026) All rights are reserved with the author (s) published by CaveMark Publications. This is an Open Access Article distributed under the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any form or medium, provided that the original work is appropriately cited or acknowledged. This paper is available online at www.literaryherm.org, and CaveMark Publications, India, published it.

Kurt Vonnegut begins *Slaughterhouse-Five* not with battle, but with failure. He tells us he spent more than twenty years trying to write the book, and that what finally appeared is “so short and jumbled and jangled” because “there is nothing intelligent to say about a massacre.” He says this before the story even starts. The warning is clear: do not look here for a clean window onto history. Look instead at why that window keeps fogging. This essay argues that three of the novel’s plainest choices work as one. The book exposes itself as a book. Its plot is broken and out of order because Billy Pilgrim has “come unstuck in time.” Its tone is flat and absurd, sealed by the refrain “So it goes.” Together they dismantle what Jean-François Lyotard called the grand narratives of Western modernity—the stories of progress, heroism, and rational will that give catastrophe a shape and often a justification. Vonnegut does not merely describe the collapse of those stories. He writes a novel that cannot hold together unless they collapse. Chronology, climax, and coherence are refused.

There is an ethics in this. Conventional form itself helps manufacture those grand stories: glorious sacrifice, historical necessity, moral clarity bought with violence. To tell Dresden “straight,” in neat cause and heroic shade, would give the event a meaning it never had for those who lived it. Fragmentation and the refusal to play it straight become, then, a kind of duty. They guard against the dishonesty Mary O’Hare names in the first chapter: turning “babies” into cinematic men, and slaughter into something that looks like sense. The novel belongs to what Linda Hutcheon called historiographic metafiction: writing that is “intensely self-reflexive” even as it “lay[s] claim to historical events and personages.” Vonnegut fits the pattern—a documentary of an atrocity he saw as a prisoner of war, wrapped in a text that never lets us forget it is a text. Jerome Klinkowitz notes that Vonnegut’s fiction is bound to his public voice as “spokesman,” so that author and narrator blur by design. Peter J. Reed saw the refusal of chronology as the novel’s meaning, not a quirk; the essays in Harold Bloom’s volume largely agree.

What follows moves in four steps. First, the metafictional frame: the autobiographical opening and Vonnegut’s own voice, which strip the story of stable authority from the start. Second, the broken, achronological structure as an analogue of traumatic memory, after Cathy Caruth. Third, absurdity—

Tralfamadorian time and the deadpan “So it goes”—as both psychological shield and Camus-like critique. Last, the novel’s direct clash with wartime history: the grand tale of justified war set against the broken, ironic testimony of those who survived it.

Few postwar American novels begin as *Slaughterhouse-Five* does. Before Billy Pilgrim appears, Vonnegut speaks in his own voice. He describes the long failure to write “his famous book about Dresden,” and his later return to the city with Bernard V. O’Hare. Patricia Waugh would call this the moment when fiction “self-consciously and systematically draw[s] attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality.” That is what happens here. A doubting person stands behind every page that follows, and he goes further than most writers by confessing the book’s failure as an aesthetic object. He remembers sketching the plot on wallpaper with his daughter’s crayons: colored lines for each character, ending where a character dies, the firebombing itself a “vertical band of orange cross-hatching” that the surviving lines pass through. The machinery a conventional novel hides is laid on the table like a child’s drawing, exposing how arbitrary the emplotment of war really is.

Just as telling is Mary O’Hare’s accusation: that he planned a glamorous war story in which the young soldiers, who “were just babies then,” would be played by “glamorous, war-loving, dirty old men” like Frank Sinatra and John Wayne. Vonnegut promises “no part for Frank Sinatra or John Wayne” and offers another title: “The Children’s Crusade.” Together they read Charles Mackay on the real Children’s Crusade and find “History,” which records the crusaders as “ignorant and savage men,” set against “Romance,” which “portrays...their piety and heroism.” In miniature, this is the novel’s whole argument. Heroic war and the record of what happened contradict each other, and Vonnegut tells us, before the story starts, which side he is on. The self-consciousness does not stay in the frame. Vonnegut steps into the third-person narrative to place himself among the events—“That was I. That was me. That was the author of this book”—and by the second chapter he has already called the coming story the work of “a pillar of salt,” Lot’s wife turned to salt for looking back at destroyed cities. He loves her for looking back “because it was so human,” and so positions his book, and himself, as a monument to a glance no one is supposed to take. He tells his editor

the novel is “a failure, and had to be, since it was written by a pillar of salt.” It is a strange thing to put in one’s own book, a surrender of mastery offered as a condition of honesty. Hutcheon would recognize the move. Historiographic metafiction “install[s]” historical reference “only to subvert it,” refusing both naïve realism and pure fictional freedom.

The clearest statement of the novel’s form is hidden inside the plot. When Billy, captive on Tralfamadore, asks for something to read, he is given a Tralfamadorian novel made of “brief clumps of symbols” that might look like telegrams, arranged without sequence: “There is no beginning, no middle, no end, no suspense, no moral, no causes, no effects,” only “the depths of many marvellous moments seen all at one time.” Set beside *Slaughterhouse-Five* itself, the resemblance is unmistakable: short scenes, white space, no driving causality, events as if simultaneous. Vonnegut has tucked a description of his own poetics inside science fiction and let the novel explain itself from within. That is the move Waugh has in mind when she says metafiction erases “the boundary between fiction and criticism.” The reader is left with nowhere neutral to stand. The most quoted sentence in *Slaughterhouse-Five* appears twice—first as a preview, then as the true opening of the story: “Billy Pilgrim has come unstuck in time” (ch. 2). That line sets the terms for everything that follows.

Vonnegut describes Billy’s condition with a cool, almost clinical calm: “He has gone to sleep a senile widower and awakened on his wedding day. He has walked through a door in 1955 and come out another one in 1941” (ch. 2). This is not ordinary flashback, and it is not the memory-work of Woolf or Faulkner, where the past is summoned by present sensation but still framed by a present tense. Billy’s time-travel is treated as literally true in the novel’s world. It happens *to* him: “Billy is spastic in time, has no control over where he is going next” (Ch. 2).

The result is a book of short, numbered vignettes, rarely more than a page or two, that leap among Billy’s childhood, his captivity in Dresden, his later life as an optometrist in Ilium, New York, and his supposed abduction to Tralfamadore—with almost no transitions to guide the reader. Critics have long seen this structure as the formal counterpart of trauma, and that reading still holds. Cathy Caruth argues that trauma resists linear memory: the event is not fully

absorbed when it happens, so it returns “belatedly,” in fragments, and shatters any straightforward life story (Caruth 4). In that light, Billy’s time-travel is less a science-fiction device than a figure for dissociative reliving. He is pulled back to Dresden no matter where he “is.” His mind is organized by recurrence, not progress. Vonnegut places the onset of this condition behind German lines during the Battle of the Bulge (Ch. 2), grounding the fantasy in something close to combat dissociation while turning that reality into allegory. Susanne Vees-Gulani notes that Billy’s symptoms—time displacement, flattened feeling, compulsive repetition—closely match PTSD, so the Tralfamadorian material reads as a coping mechanism rather than space opera (Vees-Gulani 175). Lawrence R. Broer goes further: the split between Billy’s wounded earthly self and his serene Tralfamadorian persona dramatizes schizoid dissociation. For Broer, Tralfamadorian doctrine is not a philosophy to be judged on its merits, but a protective fiction Billy builds so he can survive a memory he cannot otherwise carry (Broer 45–47).

The fragmentation is visible on the page itself: short paragraphs, white space, printer’s ornaments—none of the sustained scenes realist fiction uses to create causal and emotional continuity. Merrill and Scholl call this “the requirements of chaos,” a refusal of novelistic order that answers the disordering violence of the event (Merrill and Scholl 65). Brian McHale’s account of postmodern fiction sharpens the point. Modernist novels worry about how a mind can know a stable world. Postmodern novels foreground ontological instability—“the projection and confrontation of...worlds” that never settle into one reality (McHale 10). Billy’s movement among Dresden, Ilium, and Tralfamadore is that kind of confusion. The novel never says which world is real, and it offers no frame that would reduce the fantastic to mere delusion. The bombing of Dresden itself is never given a long set-piece. We see it only obliquely, in “corpse mines” (Ch. 9) and the aftermath of decaying bodies, never as spectacle. That absence is a formal claim: the event at the book’s center is pushed to the margins, in keeping with trauma theory’s sense that catastrophic violence resists direct representation (Caruth 4–5).

Suspense is dismantled as well. Billy’s death—murdered years later by Paul Lazzaro—is told early, long before his childhood or Dresden. The reader

knows roughly how and when he will die, just as Billy claims to know it: he has “seen his own death many times” (Ch. 2) and narrates his assassination with the same flat voice he uses for everything else. This echoes the Tralfamadorian rejection of “cause” and “effect” (Ch. 5). A novel that already knows its ending, and says so at the start, will not let us believe events are building toward anything.

The fragmentation, then, is not only an image of dissociation. It is also a polemical choice, a refusal of the suspense that conventional war stories use to make us care about outcomes that, for a real historical atrocity, have already and irrevocably happened. Fragmentation gives the novel its shape; absurdity gives it its tone. The phrase “So it goes” follows every mention of death—a single soldier, a flat bottle of champagne, six million Holocaust victims—and flattens every ending into the same formula. It appears a hundred and six times in a very short book. The phrase puts into practice the philosophy the Tralfamadorians offer Billy when he asks about free will. They tell him that of the “thirty-one inhabited planets” the speaker has visited, “only on Earth is there any talk of free will” (Ch. 4). Tralfamadorians see all moments at once, “as you might see a stretch of the Rocky Mountains” (Ch. 4). Death, for them, is not an ending but one fixed feature of a person’s shape across time. When a Tralfamadorian dies, he is “still very much alive in the past,” and the right response is a shrug and the words “So it goes” (Ch. 5).

It is tempting to read this as pure Camusian absurdism, and there is something in that. For Camus, the absurd arises from “the confrontation between the human need and the unreasonable silence of the world” (Camus 28). The proper response is neither suicide nor false hope, but a clear-eyed acceptance of meaninglessness—living “without appeal” (Camus 53). Tralfamadorian doctrine looks like a version of this at first. But it is a passive version. Camus’s absurd hero rebels against the silence of the universe; Billy simply retreats into it. Critics disagree about whether the novel endorses this fatalism or exposes its limits as an ethical answer to atrocity (Merrill and Scholl 68). The second reading is stronger. The sheer repetition of “So it goes” numbs the reader in a way that mirrors Billy’s retreat from grief. Yet the flatness feels less like comic bathos than like protest by other means: its refusal to dramatize horror becomes its own quiet register of outrage.

Absurdity also appears in sharper, more comic juxtapositions. Vonnegut lists the souvenirs former prisoners carried home from the ruins of Dresden: a “ceremonial Luftwaffe saber,” a hoard of stolen jewels, a gilded plaster model of the Eiffel Tower with a clock inside it, shown off by a toothless Englishman who says, “There’s a smashin’ thing” (Ch. 1)—right after a prisoner exchange conducted in the rain across a beet field. Consumer trinkets sit beside the machinery of mass death, and the reader is given no stable emotional register from which to take either in. This is what critics usually mean by Vonnegut’s “black humour”: a mode that, like the Tralfamadorian philosophy it dramatizes, denies catastrophe the dignity of tragic elevation—the elevation that grand stories of heroic sacrifice depend on. Tony Tanner places this comic flatness in a wider postwar unease about totalizing patterns and paranoid system-building. Novelists of Vonnegut’s generation, he argues, sought narrative postures that would let the writer “stay loose” rather than commit to a single explanatory order (Tanner 18). Vonnegut’s deadpan is best understood this way: less a philosophy in its own right than a formal strategy for dodging the totalizing closure—heroic, tragic, or ideological—that Tanner sees postwar American fiction as instinctively suspicious of.

Minor characters repeat the pattern in miniature. Roland Weary, the brutal infantry scout who imagines himself and two companions as heroic “Three Musketeers,” is undercut almost at once. His fantasy of martial brotherhood collapses within pages into capture and, later, his own death from gangrene, spent blaming Billy Pilgrim with his last furious breaths. Every character who tries to author his own heroic story is swallowed by the surrounding chaos of the text. This recursive quality—minor figures repeating, and being punished for, the very narrative ambition Vonnegut disclaims for himself in chapter one—reinforces the book’s larger claim: heroic emplotment is a story imposed after the fact, incompatible with what combat actually feels like while it is happening.

The novel’s sharpest attack on grand narrative comes not through Billy’s private mind but through its use of real military history. In chapter nine, the fictional Professor Bertram Copeland Rumford— “the official Historian of the United States Air Force” (Ch. 8)—shares a hospital room with Billy and reads aloud from an actual book, David Irving’s *The Destruction of Dresden*, including

forewords by real men: General Ira C. Eaker and Air Marshal Sir Robert Saundby. Vonnegut reproduces Eaker's justification almost word for word: his admission that he "deeply regret[s] that British and U.S. bombers killed 135,000 people in the attack on Dresden," followed at once by his insistence that he regrets "even more the loss of more than 5,000,000 Allied lives" in the fight against Nazism (Ch. 9)—and then, in the novel's usual rhythm, "So it goes" (Ch. 9). Saundby's foreword receives the same treatment: those who approved the raid "were neither wicked nor cruel," merely "too remote from the harsh realities of war" (Ch. 9).

This documentary insertion is where the novel most directly confronts what Lyotard calls the grand narrative of legitimation: the belief that violence can be redeemed once it is folded into a larger story of necessity or moral accounting (Lyotard 34–37). By placing real wartime apologetics beside Billy's fractured, apolitical, often absurd testimony, Vonnegut lets institutional history—confident, causal, morally totalizing—sit in the same room as a mode of witness that refuses exactly that kind of accounting. Then he undercuts the solemnity almost at once. Billy, lying nearby, interrupts with a non sequitur: "If you're ever in Cody, Wyoming...just ask for Wild Bob" (Ch. 9). Official rhetoric and Billy's delirious tangent occupy the same scene. The effect enacts, in miniature, the whole argument of the book: the grand narrative of justified violence cannot sit comfortably beside the traumatized testimony of those who lived through its consequences.

The same skepticism appears in the novel's treatment of character. Describing the moment when the doomed schoolteacher Edgar Derby stands up to denounce the American collaborator Howard W. Campbell, Jr., Vonnegut interrupts his own scene: "There are almost no characters in this story, and almost no dramatic confrontations, because most of the people in it are so sick and so much the listless playthings of enormous forces. One of the main effects of war...is that people are discouraged from being characters" (Ch. 8). The sentence works on two levels at once. It is a claim about the world the novel depicts (war strips people of agency), and a claim about the book's own formal choices (it will not, except here, give its figures the causal agency and interiority that "character," in the realist sense, requires). The grand narrative of the hero—the individual

whose choices carry weight, whose moral stature can be measured against history—is named explicitly and then withheld, except as bitter irony. Derby’s one heroic moment leads directly to his execution over a stolen teapot (ch. 9). The disproportion between crime and punishment says everything about the novel’s refusal of just moral accounting in war. Even the story of historical progress is ironized. Rumfoord, discussing the necessity of the Dresden raid with a nurse who is barely listening, embodies the confident causal history Lyotard associates with Enlightenment metanarrative: the belief that violence, once properly documented and justified, advances a forward-moving story of civilization. Set against Billy’s fractured testimony and the Tralfamadorians’ fatalism—for whom even the destruction of the entire universe merits nothing more than a shrugging “So it goes” (Ch. 9)—Rumfoord’s confidence looks thin. No explanatory frame on offer in the novel, whether military history, science-fictional fatalism, or realist heroism, proves adequate to the event.

Early reviewers sometimes dismissed the Tralfamadore material as a lapse into whimsy, out of keeping with the novel’s serious historical subject. Darko Suvin’s theory of science fiction suggests a more useful reading. Suvin defines science fiction as a literature of “cognitive estrangement,” in which a fictional novum—some element that violates the norms of the author’s empirical world—is introduced not for escape but to defamiliarize the reader’s assumptions, producing “a creative approach tending toward a dynamic transformation rather than a static mirroring of the author’s environment” (Suvin 10). The Tralfamadorians, who perceive time spatially rather than sequentially and treat human free will as a parochial curiosity, function exactly as this kind of novum. They estrange the ordinary beliefs that death is final, that causality governs experience, and that individual choice carries moral weight. This estrangement is not incidental to the novel’s handling of Dresden; it is the mechanism that makes an otherwise unspeakable event approachable at all. Vonnegut’s own narrator says as much: there is “nothing intelligent to say about a massacre” in the register of direct historical statement (Ch. 1). The science-fictional frame offers an oblique route around that limit rather than through it.

Vonnegut doubles this device through Kilgore Trout, the failed science-fiction novelist who recurs throughout the book, his paperbacks glimpsed in dirty-

bookstore windows, lurid covers hiding philosophically serious content nobody bothers to read. Trout's fiction, like Vonnegut's own Tralfamadore material, carries ideas too destabilizing for realist treatment, packaged in a genre the culture treats as disposable. That Billy—and arguably Vonnegut himself—takes refuge in a scorned genre to process an atrocity “serious” literature has failed to represent is itself a collapse of a grand narrative: the assumption that realist, canonical form is the only legitimate vehicle for historical truth-telling. Suvin's framework helps explain why the novel's most fantastical material is also its most historically serious: cognitive estrangement lets Vonnegut approach Dresden's violence through a detour that direct, mimetic narration simply forecloses.

None of this—the intrusive authorial frame, the scrambled chronology, the absurdist refrain—should be read as ornament laid over an otherwise conventional war story. Taken together, these choices form the novel's central ethical argument: that the Dresden firebombing, and mass atrocity more broadly, cannot be honestly told through the narrative conventions that grand narratives depend on—chronological causality, heroic agency, redemptive closure. Vonnegut's confessions of failure, his citation of official history only to puncture it with bathos, his breaking of Billy's testimony into disconnected “clumps” of scene: all of this performs what Hutcheon calls postmodernism's signature move of “installing and then undermining” the very forms it borrows (Hutcheon 8). The novel ends where it told us it would end, back in chapter one: with birdsong, “Poo-tee-weet?” (Ch. 10), the same non-statement Vonnegut had already named as “all there is to say about a massacre” (Ch. 1). There is no summation on offer. The collapse of narrative authority is, in the end, the novel's most honest formal achievement.

It is worth noting that Vonnegut's later self-assessment runs against the persistent modesty of the novel itself. In the autobiographical collage *Palm Sunday*, he grades his own body of work on an A-to-F scale and gives *Slaughterhouse-Five* the only A-plus in his corpus (*Palm Sunday* 311). That suggests the “failure” he claims for the book within its own pages is itself another instance of the ironic, self-undermining voice this article has been tracing all along. Later reference works agree. Susan Farrell's literary companion and Donald E. Morse's study of the Vonnegut corpus both treat the novel's

fragmentation as an argument in its own right rather than an evasion of its subject, and both point to it as one of the most frequently cited instances in American letters of form doing the work of historical claim-making (Farrell 233; Morse 55–58). *Slaughterhouse-Five* does not fail to tell Dresden's story. It refuses, on principle, to tell it the way a war story is supposed to be told—and that refusal is the argument.

References

- Bloom, Harold, editor. Kurt Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse-Five*. Chelsea House, 2001.
- Broer, Lawrence R. *Sanity Plea: Schizophrenia in the Novels of Kurt Vonnegut*. UMI Research Press, 1989.
- Camus, Albert. *The Myth of Sisyphus*. Translated by Justin O'Brien, Vintage International, 1991.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Farrell, Susan Elizabeth. *Critical Companion to Kurt Vonnegut: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work*. Facts on File, 2008.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. Routledge, 1988.
- Klinkowitz, Jerome. *Slaughterhouse-Five: Reforming the Novel and the World*. Twayne Publishers, 1990.
- . *Vonnegut in Fact: The Public Spokesmanship of Personal Fiction*. University of South Carolina Press, 1998.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi, University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- McHale, Brian. *Postmodernist Fiction*. Methuen, 1987.
- Merrill, Robert, and Peter A. Scholl. "Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse-Five*: The Requirements of Chaos." *Studies in American Fiction*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1978, pp. 65–76.
- Morse, Donald E. *The Novels of Kurt Vonnegut: Imagining Being an American*. Prager, 2003.

- Reed, Peter J. Kurt Vonnegut Jr. Warner Paperback Library, 1972.
- Suvin, Darko. *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. Yale University Press, 1979.
- Tanner, Tony. *City of Words: American Fiction 1950–1970*. Harper & Row, 1971.
- Vees-Gulani, Susanne. "Diagnosing Billy Pilgrim: A Psychiatric Approach to Kurt Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse-Five*." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, vol. 44, no. 2, 2003, pp. 175–184.
- Vonnegut, Kurt. *Palm Sunday: An Autobiographical Collage*. Delacorte Press, 1981.
- . *Slaughterhouse-Five*. Delacorte Press, 1969.
- Waugh, Patricia. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. Methuen, 1984.

Hariom Singh

Dr. Hariom Singh is an Assistant Professor of English at Hindu College, Moradabad. He completed his graduation, post-graduation, and Ph.D. in English at Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh. His academic interests centre on African-American studies, Black feminism, race studies, postcolonial studies, and literary theory as a broader category.

Author Declaration

The authors hereby declare and certify that:

1. **Originality:** This manuscript is an original work and has not been previously published, nor is it under consideration for publication elsewhere in the same or substantially similar form at the time of submission.
2. **Authorship and Responsibility:** All listed authors have made substantial scholarly contributions to the conception, preparation, revision, and approval of the final manuscript. All authors accept full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, integrity, and scientific content of the work and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the publication.
3. **Research Integrity:** The authors affirm that all data, results, interpretations, figures, tables, and references presented in this manuscript are accurate, authentic, and reported honestly to the best of their knowledge. All sources have been appropriately acknowledged and cited.
4. **Ethics Compliance:** Where applicable, the study was conducted in accordance with relevant ethical principles and approved by the appropriate Institutional

Review Board (IRB) or Ethics Committee. All applicable ethical guidelines, institutional approvals, participant protections, informed consent requirements, and legal or regulatory requirements have been fulfilled. For studies not involving human participants, animals, or sensitive personal data, ethical approval and informed consent were not required.

5. **Funding:** All sources of financial support have been fully disclosed in the manuscript. Where no external funding was received, this research was conducted without specific financial support from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency.
6. **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that all financial and non-financial competing interests have been disclosed. Where no such interests exist, the authors declare that they have no known conflicts of interest that could have influenced the work reported in this manuscript.
7. **Data Availability and Record Retention:** Data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, where applicable. For theoretical or review-based manuscripts, this statement is not applicable. The corresponding author further agrees to retain the original research records, underlying data, ethical approvals, permissions, AI-use disclosures, and other supporting documents for a reasonable period after publication and to provide them to the Editor upon reasonable request for verification.
8. **Artificial Intelligence (AI) Disclosure:** Any Artificial Intelligence (AI) or Generative AI tools used during manuscript preparation, where applicable, were limited to language editing, grammar correction, formatting, translation assistance, or improving readability. AI tools were not used to generate research data, perform scientific analyses, interpret scientific findings, formulate scientific conclusions, or replace the authors' intellectual contributions. All AI-assisted content was critically reviewed, verified, and approved by the authors. The authors accept full responsibility for the originality, accuracy, and integrity of the manuscript. No AI tool has been listed as an author.
9. **Similarity Index:** The authors certify that the manuscript has been screened for textual similarity and that the overall similarity index is below **10%** (excluding references, quotations, and standard bibliographic material), in accordance with accepted academic publishing standards.
10. **Copyright and Permissions:** The authors confirm that all necessary permissions have been obtained for any copyrighted material included in the manuscript and that, to the best of their knowledge, the work does not infringe upon the intellectual property rights of any individual, organization, or third party.
11. **Publication Ethics:** The authors confirm that this manuscript complies with internationally accepted standards of research integrity and publication ethics. The manuscript is original, has not been published previously, and is not under consideration elsewhere. The authors acknowledge that, if credible evidence of plagiarism, duplicate publication, data fabrication or falsification, image manipulation, copyright infringement, authorship misconduct, citation manipulation, paper mill involvement, undisclosed conflicts of interest, inappropriate or undisclosed AI use, or any other serious ethical violation is identified before or after publication, the journal reserves the right to investigate the matter and, where appropriate, reject, withdraw, correct, or retract the manuscript or published article and notify the relevant institutions, funding agencies, or regulatory authorities.

12. **Editorial Rights:** The Editorial Board reserves the right to request original research data, ethical approvals, informed consent documentation (where applicable), AI-use disclosures, copyright permissions, or any other supporting documentation at any stage of the editorial, peer-review, publication, or Post-Publication process to verify the authenticity, validity, and integrity of the submitted or published work.

