

**「International Journal of Korean Unification Studies」
Code of Ethical Behavior**

Established November 5, 2007

Revised March 1, 2008

Clause 1 Code of Ethical Behavior for Author(s)

Article 1 (Plagiarism)

The author should not present research results, arguments, or ideas from other sources as if it were their own. It is possible to clearly identify or refer to an original source of research results produced by someone else, however using or copying the ideas or work that are not your own without proper citation is considered plagiarism.

Article 2 (Publishing Contributions)

- ① The author is personally responsible for and only takes credit for research they have carried out or that they have directly contributed to. These cases are acknowledged as contributions.
- ② The order of authors or translators in publications should reflect the level of contributions they make regardless of social or peer status. A certain position in a social or peer hierarchy should not lead to authorship or justify them as the main author of a manuscript. It is also inappropriate to exclude someone based on social or peer status as a co-author or co-researcher despite their personal contributions to a body of work. Even minor contributions to writing (translation) work should be appropriately recognized in the form of footnotes, forewords, and acknowledgements.

Article 3 (Duplicate Submissions)

If an author submits an identical piece of writing, which is under consideration by another publication prior to a final publication decision, it is the responsibility of the author to prevent redundant publications as soon as notification of the first publication is received.

Article 4 (Overlapping Publication or Redundant Publication)

The author should not attempt to publish any previously published work as new research. If the author desires to republish research, the author must inform the details of the previous publication to the editors of the new journal under consideration. Prior permission must be granted based on a decision of whether previously published work is considered an overlapping publication or redundant publication.

Article 5 (Quotations and References)

- ① Quotations from open academic materials should be marked as accurately as possible, and the source of any material that is not considered part of the public

domain should be disclosed. Materials acquired through personal contact or in the process of manuscript review or evaluation for research proposal can be quoted or used only after the consent of the researcher who initially provided the material.

- ② When an author uses references or quotations from writings or ideas produced by others, they must disclose the source through footnotes (or endnotes). In this way, an author should provide the reader the ability to clearly distinguish original ideas, arguments, or interpretation from the research results of a previous author.

Article 6 (Subject of Review)

The Journal Editorial Committee has the authority to clarify allegations of plagiarism in writing under the process of review or previously published manuscripts suspected of plagiarism.

Article 7 (Appeal and Formal Objection Procedure)

- ① If the author objects to a decision by the Journal Editorial Committee they can apply for re-review through the newly formed evaluation committee.
- ② The newly formed evaluation committee is organized by the Journal Editorial Committee. The Journal Editorial Committee shall provide a list of the formal evaluation committee members to the author, who wishes to file an appeal.
- ③ The presence of the author is requested for a meeting of the newly formed evaluation committee, and an opportunity to defend themselves should be granted in front of the newly formed evaluation committee.

Article 8 (Punishment for Violations)

The Journal Editorial Committee is authorized to punish authors who violate the Code of Ethical Behavior through the following:

- ① Full or partial retrieval (refund) of honorarium for manuscript publication
- ② One to three-year ban of manuscript submission depending on the severity of the violation
- ③ Announcement of violations on the Code of Ethical Behavior via the intra and Internet webpage
- ④ Retraction of the manuscript from the Internet webpage

Article 9 (Manuscript Revision)

The author has a responsibility to accept the reviews by manuscript reviewers, and shall make an honest effort to reflect the comments and suggestions of reviewers in accordance with the review results. If the author disagrees with the opinions of the reviewers, they must provide a well-grounded basis and reasons for disagreement to the Journal Editorial Committee.

Clause 2 Code of Ethical Behavior for Editors

Article 1 Editors are fully responsible for deciding on manuscript publications and are to respect the character and independence of every author as being a scholar.

Article 2 Editors shall handle all the submitted manuscripts with fairness and impartiality solely based on the quality level of manuscripts and submission guidelines.

Article 3

- ① Editors shall select and choose reviewers equipped with expertise in relevant fields and the ability to make impartial assessments. Editors shall not choose manuscript reviewers on the basis of friendship nor exclude them on the basis of personal animosity for the purpose of conducting an unbiased and objective review.
- ② In case Editors submit a manuscript, they are strictly prohibited from reviewing the manuscripts of other submitters. Also they shall be excluded in the process of selecting manuscript reviewers, and the name of reviewers for their manuscripts should be kept confidential throughout the editorial procedure.

Article 4 Editors shall maintain confidentiality over the contents of a manuscript and must not disclose the name of an author while they are under the process of evaluation, particularly until the matter of publication is decided upon.

Clause 3 Code of Ethical Behavior for Reviewers

Article 1 Self-review, or reviewing personal manuscripts, is strictly prohibited.

Article 2 Reviewers should carry out manuscript reviews with sincerity and honesty within a given deadline and notify the Editors (or The Journal Editorial Committee) of the review results as requested. If the reviewer considers themselves inappropriate for the requested manuscript review, they must immediately inform the Editors (or The Journal Editorial Committee).

Article 3 Reviewers ought to evaluate manuscripts with impartiality based on objective criteria as provided in the evaluation form. The reviewer shall not reject a manuscript without providing sufficient or a well-grounded logic. In addition, they must refrain from rejecting a manuscript due to a conflict of interest based on a personal perspective or interpretation. In addition, the reviewer must conduct a manuscript review based on a thorough examination.

Article 4 Reviewers must respect the character and independence of an author based on professional courtesy. While stating independent opinions or comments in the evaluation form, the reviewer must provide detailed explanations or suggestions for the author if they think the manuscript needs revisions.

Article 5 Reviewers are obliged to keep evaluated manuscript and review results confidential. Except for the case of seeking advice from others for manuscript review, the reviewers should not show or discuss the manuscript with others. In addition, reviewers should not quote from the manuscript without the consent of the author prior to journal publication.

Additional Clauses

- ① (Date of Enforcement) This guiding regulations are effective as of November 5, 2007.
- ② (Transition Provisions) Matters implemented prior to the enforcement date of these guiding regulations are considered to be implemented in accordance with on-going regulations.

Additional Clauses

- ① (Date of Enforcement) This guiding regulations are effective as of March 1, 2008.