

Enacted on May 1, 2008

Revised on July 1, 2016

Revised on Jan. 1, 2017

Regulation on the research ethics of Korean Society of Physical Medicine (KSPM)

Chapter 1 General provisions

Article 1 (Objectives)

This regulation is to specify the matters which are required to establish the ethics on the research made by the researchers whose papers are to be published on the journal of KSPM ("the Journal"), prevent them from doing any research misconduct in advance and, if there is any misconduct, make the fair and systematic verification.

Article 2 (Target of application)

This regulation applies to the members who do the research in the KSPM.

Article 3 (Scope of application)

The regulation applies to the ethics and verification of authenticity of the research unless otherwise specified in other laws.

Chapter 2 Regulation on research ethics

Article 4 (Scope of research misconduct)

The research misconduct ("Misconduct") include the forgery, falsification, plagiarism and irregular marking of author, including the followings.

"Forgery" means the production of false data or research results.

"Falsification" means the distortion or twist of the research contents or results by artificially manipulating of research materials, equipment or process or randomly modifying or deleting the data.

"Plagiarism" is the act which steals the other person's idea, research contents or research results without any justifiable approve or citation. If the paper to be published in the Journal is the summary or abstract of any academic papers, it shall disclose the original paper and authors, stating that "this is the summary or abstract of the paper written by ____" at its notes.

"Unfair marking of author" means the acts of not granting the qualification of author who has contributed to the research contents or results without any justifiable reason or the acts of granting the qualification of author for the reason of showing appreciation for the person who has not made any academic contribution to the research.

"Life ethics related research" means the following researches.

- ① Research on human body which may objectively damages the human body
- ② Research using the personal information on diseases
- ③ Researches on the sample related to the human body part or
- ④ Researches which could cause the ethical problems.

"Violation of life ethics" is the act conducted on the research falling on (2) above by the researcher (first author of the paper) without the approval of the research editing committee of that entity.

"Informant" is the person who reports the fact or evidence of misconduct to the editing committee of the Journal.

"Suspect or target researcher" is the person who is targeted for investigation due to the suspected misconduct, violation of life ethics or others. This does not include witness.

"Preliminary investigation" means the procedure which is conducted to decide whether the public investigation is needed to the suspected misconduct or violation of life ethics.

"Main investigation" means the procedure to verify the misconduct or violation of life ethics.

"Judgment" is the confirmation of the investigation result and notifying that to both the informant and the suspect.

Article 5 (Scope of application)

This regulation applies to the person who is directly or indirectly related to the researches for the paper which is applied to be posted in the Journal.

Article 6 (Plagiarism)

The author shall not put the researches or arguments which he did not research on his paper or book as if they are the result of his own researches or arguments. It is possible to quote or cite the other author's research results in the paper with the original source and author. But, if he suggests them as his own research results or argument without citation, it is the plagiarism.

The author shall not falsely make the research data which does not exist (forgery) nor artificially manipulate the research process, or modify or delete them randomly to twist or distort the research contents or results.

Article 7 (Marking of the accomplishment)

① The author is responsible for the researches he actually conducted or contributed as the author or is recognized of his accomplishment of them.

② The authors and the order of authors written in the paper or other publications shall be accurately reflected depending on the contribution to the research regardless of their

relative positions. It is not justifiable that a person is recognized as the 1st author simply because he has higher position. On the other hand, the person who has contributed to the researched but has not be recorded as the joint author (translator) or joint researchers also cannot be justified. The appreciation for the small contribution to the researches or writing (translation) shall be properly expressed in the form of note, premise or acknowledgement section.

Article 8 (Dual posting or publication of research results)

The author shall not try to publish or post his research results which was published before (including the paper which is planned for posting or under review process). If an author wants to publish the research results which was published before, he shall provide the editors of the Journal with the information on the previous publication and check if the new publication falls on the dual posting or dual publication.

Article 9 (Marking of citation and reference)

The author shall try to described the citation accurately if he tries to cite the published academic data and shall disclose the source of the data unless it falls on the scope of common sense. If the data is the evaluation of a paper or research plan or is obtained from the personal contact, it can be cited in the paper with the approval of the researcher who provided the information.

Article 10 (Amendment of the paper)

The author shall try to accept the opinion of the editing member or judges suggested during the evaluation of the paper if possible and reflect it on the paper. If the author does not agree on their opinion, he shall write down its ground and inform the editing member (committee) of that.

Article 11 (Ethics for editing member)

- ① The editing member shall take all responsibility for decision as to whether the applied paper is to be posted or published or not and respect the personality and scholarly independence of the author.
- ② The editing member shall fairly handle the papers applied for the posting on the Journal in terms of quality of the papers according to the regulation on the application ignoring the sex, age, department of the author as well as any prejudice against the author or personal friendliness with the author.
- ③ The editing member shall ask the judges who have the specific knowledge and fair capacity of determination to conduct the review of the applied paper. In the request for the review, the editing member shall try to avoid the judges who have the excessive friendly relation with the author or the sense of hate against the author in order to make the objective evaluation possible. If there are a big difference in opinion between judges, the editing member may ask a third expert for advice.
- ④ The editing member shall not disclose the information on the author or the contents of the paper to any third parties except the judges.

Article 12 Ethical provisions for judges

- ① The judge shall sincerely evaluate the paper asked by the editing member (committee) of the Journal within the period specified in the regulation on review and inform the editing member (committee) of the evaluation results. If the judge thinks that he is not proper for the evaluation, he shall inform that fact to the editing member (committee) immediately.
- ② The judge shall make the fair and objective evaluation of the paper by not getting involved in the individual's academic belief and his relation to the author of the paper. He shall not disqualify the paper without specifying the sufficient ground, or on the

ground that the author's view or interpretation is in conflict with that of his own or without fully reading the paper.

③ The judge shall respect the personality and independency of the author as the professional. In the evaluation opinion sheet, the judge shall disclose his own judgment on the paper and described what is more required in the paper in details and the reasons thereof. The judge shall use the polite and soft expression and shall not use the offending or insulting expressions.

④ The judge shall keep the papers confidential. Unless the judge asks other experts for advice, he shall not show the paper to other people and discuss with other on the paper. In addition, until the paper is published on the journal, he shall not quote the contents of the paper without the approval of the author.

Chapter 3 Installation and operation of research ethics committee

Article 13 (Ethics committee)

The research ethics committee is installed in order to help the researchers of the Association to get the research ethics and verify any dispute related to the research misconduct. The committee make the deliberation and decision on the following matters.

- ① Establishment and operation of research ethics and authenticity related systems
- ② Receipt of the report on misconduct and return of the verification results
- ③ Start of the preliminary investigations and main investigations
- ④ Protection of informant and recovery of reputation for person subject to the investigation
- ⑤ Treatment of the result of the preliminary investigation and main investigation and their follow-up actions

⑥ Matters proposed by the president of the committee

Article 14 (Organization)

① The committee is made up with 4 persons including chief editor, editing member and expert member.

② President or the ethics committee: He is appointed by the president of the Association among the chief editor or members with the second of the chief editor. The outside member of the committee may be additionally appointed by the president of the Association among the members with the second of the president of the committee.

③ The secretary of the committee is appointed by the president for the administrative support.

④ The president may appoint an expert member as agreed by committee.

Article 15 (Obligations by president)

① President represents the committee and presides over the meeting.

② The chief editor takes place of the president when the president is absent due to the unavoidable causes.

Article 16 (Operation of the ethics committee)

① The committee is called by the president if the president thinks that it is necessary.

② The meeting of committee is established with the attendance of 2/3 of the members and the resolution is passed with the affirmative votes of the majority of attending members.

③ The member who is involved in the target paper cannot attend the evaluation of the paper.

④ The member shall keep all matters related to the evaluation confidential.

If the president thinks that the matter is insignificant, the evaluation may be made on documents.

Article 17 (Research procedure and actions)

- ① The researcher may conduct the research on the matters which pass the editing committee of his department.
- ② The paper submitted for the evaluation shall describe the matters specified in 1 above and if they are not written, the paper is considered to violate the life ethics and cannot get the evaluation.

Chapter 4 Procedure for solving the doubtful misconduct

Article 18 (Report and filing)

The informant may report any misconduct to the ethics committee of the Association, using any possible means such as oral, written, telephone or email in his/her own name.

Article 19 (Method of preliminary investigation)

As soon as the report is filed, the president of the ethics committee shall call the ethics committee immediately and have the members check the reporting documents to find out if the report is related to the misconduct and if the reporting contents are specific and clear enough to conduct the preliminary investigation and if the period of the target misconduct has passed 5 years. Then, it implements the following processes.

- ① The committee informs the report to the applicable researchers and makes him submit the explanatory materials.
- ② If the researcher admits his misconduct, the committee makes the determination without undergoing the investigation process.
- ③ If the research does not admit the misconduct, the main investigation starts.

- ④ If the preliminary investigation decides not to conduct the main investigation, the committee shall inform the informant of the specific reason on within 10 days after the decision unless the reporting is made anonymously.
- ⑤ If the informant does not accept the result of the preliminary investigation, he may submit the complaint with the ethics committee within 10 days after notified.
- ⑥ The preliminary investigation shall be completed within 10 days after receipt of the reporting and the result shall be reported to the president of the Association and the chief editor.

Article 20 (Method for main investigation)

The president of ethics committee starts the following procedure within 10 days after the researcher does not accept the misconduct in order to check the misconduct. The main investigations will focus on the contents of the reporting, suspected misconduct, role and suspicion of the target researcher on the research task, evidences and witnesses, complaints made by the informant or the target researcher on the investigation results, the deliberation and handling results and the record of the investigation results, etc.

- ① The ethics committee is called and the investigation is asked for the authenticity of the research performance based on the reported contents and explanatory documents.
- ② Once the president of the ethics committee receives the opinion sheet from the judges, he shall inform that to the informant and the target researcher and have them submit any complaints on it. If any complaints are not filed, he can consider that there is no complaint.
- ③ The president of ethics committee has the judges check the judge's opinion sheet, the informant's complaint, the researcher's deliberation documents and get the opinions

from them before making the final decision on the misconduct. He shall report the decision to the president of the Association, who then inform the result to the informant and the target researcher.

Chapter Principle in the investigation of misconduct

Article 21 (Request of attendance and submission of documents)

- ① The ethics committee may ask the informant, target researcher or witness to attend the hearing for making statement.
- ② The ethics committee may ask the target researcher to submit the documents.
- ③ The target researcher asked for the attendance and submission of document as described in 1 and 2 above shall comply with the request.

Article 22 (Protection of the right of informant and target researcher and confidentiality)

- ① In any case, the identity of the informant shall not be disclosed and the name of the informant shall not be written on the investigation report for the protection of informant unless it is required.
- ② Until the investigation of the misconduct is completed, the prestige or right of the target researcher shall be kept. If the target researcher is found to have no problem, the committee makes effort to recover the prestige of the researcher.
- ③ If the informant makes the reporting while knowing that the contents of reporting are false or being able to know that they are false, he is not the target for protection of rights.

Article 23 (Complaints and deliberation)

The ethics committee shall make sure that the informant or the target researcher has the right of submitting complaints or right of making their own statement.

Chapter 6 Confirmation and re-deliberation of the misconduct

Article 24 (Notification to the target researcher)

The president of the Association shall prepare the decision made by the ethics committee on the investigation results in writing and notify it to the informant and the target researcher immediately.

Article 25 (Confirmation of misconduct)

If the target researcher does not file any complaint within 20 days of receipt of the decision sheet, it is confirmed that he made the misconduct.

Article 26 (Complaints)

The informant or the target researcher may file a written complaint stating the reason of complaint with the ethics committee within 10 days of the receipt of the decision sheet if either party does not accept the decision made by the ethics committee.

Article 27 (Re-deliberation)

The ethics committee shall make the deliberation again on the matters to which the complaint is filed.

Chapter 7 Follow-up after misconduct

Article 28 (Actions based on the results)

① If any misconduct is found in the evaluation of the reported paper, the review would be immediately stopped and the fact should be informed to the researcher.

② If the misconduct is confirmed on the paper, the following actions are to be taken.

- The paper is cancelled and the fact is reported to the head of the group to which the research belongs and recommend him to take the disciplinary action.

- The fact of misconduct specified in 1 above is posted on the journal.

- The first author and corresponding author are not allowed to post their paper in the Journal for 3 years.
 - The co-author of the paper is not allowed to post his paper on the Journal for 2 years.
- ③ If the target research is asked to attend the hearing or submit the documents as specified in 1 or 2 above, he shall comply with that request.

Article 29 (Storage and disclosure of record)

The record related to the investigation would be retained by Ethics Committee for 5 years after the end of investigation.

Chapter 8 Miscellaneous

Article 30 (Mutatis mutandis)

Any matters which are related to the verification of research authenticity but are not specified in this regulation shall follow the laws and regulation related to the national research authenticity.

Additional provisions

This regulation takes effective on May 1, 2008.

The revision of this regulation takes effective on July 1, 2016.

The revision of this regulation takes effective on Jan. 1, 2017.