

# Guidelines for Operating the *Journal of Rural Development* (Extract)

Established in November 2016

## Chapter 1. General Rules

**Article 1 (Purpose)** These guidelines aim to provide the details regarding the publication and management of an academic journal, the *Journal of Rural Development* (hereafter *JRD*), according to the Rules for Issuing Publications of the Korea Rural Economic Institute (hereafter 'Institute').

**Article 2 (Purpose of Publication)** The *JRD* is published to achieve the following objectives.

1. Contribute to the academic development in the economy of agriculture, forestry, and food and the rural sector in Korea
2. Promote the development and exchange of knowledge and information related to policies for the economy of agriculture, forestry, and food and the rural sector
3. Establish an academic foundation for the development of the economy of agriculture, forestry, and food and the rural sector

## Chapter 2. Operation of the Editorial Board

**Article 3 (Purpose)** The Editorial Board is established and operated to be in charge of all the matters necessary to publish the *JRD*.

**Article 4 (Composition and Term of Office)** ① The Editorial Board consists of 10-20 members in and outside the Institute, including the chairperson, and a secretary. The Director of Planning & Coordination is an ex officio member.

② The President of the Institute appoints the chairperson among research directors or outside experts, and can designate a distinguished overseas scholar in the related field as co-chairperson.

③ The President of the Institute appoints employees of the Institute or outside experts as board members, and appoints one of the people in charge of publishing as secretary.

④ The term of the chairperson and board members is two years, and they can be reappointed. If they cannot perform their duties due to unavoidable circumstances, they can be replaced during their term of office.

**Article 5 (Roles of Editorial Board)** The following are major roles of the Editorial Board:

1. Review of the rules for submission and examination of papers
2. Receipt of submitted papers
3. Decision as to whether a submitted paper is worthy of examination
4. Selection of referees and request for examination
5. Decision as to whether a submitted paper will be published
6. Matters related to editing and publication
7. Other matters necessary for publication and matters for which the President of the Institute recognizes the necessity.

### Chapter 3. Publication

**Article 7 (Publication)** The *JRD* is published in Korean four times a year, on March 21, June 21, September 21, and December 21. If many papers in English are submitted, a special issue in English can be published once or twice a year.

**Article 8 (Submission and Examination of Manuscript)** ① A submitted manuscript should comply with the examination guidelines of the *JRD*, and the Editorial Board decides whether the manuscript will be published, according to the procedure specified in the guidelines.

② The office in charge of publication performs other related tasks through discussion.

**Article 9 (Manuscript Fees and Review Fees)** ① If a manuscript submitted by an outside author is approved for publication, the author can be paid a manuscript fee which the Institute decided.

② If an outside referee reviews a submitted paper, he or she can be paid a review fee which the Institute decided.

**Article 10 (Publication Rights and Profit)** The Institute holds the publication rights of a paper published in the *JRD*, and the paper cannot be reproduced or reprinted in any languages without prior approval of the President of the Institute. Matters regarding the transfer and lending of publication rights are decided by the *JRD* Editorial Board.

**Article 14 (Order of Publication of Papers)** ① The Editorial Board decides the order of publication of selected papers.

② If papers accepted for publication are too many to be published in one issue, some of them can be published in the next issue.

**Article 15 (Certificate of Acceptance)** If a submitted paper is accepted for publication through

h the final examination and the author requests its certification before publication, a Certificate of Acceptance can be issued.

#### Chapter 4. Manuscript Submission

**Article 16 (Qualifications for Manuscript Submission and Contents of Manuscript)** ① Anyone can submit his or her manuscript.

② Submitted manuscripts should be academic papers in Korean or English on topics including the economy of agriculture, forestry, and food, rural society and welfare, regional development, and international trade policy.

**Article 17 (Length of Manuscript)** ① The length of a manuscript should not exceed 20 A4-size pages (40 characters, 25 lines in Korean; 80 characters, 26 lines in English), including an abstract and references, according to the format specified in the Manuscript Preparation Instruction.

② Manuscripts should be prepared according to the attached Guidelines for Manuscript Submission to the *JRD*.

**Article 18 (Prohibition of Redundant Submission and Publication)** A paper which was published or is under examination in another academic journal at home or abroad should not be submitted to the *JRD*. A manuscript which was disapproved for publication in the *JRD* cannot be resubmitted to the journal. Also, a paper published in the *JRD* cannot be reproduced in another publication discretionally.

**Article 19 (Indication of Authorship)** If a paper is written by two or more authors, the first author should be indicated first among the authors, and the other authors should be listed in order of their contribution to the writing of the paper.

**Article 20 (Receipt of Manuscript)** ① Manuscripts for the *JRD* are received all year round.

② The file of a manuscript should be sent to the following e-mail address: journal@krei.re.kr.

③ Submitted manuscripts will not be returned.

**Article 21 (Transfer of Copyright)** The copyright of a manuscript accepted for publication is transferred to the Institute, and the author of the manuscript shall sign and submit a form. The Institute holds the rights to publish, distribute, or print the manuscript in another medium.

## Chapter 5. Examination

**Article 23 (Appointment of Referees and Sending of Manuscript)** ① For every submitted manuscript, the chairperson of the Editorial Board appoints three referees among the candidates recommended by board members. The candidate referees must be experts in the field concerned.

② In selecting the referees, high regard should be given to fully consider the academic speciality concerned and secure fairness in the examination process.

③ The personal information of the author cannot be disclosed in the manuscript under examination.

**Article 24 (Examination of Manuscript)** ① The referee should disclose his or her assessment of a submitted manuscript by marking it with one of the following four grades: 'approve,' 'approve after revision,' 'reexamination after revision,' or 'disapprove.' In addition, the referee must prepare a referee report and submit it to the Editorial Board by a given date.

② If there arises a need to advise a revision of the manuscript, the referee must specifically state the contents to be revised.

③ If the referee wishes to grade the manuscript as 'disapprove,' he or she must state the reason in detail.

**Article 25 (Examination Criteria)** ① The referee should review the manuscript according to the following criteria:

1. Originality: Is the research topic or the method of analysis and approach new and original?
2. Suitability of Research Method: Are the topic, methods of analysis, and approaches appropriate?
3. Logic and Consistency of Reasoning: Are the composition and reasoning logical and appropriate?
4. Feasibility and Objectivity of Analysis and Assessment: Is the analysis valid and based on reliable and objective data?
5. Academic Contribution: Is the research expected to contribute to academic progress?
6. Accurateness: Are bibliographical materials and data correctly quoted and referenced?

7. Completeness of Composition Elements: Does the manuscript have all the necessary composition elements, such as keywords, abstract in Korean or English, introduction, body, conclusion, and references?

8. Adherence to the Code of Ethics: Did the author observe the research ethics specified in Chapter 6?

**Article 26 (Management of Examination Results)** ① If the referee's assessment turns out to be 'reexamination after revision,' then the Editorial Board should request the author to amend the manuscript and submit a reply in response to the referee report. The Board should ask for reexamination when it receives the reply and the revised manuscript.

② If the referee's assessment is 'approve after revision,' then the Board should request the author to revise the manuscript and submit a reply in response to the referee report. In this case, the revised manuscript shall be reviewed by the same referee.

③ If the referee gives a 'disapprove' grade, then the same referee should be exempt from the reexamination task.

**Article 27 (Appraisal of Examination Results)** ① Referees should examine the manuscript and grade the initial examination result into one of the following four categories:

1. Approve: good to be published as it is.
2. Approve after revision: needs a partial revision for publication.
3. Reexamination after revision: the same referee needs to reexamine after revision.
4. Disapprove: not suitable for publication.

② The final assessment of a manuscript should be made according to the grade table as shown below. If the assessment falls into the category of 'approve' or 'approve after revision,' then the manuscript will be published in the journal. However, if the appraisal is 'disapprove,' then the Editorial Board should inform the author of the decision and the reason for the decision.

③ If the result of the first comprehensive examination is 'reexamination after revision,' then reexamination must proceed.

④ If the author of a manuscript rejects revision of his or her manuscript or a reply in resp

onse to referees' opinions or does not submit a revised paper within 30 days for reexamination, the reexamination result is 'disapprove.'

- ⑤ The result of a reexamination shall be classified into either one of the following grades: 'approve,' 'approve after revision,' or 'disapprove.' Once the appraisal grade is given at this stage, the decision will be final.
- ⑥ The Editorial Board makes a decision on publication of a manuscript by considering all three referees' reports. The manuscripts to be considered for publication are the ones whose total grade is marked as 'approve' or 'approve after revision' as shown in the grade table below.
- ⑦ If the comprehensive assessment of a manuscript is 'approve' or 'approve after revision' but one referee grades the manuscript as 'disapprove,' then the Editorial Board can request the author to make revisions to the manuscript. The Editorial Board can also place the manuscript on the waiting list for the next issue.
- ⑧ If the manuscript that has passed the screening is found to have plagiarized all or part of another person's manuscript, or has already been published in another academic journal, then the Board should revoke the decision to publish the manuscript and handle the matter according to Chapter 6.

※ Grade Table

Referee 1	Referee 2	Referee 3	Final Grade
Approve	Approve	Approve	Approve
Approve	Approve	Approve after revision	
Approve	Approve	Reexam after revision	
Approve	Approve	Disapprove	
Approve after revision	Approve after revision	Approve	Approve after revision
Approve after revision	Approve after revision	Approve after revision	
Approve after revision	Approve after revision	Reexam after revision	
Approve after revision	Approve after revision	Disapprove	
Approve after revision	Approve	Reexam after revision	
Approve after revision	Approve	Disapprove	
Reexam after revision	Reexam after revision	Approve	Reexam after revision
Reexam after revision	Reexam after revision	Approve after revision	
Reexam after revision	Reexam after revision	Reexam after revision	
Reexam after revision	Reexam after revision	Disapprove	
Reexam after revision	Approve	Disapprove	
Reexam after revision	Approve after revision	Disapprove	
Disapprove	Disapprove	Disapprove	Disapprove
Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve	
Disapprove	Disapprove	Approve after revision	
Disapprove	Disapprove	Reexam after revision	

**Article 28 (Presentation of Dissenting Opinion)** ① The author who does not agree with the referee report, including the request for revision and the reason for reexamination, can express a dissenting opinion in writing to the Editorial Board. In doing so, the author has to present sufficient reasons for the argument or empirical cases.

② The Editorial Board must review and deal with the author's contention. Also, the Board can act as an anonymous mediator between the referee and the author. If the gap between the differing views of the two remains unresolved, the Board shall make a final decision as to the validity of the arguments.

③ The Editorial Board holds the right to dismiss any additional contention once the final decision is made.

**Article 29 (Protection of Personal Information)** The personal information obtained from the examination cannot be disclosed to anybody except the Editorial Board.

**Article 30 (Other Issues of Concern)** Decisions on issues that have not been touched upon in the guidelines shall be made by the Editorial Board.

## Chapter 6. Research Ethics

**Article 31 (Purpose)** This chapter aims to establish the standards of research ethics, which authors who want to publish their papers, Editorial Board members, referees, and Research Ethics Committee members should comply with, concerning the publication of the *JRD*, the academic journal published by the Institute.

**Article 32 (Subjects of Application)** This chapter shall apply to an author who wants to publish his or her paper in the *JRD* (hereafter 'submitter'), Editorial Board members, referees, and Research Ethics Committee members.

**Article 33 (Definition of Research Misconduct and Scope of Application)** ① Research misconduct (hereafter 'misconduct') includes fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, unrighteous indication of authorship, and redundant publication as follows in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Misconduct does not include error, a minor mistake, or differences of opinion.

1. 'Fabrication' means making up data or research results and recording or reporting them.
2. 'Falsification' refers to distorting research contents or results by manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or by changing or omitting data or research results.
3. 'Plagiarism' means the appropriation of another person's ideas, logic, unique terms, data, analytic systems and so on that are not general knowledge without appropriately indicating the source, whether intentionally or not.
4. 'Unrighteous indication of authorship' refers to not bestowing, without good cause, the authorship on a person who has made an academic or technical contribution to research contents or results, or giving the authorship for the simple reason of showing gratitude or courtesy to a person who has not done so.
5. 'Redundant publication' or 'self-plagiarism' means reusing all or part of one's previous work in a new work without adequate indication of the source, or using one's past work beyond the amount socially accepted even with indication of the source.
6. Misconduct includes other actions far beyond the scope commonly permissible in academia.

**Article 34 (Standards of Research Ethics)** ① Submitters should comply with the following ethical standards.

1. Submitters should not commit research misconduct specified in Article 33.
2. (Quotation and Referencing) When citing a published academic material, submitters should

d exactly indicate the fact according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Submission to the *JRD*. An unpublished academic material can be cited only with consent of the researcher who provided the information.

3. (Revision of Paper) Submitters should revise their papers according to the regulations of the Editorial Board and submit the contents reflecting referees' opinions to the Board.

4. Submitters should respect the opinion and examination result of the Editorial Board.

② The Editorial Board should comply with the following ethical standards.

1. (Board Members' Basic Duty) The Editorial Board should respect a submitter's personality and independence.

2. (Prohibition on Discrimination) The Editorial Board should fairly treat a paper submitted to the *JRD* based only on its quality and the rules for submission and examination of manuscripts, regardless of the submitter's gender, age, institution, and any prejudice or private acquaintance.

3. Fair Request for Examination

a. The Editorial Board should request a referee with expertise in the field concerned who can make a fair judgment to review a submitted paper.

b. When requesting the examination of the submitted paper, the Editorial Board should provide the referee only with the content of the paper without the information that reveals the submitter's identity.

4. (Confidentiality) Editorial Board members should not disclose the information related to a submitter or the content of a submitted paper to a person other than the referee, nor should they use the content. However, the following cases are exceptions: with the submitter's consent; for dealing with affairs regarding the assessment of the academic journal by the National Research Foundation of Korea; and according to the regulations of other legislations.

③ Referees should comply with the following ethical standards.

1. Sincere Examination

a. The referee should faithfully assess the paper which the Editorial Board sends, within a period of time specified by the examination rules, and should notify the Board of the assessment result.

b. If the referee cannot assess the content of the paper due to differences in specialty or other personal reasons, he or she should immediately notify the Editorial Board (or a board member) of the fact.

## 2. Fair Examination

- a. The referee should fairly assess the paper according to the Examination Criteria of Article 25.
- b. If the referee grades the paper as 'disapprove,' he or she must state the reason clearly.

## 3. Respect for the Submitter

- a. The referee should respect the personality and independence of the submitter as a professional intellectual.
- b. Preparing a referee report, the referee should use respectful and polite expressions and clarify his or her judgment on the paper. If the referee thinks that the paper needs revision, he or she should also explain the reason.

4. (Confidentiality) The referee should keep confidentiality about the paper for examination. The referee should not show or discuss it to or with another person except when advice is essential for the appropriate assessment of the paper, and should not disclose the content of the paper before its publication in the journal.

**Article 35 (Bringing Up Violation of Regulations of Research Ethics)** ① Concerning the publication of the *JRD*, if doubt exists as to the violation of these regulations, anyone can report the related matters to the chairperson or secretary of the Editorial Board.

**Article 36 (Composition and Decision-making of Research Ethics Committee)** ① If an issue is raised according to the regulations of Section 1, Article 35, the chairperson shall organize the Research Ethics Committee with five or more related experts recommended by the Editorial Board.

**Article 37 (Responsibilities and Rights of Research Ethics Committee)** ① The Research Ethics Committee has a responsibility to prove whether the regulations have been violated, and the author in question has a responsibility to prove his or her compliance with the regulations.

**Article 41 (Confidentiality about Subject of Investigation)** People who participate in investigation and deliberation on whether the regulations have been violated, including Research Ethics Committee members, should not reveal the content of the investigation or the personal information of the author in question to the outside.

**Article 42 (Disciplinary Measures)** If the Research Ethics Committee judges the author to have violated the regulations, the following disciplinary measures shall be applied.

- ① The author of the paper which was judged as plagiarism cannot submit a manuscript to the *JRD* alone or jointly for a certain period of time.

- ② If plagiarism is judged after the publication of the paper, the paper will be officially removed from the list of articles of the *JRD*.
- ③ The chairperson of the Editorial Board who received the report of the Ethics Committee shall notify the author who violated the regulations of the facts of Sections 1 and 2. At the same time, the paper will be removed from the website of the Institute, and this fact will be open to the public on the website.
- ④ Within 30 days after the completion of the work of Section 3, the chairperson of the Editorial Board shall notify the National Research Foundation of Korea of the details on the judgment of plagiarism and disciplinary measures.
- ⑤ Concerning the judgment of the violation of the regulations other than plagiarism, disciplinary measures decided by the Research Ethics Committee will be applied.

## **Chapter 7. Supplementary Rules**

**Article 43 (Other Regulations)** The President of the Institute decides matters not included in these guidelines and the establishment and amendment of the guidelines through the deliberation of the *JRD* Editorial Board.