

Research in Dance and Physical Activity

- Research Ethics Policy -

Chapter 1 General Provisions

Article 1 (Objective) This document lays out the research ethics, ethics of paper review, and the composition and activities of the research ethics committee of **Research in Dance and Physical Activity (RDPA)**, an English academic journal (hereinafter “Journal”) published by the Global Research Institute for Arts & Culture Education (hereinafter “Institute”) with the aim of creating a sound and fair research environment and ensuring that the Journal fulfills its duty as an academic journal.

Article 2 (Main Agents and Scope) The policy applies to the editorial board members, reviewers, authors, and other main agents involved directly or indirectly in the Journal. Any matters related to establishing research ethics and verifying research integrity, unless otherwise prescribed, are based on this policy.

Chapter 2 Research Ethics

Article 3 (Overview of Author’s Research Ethics)

1. Submitted papers should include academically significant conclusions and comprehensive supporting arguments. Authors should thoroughly investigate whether any previous studies have used the same research methods or produced the same results, while making no attempts to arbitrarily alter derived results.
2. Authors should fulfill their duties as researchers to avoid multiple submissions and/or publications, partial publications, or plagiarism, the occurrence of which may result in disciplinary measures in accordance with the Institute’s guidelines and policies.
3. Academic criticism and evaluations of preceding studies and other researchers are deemed necessary, but personal accusations are strictly prohibited.

Article 4 (Author)

1. Anyone who has made significant contributions to the research work and who will share credit and responsibility for the research outcomes should be listed as a co-author.
2. Recognition of co-authorship requires the approval of all other co-authors. Authors should list co-authors in order of contributions.
3. Authors should list the institutions they were affiliated with when they conducted the submitted research. If their affiliations have changed prior to the paper submission period, they can indicate such changes in a footnote.

Article 5 (Research Method)

1. The research method should be described in detail so that other researchers with comparable knowledge and experience could reproduce the same research.
2. Any attempt to arbitrarily generate or manipulate research data is strictly prohibited.
3. Reference sources should be clearly provided. In particular, secondary sources should be cited in an appropriate manner.

Article 6 (Research Participants)

1. Researchers should be careful not to disclose the identities of their human participants. Additionally, researchers should specifically inform the participants of the nature and projected benefits of their research as well as its objectives, methods, and inherent risks. They should also explicitly indicate the receipt of approval from participants.
2. Researchers should notify the participants or their guardians of their rights to decline participations in the research while guaranteeing these rights.
3. During the paper review process, researchers may be required to submit documents regarding their participants' consent and the participants selection criteria.

Chapter 3 Ethics of Paper Review

Article 7 (Overview of Reviewers' Research Ethics)

1. Reviewers should review papers in a positive, fair, and conscientious manner and be fully aware of the enormous time and effort involved in the review process.

2. Reviewers should be impartial, seeking to minimize the possibility of their being overly generous toward papers whose views and arguments they share or overly critical of papers that present conflicting views and arguments.
3. Submitted papers that are yet to be published should be securely protected from theft. Reviewers are prohibited from citing or taking advantage of any parts of submitted papers for their own research.

Article 8 (Review Procedures)

1. Reviewers are prohibited from discussing authors and papers, and authors are not apprised of reviewers' identities.
2. When reviewers find it difficult to remain impartial because of personal connections or other personal circumstances, they should return the papers un-reviewed along with valid reasons to the chief editor.
3. Reviewers should complete their reviews within the prescribed time. If unavoidable circumstances prevent them from completing the reviews in the period allotted, they should immediately report their circumstances to the chief editor.
4. Reviewers should keep in mind that delays in reviewing papers can negatively impact the authors.

Article 9 (Review Report)

1. Reviewers should state their opinions and correction instructions politely to avoid any emotional misunderstandings. They should also be cautious in the expressions they use to ensure authors do not mistake their review comments for publication requirements.
2. When writing their reports, examiners should clearly differentiate corrections that are absolutely necessary from recommended corrections.
3. For papers rated "reject," reviewers should provide detailed reasons and explanations. Insufficient explanations of review decisions may invite needless disputes. Should any dispute arise, the chief editor may arbitrate between the parties and require authors or reviewers to elaborate their arguments to make their positions more concrete.
4. Since final publication decisions depend on coordinating the opinions of two or sometimes three reviewers, these decisions may not directly reflect the opinions of any one reviewer.
5. Reviewers should be aware that they are accountable for their review opinions.

Article 10 (Verification of Duplicate Publications and Plagiarism) Before reviewing a paper, reviewers should thoroughly check whether part or all of the paper has been published in the Journal or other journals. Any possibility of plagiarism should also be reviewed.

Chapter 4 The Research Ethics Committee

Article 11 (Composition)

1. The committee should comprise one ex-officio member and four or so members holding recommended positions.
 - 1) The ex-officio member is the chief editor.
 - 2) The Institute's director and the chief editor appoint members to the recommended positions in consultation with each another.
2. The chairperson is elected by mutual vote and may serve a three-year term and be reappointed or serve six years in two consecutive terms.

Article 12 (Functions)

1. Prevent research cheating
2. Investigate research cheating
3. Protect informants and ensure their confidentiality
4. Analyze findings from investigations into research cheating and implement follow-up measures
5. Provide education on research ethics compliance and the prevention of fraudulent acts.

Article 13 (Operations)

1. The committee convenes at the request of the chairperson or when the chairperson deems it necessary.
2. The committee's decision-making is based on quorate and majority vote. The letter of attorney shall be recognized as an attendance at the establishment of the committee, but the voting rights shall not be granted.
3. Any member involved in the research work that is subject to examination cannot participate in the process of reviewing the research work in question.

4. Non-members may be invited to share their opinions when necessary.
5. The committee should meet behind closed doors and the members should keep all review-related matters confidential.
6. The committee should deliberate and resolve ethics violation cases within 60 days of the date cases are received.

Article 14 (Authority)

1. The committee may demand that informants, persons under investigation, witnesses, and testifiers deliver their statements in person; in such cases, the persons under investigation must comply with the request without fail.
2. The committee may require person(s) under investigation to submit related data and information.
3. The committee may inform the heads of the institutions affiliated with persons who commit ethical violations so that said institutions can take appropriate disciplinary actions.

Article 15 (Establishment of Special Investigation Commission)

1. When a research cheating-related case that needs to be examined and investigated arises, the chairperson of the research ethics committee may set up a special commission and appoint up to five members who have academic expertise in the discipline in question. To ensure transparency and fairness, one outsider not related to the Institute should be appointed.
2. Anyone who has a conflict of interest in relation to the investigative case in question should not be involved.
3. Before investigations, informants should be notified of the members in charge of the investigations. If an informant presents a valid reason to disqualify certain members from participating, the commission should accept the request.

Chapter 5 Follow-up policy for published papers

Article 16 (Corrections)

1. The journal editors should issue a correction notice when it is necessary to amend the following errors or omissions.
 - 1) Significant editorial mistakes;

- 2) Partial errors that do not compromise the integrity of a paper;
- 3) Omission of contributing author(s);
- 4) A paper that contains some sentences considered plagiarism

Article 17 (Editor's Note)

1. An Editor's Note is issued to alert readers to serious concerns potentially affecting the integrity of a published paper, thus obviating negative consequences.
2. The editors should issue an Editor's Note in a timely manner to minimize the impact of a flawed paper. The Note is published in online databases and posted in the next edition of the journal.
3. The Note should specify the paper in question and the concerns raised.

Article 18 (Retraction)

1. The journal editors should retract a published paper when the following circumstances arise.
 - 1) The integrity and validity of a paper have been substantially undermined due to violation of research ethics such as fabrication and falsification, errors in analytical calculations or experimental measurements, and confirmed plagiarism or unethical research practices.
 - 2) The relevant manuscript has been published elsewhere in duplicate without providing the appropriate references or seeking prior approval. The editors should specify the reason for retraction and retract the paper published later. The paper published first may not be subject to retraction unless its validity is questioned. However, the fact that the same paper was published in two different journals should be disclosed in the form of an Editor's Note.
2. The retraction notice should specify the paper subject to retraction and the reason for retraction.
3. A retraction of a paper will be notified in the following manner.
 - 1) Upon the journal's decision, a retraction notice will be published in online databases and posted in the next edition of the journal.
 - 2) A paper should be retracted as soon as possible not only to minimize damage to other

researchers who have invested considerable time and effort into drawing analytical conclusions only to be misguided by a flawed paper but also to reduce the cases of misleading analytical results due to inclusion of duplicate data in meta-analysis.

- 3) Only papers that have already been published can be retracted. Where a paper is retracted after it has been published online and before its printed version is produced, a retraction notice is posted for the paper already loaded on the website, while the affected paper is indexed in the database of papers retracted in the same manner. However, no retraction notice is posted in its printed version.
4. A retracted paper is publicly accessible, but the fact that it has been retracted should be clearly communicated to readers. Locating retracted publications in databases should produce a clear message that they have been retracted.
5. A retraction can be instigated by the paper's author(s) or by the journal, and the editors will make the final decision to retract a paper. Alternatively, the chief editor can make a retraction decision *ex officio*.
6. Some or all of the paper's authors can request that the editors retract their paper. In this case, the reason for retraction should be clearly stated. When the authors do not all agree to retract, the reason for that should be also specified.

Supplementary provision

1. This policy takes effect on February 06, 2017.
2. The first revised policy takes effect on December 21, 2018.
3. The second revised policy takes effect on February 15, 2019.
4. The third revised policy takes effect on July 23, 2020.
5. The fourth revised policy takes effect on September 18, 2020.
6. The fifth revised policy takes effect on October 01, 2023.