

Regulations related to editorial board members

Article 1 (Name)

This committee is called the Korean Society of Peripheral Nervous System (hereinafter, KPNS).

Article 2 (Purpose)

The purpose of this committee is to stipulate details of the composition and operation of the KPNS editorial committee, with an aim to progressively carry out all tasks related to editing and publication of 『The Nerve』.

Article 3 (Composition and tenure)

The composition and tenure of the committee are as follows.

1. Regarding the composition of this committee, it consists of around 15 members, including 1 chairman of the editorial board (hereinafter chairman), 1 assistant editor-in-chief, and 1 (or more) secretary.
2. The tenure is 3 years for the chairman and members who can be reappointed.

Article 4 (Appointment of chairman and committee members)

Article 4 (Appointment of chairman and committee members) The Chairman oversees the publication of this journal. The Chairman is appointed by the President of KPNS. The editorial board is recommended by the chairman and appointed by the President of the academic society, considering regional distribution by field of related studies among members with outstanding academic achievements. The secretary assists the chairman so that the committee's business can be handled smoothly. Among editorial members, the secretary is chosen and appointed by the chairman.

Article 5 (Committee function)

1. Items regarding the review, editing, and publication of papers requested to be published in the journal;
2. Items regarding the revision of submission regulations to improve the quality of the journal format;
3. Designation of reviewers;
4. Items regarding other committee work.

Article 6 (Meeting)

1. Meetings take place four times a year on a regular basis. Ad-hoc meetings can be called or postponed when the chairman deems it necessary or when requested by a majority of the members.

2. The committee meeting takes place with the attendance of a majority of members present. Resolutions are made with the consent of a majority of members present. The chairman does not participate in the voting, although the chairman has the deciding vote if votes for and against are equal.

3. Meeting arrangement and discussion agenda shall be notified to each member in writing or by phone 7 days in advance. However, exceptions are made in cases of emergency.

Article 7 (Detailed regulation)

In order to stipulate details related to publication of the journal, journal review rules and submission rules are established.

Article 8 (Reporting)

Matters deliberated and decided by the committee are reported to the president and reflected in meeting minutes.

Article 9 (Mandate)

Article 1 (Effective date)

This regulation is effective from March 1st, 2018. Items not specified in these regulations shall be determined by the committee.

► Review regulation

Article 1 (Purpose)

The purpose of this regulation is to set forth all details for the review and publication decision of articles submitted according to submission guidelines for publication in the KPNS journal 『The Nerve』.

Article 2 (Selection of judges)

The number of judges and selection method are as follows.

1. In principle, all submitted manuscripts should be reviewed by two or more experts in the field.

2. The editorial board is formed by appointing judges in consultation with the chairman, secretary, and committee members. Judges are selected from those who meet at least one of the following qualifications in the relevant field of expertise: a person who has worked as a professor at a university as a full-time lecturer or higher, who has a doctorate degree or a master's degree with more than five years of experience in the relevant field, or a person who is recognized by the editorial board as an expert in the relevant field. Qualifications of judges are premised on members of the society. Even if they are not members of the society, the chairman can appoint them as judges after recommending qualified external personnel.

3. The list of reviewers for each selected manuscript is not disclosed outside the editorial board.

Article 3 (Request for review)

Select two reviewers for each submitted article and request review of the article.

Article 4 (Submission of review results)

Judges must conduct an independent review within two weeks of receiving the review request, prepare an article review opinion, and submit it to the chairman.

Article 5 (Review criteria)

- ① Are contents of the manuscript suitable for publication in this journal?
- ② Does the title of the manuscript represent research contents?
- ③ Is the research background concisely and clearly described in the introduction?
- ④ Is the research purpose clear?
- ⑤ Are research subjects' selection and method appropriate?
- ⑥ Are proper statistical method used?
- ⑦ Does the analysis of results draw accurate and relevant conclusions?
- ⑧ Is the theme clear and the context continuous?
- ⑨ Does the manuscript's contents conform to the submission guidelines?
- ⑩ Is the structure of the sentence concise and free of typos?

⑪ Does the manuscript cite only necessary references in accordance with regulations for references?

⑫ Do tables and figures include important contents of the manuscript and accurately present the contents?

⑬ Is it compliant with journal submission regulations and research ethics regulations of the society?

Article 6 (Review result)

1. Review results include ① permission for publication, ② publication after revision, ③ reexamination after revision, and ④ rejection of publication.

① Permission for publication: the manuscript is transferred directly to the printing process after it passes the examination without the need for revision.

② Publication after revision: reviewers' comments are notified to the author. If the author makes revisions and resubmits it to the journal, the reviewers review the revised items and determine whether the decision is ① permission for publication or ② publication after revision and notify the author.

③ Reexamination after revision: the author is notified to revise the manuscript based on reviewers' comments. If the author revises and resubmits, two reviewers will review the manuscript again. After summarizing results of the reviewers' secondary review, notify the author of the secondary review result (either ① permission for publication, ② publication after revision, ③ reexamination after revision, or ④ rejection of publication).

2. If there is no reply from the author within 30 days after the recommendation for revision, journal publication is considered abandoned. The chairman can terminate the review status of the manuscript and decide the rejection of publication. In unavoidable cases, specific reasons must be submitted to the KPNS editorial committee.

Article 7 (Rejection of publication)

In the following cases, it is decided that the article cannot be published and reasons are specified in the review opinion.

- ① In the review process, when two or more judges give their opinions as rejection of publication
- ② If 1 judge decides for rejection of publication and one judge decides for reexamination after revision, the chairman can decide rejection of publication.
- ③ If a decision is made by one judge for rejection of publication and the other judge for publication after revision, a new judge will be selected and the review will be requested again.
- ④ If the author received a review comment but did not revise it within the notified period without justifiable reasons.
- ⑤ In principle, review can be performed up to four times. If the reviewers judge that the revision of the manuscript is insufficient even after the 4th review, the chairman may halt further review and decide rejection of publication.
- ⑥ If ethics regulations of this article are violated

Article 8 (Notification of review results)

When review results are collected from reviewers, authors are notified immediately and revisions are requested to authors. In case review opinions of judges are different from each other, the more challenging comment will be presented to the author. If the author has an objection to the review result, he or she may write and submit a written opinion. This is reviewed by the committee to decide whether to publish.

Article 9 (Confidentiality of review content)

The content of the submitted manuscript is the author's intellectual property. It must be reviewed only by the judges and within the committee. It must not be disclosed to external parties prior to publication.

Article 10 (Decision on whether to publish)

The final decision on whether to publish is decided by a majority vote of judges.

Article 11 (Review form)

Form required for the review process is used after being approved by the committee.

Article 12 (Review fee)

Article review fee can be charged to the author and a certain review fee is paid to the reviewers. The amount of the review fee is determined by the board of directors.

Article 13 (Delegation)

Items not specified in this regulation are dealt with by the chairman according to custom and reported to the committee.

(Addendum) This regulation is effective from February 1st, 2018.

► **Submission rules**

Stated on The Nerve webpage. (<https://www.thenerve.net/authors/authors.php>)

► **Publication rules**

Article 1 (Purpose)

This regulation stipulates contents of manuscript submission, review, and publication in 『The Nerve』, the official academic journal of KPNS. The goal is to publish academic article on time and develop academic articles through fair and prompt article review.

Article 2 (Publication period)

Regular publication dates for articles are April 30th and October 31st each year. The number of publications is, in principle, twice a year.

Article 3 (Manuscript submission and publication review)

1. All manuscripts should be submitted using the academy's English submission system (<https://submit.thenerve.net>).
2. All authors' information must be included when submitting to the Journal. Authors cannot be added or deleted arbitrarily during revision or final submission. If you want to change the author before the final submission, you must submit a change request signed by all authors to the academy.

3. If the submitted article violates research ethics, it will be reviewed by the editorial board and reported to the research ethics committee. Results of the review will be released in the next issue.

4. Submitted articles must comply with submission rules of the relevant journal. Whether to publish the article is determined by the committee through the review process according to journal review rules.

Article 4 (Copyright)

When a manuscript is published, the copyright is owned by this academy.

Article 5 (Others)

1. Publication costs related to journal publication, such as appendix, photos, and special printing, are borne by the author. Costs are subject to rules of the publisher.

2. All unspecified tasks before printing follow the decision of the committee.

Addendum

Article 1 (Effective date) This regulation is effective from March 1st, 2020.

► Regulations related to research ethics

Chapter 1: General provisions

Article 1 (Purpose)

The purpose of this regulation is to prevent cheating in the process of experimentation, research, and article writing, and to establish principles and standards for KPNS (hereinafter, academy) members and academy journal authors.

Article 2 (Application)

This regulation applies to all members of this academy and academy journal submitters.

Article 3 (Definition of terms)

"Research misconduct" refers to intentional or significant defects that may be committed in the process of research proposal, conduct, report, and presentation of results. It refers to forgery, falsification, plagiarism, fabrication, unfair indication of authors, duplicate publication, and double publication. Details are as follows.

1. 'Forgery' is the false reporting of research data or research results that do not exist.
2. 'Falsification' is to distort research contents or results by arbitrarily manipulating, transforming, or deleting data, processes, and results.
3. 'Plagiarism' is unauthorized use of other people's research ideas, processes, results, etc. without formal approval or proper indication of the source.
4. 'Fabrication' is the intentional creation of records that do not exist.
5. 'Unfair indication of the authors' means that the person who contributed to the contents or results of the study is not granted the qualification of the author of the article without a justifiable reason. Or thesis authorship is granted for reasons of appreciation or courtesy to those who have not made academic contributions.
6. 'Duplicate publication' is the publication of an article with the same content scheduled for publication or under review in one or more other academy journals.
7. 'Double publication' refers to re-publishing an already published article in another journal with the exact same or almost identical contents.

Article 4 (Principle of protection of human subjects)

In clinical trials, after approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) based on the Declaration of Helsinki, subjects (with their guardians, if necessary) are informed of the purpose of the study and possible mental and physical problems during participation in the study. It should be fully explained according to the established procedure. Written consent must be obtained from the subject. We also recommend registering the clinical trial at Clinical Research Information Service (CRIS).

Article 5 (Principle of laboratory animal welfare)

As a rule, research using laboratory animals should be made clear that efforts have been made

to minimize pain and discomfort of laboratory animals in accordance with guidelines of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC).

Chapter 2 Organization and operation system of the research ethics committee

Article 6 (Function)

The research ethics committee (hereinafter, committee) deliberates and decides on each of the following items related to research ethics of academy members.

1. Items related to the establishment of research ethics
2. Items related to prevention and investigation of research misconduct
3. Items related to the protection of informants and confidentiality
4. Items related to research ethics violation verification, verification result processing, and follow-up measures
5. Items related to measures to restore reputation of the person under investigation
6. Items discussed by the chairperson of other committees
7. Intentionally interfering with investigation or threatening the informant
8. An act that is seriously out of the range generally accepted in the medical industry.

Article 7 (Composition)

1. The publication committee oversees the function of the committee.
2. The chairman represents the committee. The tenure of the chairman and members is the same as the term of office of this year.
3. One secretary can be selected from committee members to handle general affairs of the Committee. The secretary is appointed by the chairman.

Article 8 (Meeting)

1. The chairman convenes a meeting when necessary and becomes its chairman.
2. Unless otherwise specified, a meeting takes place with the attendance of a majority of the members present and resolutions are made with the consent of a majority of the members present.
3. When the committee deems it necessary, it may ask related persons to attend and listen to

their opinions.

4. In principle, meetings are confidential.

5. Members involved in research cannot participate in the meeting.

Article 9 (Authority and responsibilities of committee)

1. The committee may request submission of data or reports from the informant, the person under investigation, the witness, and the reference person for deliberation.

2. If the person under investigation refuses to submit data or report without justifiable reasons, it can be presumed that he acknowledged the charges.

3. The committee may take considerable measures to prevent loss, destruction, concealment or alteration of research records or evidence.

4. Committee members must observe confidentiality regarding all matters related to deliberation.

5. It is mandatory to attend research ethics training at least once a year. If necessary, the chairman may convene a small meeting to conduct training.

Chapter 3 Research ethics violation verification

Article 10 (Reporting and receipt of misconduct)

Research misconduct that violates research ethics regulations can be reported in all possible ways, such as verbally, in writing, by phone, or e-mail. However, even if it is an anonymous report, if the report includes the article name (or research project name) and details and evidence of specific research misconduct, it will be handled in accordance with real-name reports.

Article 11 (Investigation and deliberation of misconduct)

1. The committee shall investigate whether there are specific reports or research misconduct.

2. The committee may request attendance for statements from the informant, the person under investigation, the witness, and the reference person. In this case, the person under investigation must respond to this. If he/she does not respond, it is regarded as having no objection.

3. The committee shall provide the person under investigation who has been reported for

violating research ethics with an opportunity to file an objection and explain.

Article 12 (Protection of informant and person under investigation rights and confidentiality)

1. Under no circumstances should the informant's identity be exposed. Care must be taken to ensure that the honor or rights of the person under investigation are not infringed until the verification of cheating is completed.
2. Items related to the investigation shall be kept confidential. Those who participate in the investigation shall not unreasonably divulge any information obtained during investigation and performance of duties. However, if there is a reasonable need for disclosure, it may be disclosed through a resolution of the committee.

Article 13 (Judgment)

1. The committee shall complete all investigations from initiation of investigation to decision within six months.
2. Determination of research misconduct is determined by the attendance of a majority (two-thirds or more) of current members and consent of more than two-thirds of the present members.
3. If the informant or person under investigation is dissatisfied with the decision, he/she may file an objection to the academy within 30 days of receiving the notification.

Chapter 4 Follow-up

Article 14 (Follow-up measures)

If research misconduct is confirmed, the committee may apply the following sanctions after the approval of the committee.

1. Sending an official letter to the affiliated institutions of authors of misconduct in research and to research fund support institutions.
2. Publication of notice including author name, journal name, journal volume (number), date of cancellation, and reason for cancellation in this article
3. Notice on the academy website
4. Deletion and invalidation of published articles
5. Authors (corresponding author and first author) of the article are prohibited from submitting

to this academy journal for five years

6. Deprivation or suspension of membership

Article 15 (Notification of result)

The chairman shall make the decision of the committee on the investigation result in writing and notify the informant and the person under investigation without delay.

Article 16 (Follow-up measures such as restoration of reputation)

If it is confirmed because of the investigation that there was no research misconduct, the committee may take appropriate follow-up measures while striving to restore the reputation of the person under investigation. If there are violations of research publication ethics, such as double publication, plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, change of author, conflict of interest, research ethics issue, or reviewer plagiarizing author's article, refer to the flow chart

<http://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts>, which is the processing procedure of COPE.

The publication committee discusses the issue to determine and implement action plans.

Addendum

Article 1 (Effective Date)

This regulation is effective from March 1st, 2020.