

# **The International Journal of Korean Unification Studies**

## **Submission Guideline**

Last updated on March 05, 2021

### **1. Aims and Scope**

The International Journal of Korean Unification Studies (IJKUS) is a peer review journal bi-annually published (June, December) by the Korea Institute for National Unification (KINU), a government-funded research institution in the Republic of Korea. It publishes original papers covering issues surrounding the Korean Peninsula, such as inter-Korean relations, unification policy, and North Korea, issues of peace and stability in Northeast Asia, and foreign policy and international affairs related to the Korean Peninsula and beyond. IJKUS aims to provide a forum for in-depth analysis, theoretical exploration, and creative policy alternatives of experts and scholars at home and abroad on Korean Peninsular issues and circumstances in Northeast Asia. Since its founding in 1992, IJKUS has contributed to enhancing the interests and understanding of the international community on issues of unification on the Korean Peninsula by providing a global venue for active academic discussions.

### **2. Qualifications**

Submission is open to:

- 1) Ph.D. student
- 2) Professors, research fellows, and independent researchers with a doctorate degree
- 3) Experts in the field of North Korean and unification studies and on Korean Peninsular issues with qualifications corresponding to above requirements.

### **3. Manuscript Preparation**

Submitted manuscripts should use American-English as a standard format and range between 6,000 and 10,000 words. They must be double-spaced, with 12 point font and in a Microsoft

Word file. The style of the text, footnotes, bibliography must conform to The Chicago Manual of Style with the Notes-Bibliography (NB) System and footnote (not the Author-Date System and endnote). (For details, see the Chicago Manual of Style:

[https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research\\_and\\_citation/chicago\\_manual\\_17th\\_edition/cmos\\_formatting\\_and\\_style\\_guide/general\\_format.html](https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/chicago_manual_17th_edition/cmos_formatting_and_style_guide/general_format.html)). The manuscript should include an abstract (150 words), five keywords (5 words), and bibliographic references and exclude any of the author's information. An author's biography (less than 150 words) should be submitted in a separate file.

#### **4. Honorarium and Funding**

The journal provides the author with an honorarium for the articles that have been chosen for publication. Every author is requested to identify who provided financial support for the conduct of the research and/or preparation of the article. Articles written with the aid of funding are exempt from honorarium. List funding sources in the standard way to facilitate compliance to funder's requirements as follows:

Funding: This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health [grant numbers xxxx, yyyy]; the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Seattle, WA [grant number zzzz]; and the United States Institutes of Peace [grant number aaaa].

#### **5. Submission and Deadline**

Manuscripts should be submitted through JAMS by creating an account: <JAMS: <http://kinu.jams.or.kr/co/main/jmMain.kci>> The contributor must agree to the 'Contributor's Research Ethics Pledge' on JAMS when submitting the paper. A consecutive submission is not allowed to avoid the dominance of authors and to promote the diversity of the journal. Submission of a paper will be held to imply that it contains original unpublished work and is not being submitted for publication elsewhere; manuscripts under consideration for publication elsewhere are ineligible. The deadline for manuscript submission is April 21 for June issue and October 21 for December issue (subject to change).

## 6. Peer Review Process

1) This journal operates a double blind peer review process, which means that the reviewers do not know the identity of the authors and vice versa. All manuscripts, including those invited by the Editor, are subject to the peer review.

2) If a manuscript does not fit the aims and scope of the Journal or does not adhere to the Instructions for Authors, it may be returned to the author immediately after receipt without a review. Authors also have to submit the results of similarity check powered by KCI (<https://check.kci.go.kr/>) with their manuscripts for the examination of plagiarism. Manuscripts that are above 10% of similarity by the inspection of the KCI will be returned to the authors as well.

3) Manuscripts deemed suitable are then sent to three independent expert reviewers to assess the scholastic quality of the paper. Manuscripts are reviewed based on the following criteria.

### **1. Creativity and Originality (30 point)**

- The work described is innovative and creative in terms of its theme, approach, data/information, and perspectives.
- The manuscript reveals original thinking and has potential to advance the discipline.

### **2. Clarity (10 point)**

- The author's arguments are clear and concise in view of the logic and approaches employed in the manuscript.
- The paper is concisely written in compliance with the Chicago style without grammar and typing error.

### **3. Structure of Article (10 point)**

- The paper has adequate organizational coherence and features essential elements: the title, an abstract, an introduction, a body and conclusion.
- All parts of the text, references, graphics and tables are necessary for the results.

### **4. Methods/Approach (20 point)**

- The overall strategy, methodology, research design, and techniques are clear, well-reasoned, appropriate, and current and are implemented with rigor.
- Appropriate data analyses are selected given the purpose of the study and research questions.

### **5. Academic Contribution (15 point)**

- This paper puts the progress it reports in the context of previous literature, existing models, or theories.

### **6. Policy Implications (15 point)**

- The article carries meaningful policy implications.

Reviewers will evaluate the manuscript and recommend one of the followings: (1) Accepted as it is, (2) Accepted after minor revision, (3) Re-review after major revision, and (4) Rejected.

The editor makes final decisions based on the following table.

<Table 1> Evaluation Table

No.	Accepted	Accepted after minor revision	Re-review after major revision	Rejected
1	accept	accept	accept	accept
	accept	accept	accept with minor revision	reject
	accept	reject	reject	reject
2	accept	accept	accept	accept with minor revision
	accept	accept with minor revision	resubmit after major revision	resubmit after major revision
	accept with minor revision	resubmit after major revision	resubmit after major revision	reject
3	accept	accept with minor revision	accept with minor revision	resubmit after major revision
	accept	accept with minor revision	accept with minor revision	resubmit after major revision
	resubmit after major revision	resubmit after major revision	resubmit after major revision	resubmit after major revision
4	accept		accept	accept with minor revision
	accept with minor revision		resubmit after major revision	reject
	accept with minor revision		reject	reject
5			accept with minor revision	resubmit after major revision
			accept with minor revision	resubmit after major revision
			reject	reject
6			accept with minor revision	resubmit after major revision
			resubmit after major revision	reject
			resubmit after major revision	reject
7				reject
				reject
				reject

**<Table 2> Re-evaluation Table**

No.	Accepted	Rejected
1	accept	accept
	accept	reject
	accept	reject
2	accept	reject
	accept	reject
	reject	reject

5) The editor is responsible for the final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of articles based on the reviewers' comments. The editor could ask necessary revisions and/or editions to authors before final acceptance. The editor's decision is final. Authors will receive notification of the publication decision, along with copies of the reviews and instruction for revision.

Final acceptance or rejection rests with the Editorial Board, who reserves the right to refuse any material for publication. Where contributions are judged as acceptable for publication on the basis of content, the Editor and the Publisher reserve the right to modify typescripts to eliminate ambiguity and repetition and improve communication between author and reader. If extensive alterations are required, the manuscript will be returned to the author for revision.

6) If there is any objection to the review results, an author(s) can appeal the editorial decision within five days of the review result notification. Editor-in Chief may forward the appeal to the editorial board and form a new evaluation panel for re-review.

**7. Style Guideline, Citations and References**

The style of the text, footnotes, bibliography must conform to The Chicago Manual of Style with the Notes-Bibliography (NB) System and footnote (not the Author-Date System and endnote)

(For details, see the Chicago Manual of Style:

[https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research\\_and\\_citation/chicago\\_manual\\_17th\\_edition/cmose\\_formatting\\_and\\_style\\_guide/general\\_format.html](https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/chicago_manual_17th_edition/cmose_formatting_and_style_guide/general_format.html)).

## 8. Research Ethics (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 that 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 within five days of the review result notification through the newly formed evaluation committee.

② Editor-in Chief may forward the appeal to the Journal Editorial Committee and form a new evaluation committee for re-review.

#### 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.

### **9. Ownership, Copyright, and Publication Right**

The ownership, copy right, and publication right of the manuscript and the results submitted by the author shall vest in Korea Institute for National Unification. Any reproduction or use of a part or the entirety of the manuscript of research shall be approved by Korea Institute for National Unification in advance. The views expressed in this Journal are those of the individual contributors and do not necessarily represent the views of KINU.

## **10. Publisher**

*International Journal of Korean Unification Studies*

Korea Institute for National Unification

217 Banpo-daero (Banpo-dong), Seocho-gu, Seoul 06578, Republic of Korea

Tel: (82-2) 2023-8208 Fax: (82-2) 2023-8298

E-Mail: kinujournal@kinu.or.kr

Webpage: <http://www.kinu.or.kr>