

# **Review Regulations for Global Health and Nursing**

Enacted: June 1, 2010

Revised: March 14, 2011

Revised: June 12th, 2012.

Revised: February 22, 2013

Revised: October 30, 2016

Revised: February 1st, 2022.

Article 1. This regulation stipulates matters concerning review and publication in accordance with the “Global Health and Nursing (Global Health Nurs)” protocol.

Article 2. The review and acceptance of manuscripts shall comply with this regulation.

Article 3. The review is conducted on research papers in nursing science and theses for master’s and doctorate degrees.

Article 4. The names of reviewers for each paper shall not be disclosed.

Article 5. The manuscript is reviewed according to the evaluation standard form, based on the research type.

Article 6. The manuscript review procedure is as follows.

- ① When a paper is received, it is first confirmed whether it conforms to the qualifications and complies with the rules for contributions. Upon confirmation, the paper application is deemed completed. In the event of research ethics problems, the Ethics Considerations of this journal shall be followed.
- ② The editor-in-chief selects three reviewers who are appropriate for the main concept and major field of the manuscript, who will perform the review online.
- ③ The editor-in-chief selects one editorial member who is appropriate for the main concept and major field of the manuscript, who will work on the manuscript online.
- ④ A reviewer conducts a manuscript review and completes the review by recording online the review and evaluation, body corrections, and supplementary matters, within two weeks. The review deadline can be extended to one month with the consent of the editor-in-chief. The reviewer also strictly examines whether the manuscript meets the rules for contributions.

- ⑤ If a reviewer does not report the results of the review, despite the lapse of the specified date, the editor-in-chief may replace the reviewer.
- ⑥ If there is a need for the reviewers to exchange mutual opinions, they shall contact the editor-in-chief.

Article 7. The reviewers shall comply fairly with the manuscript review regulations to ensure that there is no unfair treatment of the contributors.

- ① The reviewers shall comply with the following matters.
  - 1. The reviewers must maintain fairness and objectivity in the examination, free from any bias.
  - 2. The reviewers should have expertise in the manuscript examined, and if it is determined that they do not have the necessary expertise, they shall notify the editor and suspend the examination.
  - 3. If the reviewers become aware of the identity of the author during the manuscript review or are determined to have an interest, they shall immediately inform the editor.
  - 4. The reviewers shall faithfully evaluate the requested manuscript in compliance with the examination criteria within the period prescribed by the reviewer regulations.
  - 5. The reviewers shall evaluate the manuscript fairly based on objective criteria, regardless of their personal academic beliefs or friendship with the author. The paper should not be eliminated without specifying sufficient grounds. Neither should the paper be eliminated because of conflicts with the reviewer's own perspective or interpretation. The paper to be reviewed should not be evaluated without an in-depth reading.
  - 6. The reviewers shall not use the information obtained during the examination or contact the author personally, without the permission of the Editorial Committee.
  - 7. The reviewers should be constructive and not undermine or be hostile to the author.
- ② In examining the research procedures and descriptions of results, the reviewers are responsible for reporting research irregularities to the Editorial and Ethics Committees.

Article 8. The reviewers shall prepare the examination results with general review and evaluation details and determine whether to publish it, post it after revision, reexamine it after revision, or not publish it.

- ① Publishable: Adopt without modification.
- ② Publishable after revision: After the author corrects the issues pointed out by the reviewers, and the editor confirms and accepts the revisions.

- ③ Reexamination after revision: After the author updates the issues pointed out by the reviewers, the reviewers reexamine and decide whether to accept them.
- ④ Unable to publish: This is limited to cases in which the manuscript's contents fall under any of the following paragraphs.
1. When the research subject is not original or lacks nursing significance.
  2. In cases of plagiarizing the contents of another person's research, which have already been announced.
  3. In case of lack of reliability or validity of the research results.
  4. In a case where it is deemed impossible to publish even if the author makes a major amendment.
  5. In a case where more than 30% of the items were evaluated as "very insufficient" in the examination results.
  6. If it is deemed impossible to modify.

Article 9. According to the results of the examination by the three reviewers, the revised table shall be organized and submitted by each reviewer in the following format.

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| A revised table based on the results of the review |                       |
| The title of the manuscript:                       |                       |
| The content of the review                          | Answers and revisions |
|  |                       |

Article 10. The final deliberation on a manuscript that has been reviewed by three reviewers shall be completed, by the Editorial Committee appointed by the editor-in-chief of the manuscript. The editor-in-chief may deliberate whether the submitted paper has been faithfully revised in accordance with the reviewer's points and, if necessary, request a re-correction from the author.

Article 11. If two reviewers determine that it is impossible to publish, the manuscript may not be published.

Article 12. When the appointed editor-in-chief completes deliberation on the paper, the editor-in-chief shall finally decide whether to publish it. The editor-in-chief may suspend publication and request re-correction from the author if there is an insufficient correction of collateral matters, if additional correction is required, or if it does not comply with adoption rules.

Article 13. The contents of the review shall not be published to anyone other than the author.

Article 14. In the event that the corresponding author raises an objection, in writing, to the final determination that the manuscript is not to be published, the Editorial Committee chairperson shall notify the Editorial Committee, which shall then deliberate on whether to publish it or not.

Article 15. If the manuscript revised by the author is not submitted within one month from the date of request for amendment made by the Editorial Committee, the manuscript is considered withdrawn by the author. (However, if there is a request for extension, it can be extended by one more month.)

Article 16. Matters not specified in this regulation shall be handled by the editor-in-chief of the Editorial Committee in accordance with custom and reported to the Editorial Committee.

Supplementary rule.

1. (Enforcement Date) This regulation took effect on June 1, 2010.
2. (Enforcement Date) This regulation took effect on March 14, 2011.
3. (Enforcement Date) This regulation took effect on June 12, 2012.
4. (Enforcement Date) This regulation took effect on February 22, 2013.
5. (Enforcement Date) This regulation took effect on October 30, 2016.
6. (Enforcement Date) This regulation took effect on February 1, 2022.