

“Journal of Artificial Intelligence Humanities”

Research Ethics Regulations

Enacted February 1, 2018
Amended August 14, 2019

Chapter 1. General Provisions

- Article 1 (Objective)** The purpose of this regulation is to promote the research ethics of the members of the Humanities Research Institute.
- Article 2 (Committee)** The Humanities Research Institute’s research ethics and related matters are handled by the Humanities Research Institute’s Research Ethics Committee.
- Article 3 (Establishment)** The Research Ethics Committee conforms to the bylaws of the Humanities Research Institute and is established separately.
- Article 4 (Objective)** The Research Ethics Committee is established to promote an honest research culture related to the presentations and articles produced and published in symposiums (including lectures) and academic journals under the Institute’s supervision.
- Article 5 (Composition)** The Chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee is determined by mutual election in the Steering Planning Committee, and the members of the

Research Ethics Committee are appointed by the Head of the Humanities Research Institute after being nominated by the Chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee.

Article 6 (Functions) The Research Ethics Committee carries out the following functions.

The Research Ethics Committee governs the establishment and operation of all regulations.

The Research Ethics Committee receives information related to research ethics violations and swiftly processes this information according to regulations.

The Research Ethics Committee regulates matters relating to the character and reputation of the whistleblowers and examinees.

The Chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee prepares the final investigation outcomes in writing and presents it to the Head.

Ultimately enforces matters relating to the follow-up measures (judgment outcome).

Article 7 (Meetings and term of office)

The Chairperson may convene meetings on research ethics issues at any time.

The term of office of the Research Ethics Committee is two years, and it can be renewed.

Article 8 (Members' duties) Even if all existing and new members have not individually signed the Research Ethics Committee's regulations, they must comply with the regulations.

Chapter 2. Researcher Ethics and Ethics Training

Article 9 (Research originality) The articles prepared by researchers must be original and based on a faithful investigation of the research topic material.

Article 10 (Prohibition of duplicate submission) The article must not have been published or duplicated in other academic journals. Research theses that have been presented in other academic institutions, or duplicate submissions of partially amended research theses on a similar topic to the one submitted to another institution's academic journal, are prohibited.

Article 11 (Prohibition of plagiarism) The researcher must be honest when writing their thesis to avoid suspicions of plagiarism. After fully reviewing the original bibliography of the chosen subject, the researcher must clearly cite the bibliography items in the body of the text and footnotes when quoting these references.

Article 12 (Declaration of authorship) Declaring lead authorship, joint-authorship, or second authorship without actually participating in a joint research thesis publication is prohibited.

Article 13 (Researcher's obligations) The researcher must sincerely cooperate with the investigation requested by the Research Ethics Committee in cases where a thesis submitted to an academic journal has been noted to contain issues relating to duplicate publication,

plagiarism, and authorship (e.g., receipt of unethical research funding).

Article 14 (Research ethics education) The Research Ethics Committee must conduct training on research ethics for the members of the Institute by means of lectures or symposiums at least once a year.

Article 15 (Submission of the written oath of research ethics regulations upon submission of thesis) Upon submission of the thesis, the Research Institute member must simultaneously turn in a written oath stating compliance with the Institute's Research Ethics Regulations and bylaws.

Chapter 3. Raising Complaints, Investigation, and Assessment

Article 16 (Establishment of the problem)

1. Problems raised by the thesis investigator: The thesis investigator must thoroughly examine the submitted thesis content. In cases where the investigator identifies an ethical issue with the thesis, he or she must prepare a detailed description of the problem and report it to the Chief Editor. The Chief Editor must hold an editorial board meeting, and if it is judged that a problem exists, it must be reported to the Research Ethics Committee.
2. Problems raised by an external informer: An external

informer may bring up an ethical issue relating to a submitted thesis. In such cases, the external informer must explain the issue with the thesis by writing or address it to the Chair of the Research Ethics Committee in person. At this stage, personally identifying information of the thesis investigator or the external informer must not be disclosed.

Article 17 (Investigation) A thesis that is brought to the Research Ethics Committee due to ethical issues can be judged by the Research Ethics Committee itself. Opinions of a subject expert can be requested and referenced as required. The Research Ethics Committee must decide on the final disciplinary action based on the investigation results.

Article 18 (Incest) If the author of the thesis submitted to the Research Ethics Committee is closely acquainted with a member of the Research Ethics Committee or the Editorial Board on the basis of school and regional ties, the member in question will be excluded from the thesis investigation.

Article 19 (Assessment) If a thesis has been deemed to have ethical issues following the ethics investigation, the Research Ethics Committee will determine the disciplinary actions according to the clauses set forth in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4. Disciplinary Actions and Procedures

Article 20 (Plagiarism) Theses suspected of plagiarism are not published in this academic journal, irrespective of the investigation results. Even if the plagiarized thesis has been published in the current academic journal, it will be excluded from research achievements through the cancellation of the publication.

Article 21 (Plagiarized and duplicate publication) Same as Article 1.

Article 22 (Plagiarism and duplication in good faith) Where the thesis displays similarities to another academic's thesis by chance, despite the intentions of the author, the Research Ethic Committee can request for amendments from the author. However, if the author refuses to supply the amendments, the thesis will not be published in the academic journal; moreover, it will also be prevented from being presented at academic conferences.

Article 23 (Types of disciplinary action) At the conclusion of the Research Ethics Committee's deliberation, if a thesis that has been published or presented in an academic conference has been deemed to have contravened the research ethics, the following disciplinary actions may be imposed.

1. Disciplinary actions relating to theses

① Request of amendment

② Voluntary withdrawal

③ Cancellation of publication

2. Disciplinary actions relating to the violator of research ethics

- ① If it is deemed that the violation of research ethics is minor and unintentional, the Chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee will issue a “warning” to the relevant person and report this to the Head.
- ② If it is deemed that the violation of research ethics is minor but intentional, the Chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee will impose a “two-year ban on academic conference presentations” and a “two-year ban on submissions to academic journals,” and report this to the Head.
- ③ If it is deemed that the violation of research ethics is serious and intentional, the Chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee will strip the individual of their membership of the academic institution as well as prohibit them from presenting in academic conferences and submitting to academic journals in perpetuity, and report this to the Head.

Article 24 (Implementation procedures for disciplinary actions)

Disciplinary action decisions by the Research Ethics Committee must be reported to the Head in writing within one week, and the Head shall report this to the Planning Steering Committee which makes a final decision. If the Planning Steering Committee decides that the Research Ethics Committee’s conclusion is

inappropriate, it can report such judgment to the Research Ethics Committee. With reference to such judgment, the Research Ethics Committee makes its decision by undertaking the disciplinary proceedings again. This time, the procedure ends after reporting to the Head; the same disciplinary decisions are not made.

Article 25 (Execution of disciplinary decisions) The Head informs the individual of the Research Ethics Committee's final disciplinary decision in writing; if the publication of the thesis has been cancelled, only the title of the thesis and decision details are posted on the journal's website. If "amendment of the thesis or its voluntary withdrawal" is not carried out within the specified time, the Head can take measures to forcibly "cancel the publication of the thesis" or the "the thesis presentation."

Article 26 (Defense) The thesis author who is charged with violating the ethics regulations must be given the opportunity to sufficiently explain his or her position during the defense process.

Article 27 (Disciplinary action decisions) Disciplinary actions are decided through a two-thirds majority agreement of a two-thirds quorum of the Research Ethics Committee members. The decision details are reported by the Chairperson in writing within one week.

Article 28 (Duration of disciplinary actions) The thesis author who is subject to a disciplinary action under Article 1 and 2 of this document is restricted from presenting and

submitting for the period specified by the disciplinary decision.

Article 29 (Notice) If the Research Ethics Committee's disciplinary decision has been notified, matters other than the "revocation of publication" are kept confidential; however, they can be communicated upon the request of a public institution. However, the character and standing of the disciplined author must be respected in all instances.

Article 30 (Disciplinary action of a thesis in receipt of a research grant) If a thesis that has received a research grant receives a disciplinary decision by the Research Ethics Committee, the granting institution is notified of the disciplinary action regardless of whether a request was made by that institution.

Chapter 5. Amendment of Regulations and Matters Relating to Implementation

Article 31 (Amendment of regulations) This Research Ethics Regulations can be amended by the general assembly's vote, if proposed by the Humanities Research Institute's Research Ethics Committee.

Article 32 (Rules for operation) The evaluation standards designed to assess the ethical issues related to the research method and findings, and the matters relating to its operation,

are decided by separate rules of operation.

Article 33 (Miscellaneous) Items not specified in these regulations are to be dealt with using commonly accepted practices.

Supplementary Provisions

(Effective date) These regulations are applied and come into force from Artificial Intelligence Humanities Research, Issue 1 (published April 30, 2018).

(Effective date) These regulations are applied and come into force from August 14, 2019.

“Journal of Artificial Intelligence Humanities”

Research Ethics Detailed Regulations

Enacted on February 1, 2018

Amended on August 14, 2019

Chapter 1 General provisions

Article 1 (Purpose) The purpose of these regulations is to prevent research misconduct related to the publication of the “Journal of Artificial Intelligence Humanities” in advance and to establish matters concerning the detailed evaluation standards and operations in order to establish and comply with the research ethics.

Article 2 (Composition and function of the subcommittee of the Research Ethics Committee) A subcommittee shall be established under the Research Ethics Committee to promptly deal with reported violation of research ethics regulations. The composition and function of the subcommittee of the Research Ethics Committee (hereinafter referred to as “the subcommittee”) is as follows.

1. The subcommittee of the Research Ethics Committee (hereinafter referred to as the “subcommittee”) shall be established under the Research Ethics Committee in order to expedite deliberation on violations of research ethics.

2. The chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee shall also be the chairperson of the subcommittee. The subcommittee shall be composed of three or more members recommended by the Research Ethics Committee chairperson, including one or more members of the Research Ethics Committee of the Institute.
3. The term of office of the members shall not be determined separately and shall be from the start of the case of deliberation to the conclusion.
- 4 The role of the subcommittee is as follows.
 - ① Preliminary investigation on violation of research ethics
 - ② Data review and request for supplement
 - ③ Preparation of report on preliminary survey results
 - ④ Determination of whether to submit to the main investigation

Article 3 (Scope of application) These bylaws apply to members and associate members of the Institute, those who made the publication, and those directly or indirectly related to the research activities of the Institute.

Chapter 2 Standards for judgment of research ethics

Section 1 Ethical rules to be observed by authors

Article 4 (Research misconduct of authors) “Research misconduct

of authors” refers to forgery and falsification, plagiarism, wrongful indication of authors, duplicate publication, salami slicing, and interference with investigations related to research ethics that may occur in the entire research process related to writing (research proposal, research conduct, report of results and presentation, etc.).

1. “Forgery” refers to the act of forging, recording, or reporting source materials, research data or results that do not exist.
2. “Falsification” refers to the act of artificially manipulating research data or process, distorting research contents or results by randomly modifying or deleting source materials or research data.
3. “Plagiarism” refers to the act of using the original ideas or creations of others instead of general knowledge without appropriate indication of source as follows, thereby making a third party believe they are its own creations,
 - ① When using all or part of another’s research without indicating the source,
 - ② When partially modifying and using words or sentence structures of works by others without indicating the source,
 - ③ When using original thoughts of others without indicating the source,
 - ④ When translating and using works of others without indicating the source.

4. “Wrongful indication of authors” refers to the act of not granting authorship rights to the person who contributed to research content or results without justifiable reasons, or the act of granting authorship rights as a token of gratitude or honorable treatment to the person who has not contributed.
 - ① Granting authorship rights to the person who did not contribute to research content or results.
 - ② Not granting authorship rights to the person who contributed to research content or results.
 - ③ Publishing or presenting a student’s thesis in a journal under the professor’s name only.
5. “Wrongful duplicate publication (self-plagiarism)” refers to the act of publishing works that are the same as or similar to all or part of one’s own previous research without indicating the source.
6. “Interference with investigations related to research ethics” refers to the act of intentionally obstructing the investigation into one’s own or another’s misconduct or doing harm to the informant who reports the misconduct.
7. Salami slicing refers to the act of partitioning a large study that could have been reported in a single research article into smaller articles to overstate the achievements.
8. Other acts that seriously infringe on what is conventionally accepted in the fields of artificial intelligence and humanities or other fields.

Article 5 (Citation method and principles)

1. Authors shall disclose their sources when citing a part of the works of others in its original form or in translation by way of introduction, reference, or review in their own works.
2. Authors shall clearly state the citations made in the main text in the references. They shall identify all elements of citations (author names, journal volume and issue, pages, publication year, etc.) directly from the original article instead of relying on secondary sources, but may also provide the citation from the secondary source if necessary.
3. Authors shall cite them in a reasonable way based on the principle of good faith so that their works and cited works can be clearly distinguished.
4. When borrowing intensively from a single source, authors shall make sure that readers know clearly which ideas theirs are and which ideas come from the referenced sources.
5. Authors shall specify the source when introducing a theory or idea in a thesis already published by another person.
6. Authors shall cite published works by principle, and if they obtained undisclosed academic materials from thesis review, research proposal review, or personal contact, they must be cited upon the consent of the original researcher.

7. Authors shall include in the references all documents that have had a significant impact on the direction of the study or may be helpful for readers to understand the research content.
8. When authors use the abstract of a previous study in literature review, they shall not mark it as a journal article in the references. When they cite a published article, they shall not mark it as if it is a reference of academic conference materials or unpublished materials.

Article 6 (Citation of general knowledge)

1. When using information about another person's ideas or facts they provided, it is necessary to indicate the source of the relevant person, except when it is generally shared knowledge or is clearly perceived by the readers.
2. If you have any doubt as to whether a certain concept or fact is common knowledge, it is preferable to cite it.

Article 7 (Plagiarism of ideas)

1. Plagiarism refers to the act of stealing one's ideas (explanations, theories, conclusions, hypotheses, examples, metaphors, etc.) by completely or superficially modifying them in whole or in part without acknowledging the creator's achievements.
2. Authors generally have the ethical responsibility to reveal the source of their ideas in the form of footnotes or references.
3. Authors shall not plagiarize another person's ideas that they have learned through another person's research

proposal or submitted manuscript review without proper sources and citations.

Article 8 (Plagiarism of content) “Plagiarism of content” refers to plagiarizing part of the content of another author without revealing the author.

Article 9 (Mosaic plagiarism) “Mosaic plagiarism” refers to the act of combining parts of another person’s works, adding or inserting words, or replacing words with synonyms without revealing the original authors and sources.

Article 10 (Duplicate publication)

1. If the main content is similar to your articles that are already published (including graduate thesis), it is considered a duplicate publication even if you use texts that show a different view or perspective in your article that is later published or include a different analysis on the same data already published.
2. However, if a duplicate publication is made for another readership that cannot recognize or perceive the article already published, written consent must be obtained regarding the duplicate publication from the editor or publisher of the previously published journal (advisor or chairperson of the review board or head of the institute that provides the degree in the case of a graduate thesis), as well as the editor or publisher of the journal that will make the duplicate publication. In addition, the author must reveal to the readers that the same article had been published in a different journal.

This also applies to the case in which an article published in one language is translated into another language to be published in a different journal, or also the case of a graduate thesis.

3. It is prohibited to submit the same article to different journals at the same time. The rule is to submit the article to another journal after the rejection is decided by one journal.

Article 11 (Prohibition of distortion of references)

1. References shall include only documents that are directly related to the content of the article. Documents with questionable relevance shall not be included intentionally in the references only for the purpose of manipulating the citation index of the journal or article, or to increase the possibility of publication.
2. Authors shall not include biased documents in the references that are favorable to their arguments or theories, but have the ethical duty to cite references that may contradict their view.

Article 12 (Cautions about research misconduct and copyright infringement)

1. Duplicate publication may cause copyright infringement and thus requires attention.
2. It should be noted that when citing texts extensively from sources with protected copyrights, the copyrights may be infringed if the amount of citation is excessive even if the citations are marked appropriately.

Article 13 (Plagiarism objection) If the author does not agree with the judgment made by the Editorial Board and reviewers regarding forgery, falsification, and plagiarism, he or she may raise objections to the Research Ethics Committee by writing the grounds and reasons for his or her objections.

Section 2 Ethical rules to be observed by reviewers

Article 14 (Closed review principle) Reviewers shall keep the content and authors of the articles confidential until the articles are finalized for publication in the journal in the review process. The articles that are rejected shall also be confidential, and sufficient grounds and reasons for rejection shall be specified and delivered to the Editorial Board.

Article 15 (Unethical behavior in the review process)

1. Reviewers shall not use certain information obtained in the research proposal or review process in research in which they are directly or indirectly involved without the consent of the original author.
2. The following acts shall be avoided as they may be regarded as unethical research activities in the review process.
 - ① Requesting a student or a third party to review the paper that they are put in charge of,
 - ② Discussing the content of the research proposal or

article in the middle of review with fellow researchers at the Institute,

- ③ Making statements that stain someone's honor or personal attacks in the process of examining submitted articles,
- ④ Overrating the research findings to obtain financial gain,
- ⑤ Examining and evaluating the articles without reading them.

Article 16 (Ethical behavior related to avoidance and exclusion)

Personal prejudice shall be avoided in examining the articles. If the reviewer directly or indirectly finds out who the author is and that he or she is in a relationship of avoidance or exclusion with the reviewer, the Editorial Board shall be notified immediately. However, the reviewer may participate in the review if requested even after revealing the conflicts of interest including personal conflicts.

Article 17 (Precautions for review)

1. The review shall be conducted fairly and objectively, and shall keep the deadline and confidentiality.
2. Reviewers shall be careful in writing the comments so that the author's personality is respected, and his/her reputation is not damaged.

Article 18 (Intellectual conflicts) If reviewers have a strong view about support or opposition to certain research fields or results, or have a strong moral belief that may affect the

articles and thus may cause intellectual conflicts, they shall reveal their view and moral belief to the Editorial Board so that others may determine their validity as reviewers.

Section 3 Ethical rules to be observed by the Editorial Board

Article 19 (Basic principles) The Editorial Board shall be responsible for all processes, including the review and determination of publication of submitted articles and shall establish and comply with strict and fair standards and procedures.

Article 20 (Request for review) The Editorial Board shall not be affected by the author's gender, age, affiliation, or personal relationship, but shall request the review be conducted fairly based on the quality of the article and the review guidelines, while also considering the reasons for avoidance and exclusion.

Article 21 (Appointment of reviewers) The Editorial Board shall appoint three or more reviewers who are specialists in the field of articles to be reviewed, considering the reasons for avoidance and exclusion as well as academic activities and expertise.

Article 22 (Avoidance, exclusion) The review is not requested of those in a teacher–student relationship with the author or who work in the same university, or to specialists who completed the degree course at the same time as

the author in the university where he or she earned the doctor's degree, except for inevitable reasons such as the case in which specialists in the field are rare.

Article 23 (Article non-disclosure principle) The Editorial Board shall not disclose details about the author or the content of the article until the publication of the article is decided.

Article 24 (Delivery of review results) The Editorial Board shall deliver the results of review to the author along with the decision on publication. In case of delivering other matters, the author must be notified that it is the view of the Editorial Board.

Chapter 3 Research misconduct verification procedures

Article 25 (Report and investigation of research misconduct)

1. Report of research misconduct can be received through the following routes.
 - ① Reviewer who decided that the article violates research ethics
 - ② Report in real name
 - ③ Notification in real name
 - ④ Reports shall be made in real name orally, in writing, by telephone, or via email in principle. However, anonymous reports in writing or email that include evidence such as book title, article title, and specific act of research misconduct may also be handled as

a report in real name.

2. If the Institute receives a report or notification on research misconduct, it shall be forwarded to the chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee within one week.
3. The chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee shall form a subcommittee within 15 days to review the validity of the research misconduct and commence the deliberation.

Article 26 (Determination of research misconduct) Research misconduct shall be determined based on the following criteria.

1. Consider whether the act deserves to be ethically or legally criticized in the field of study to which the researcher belongs;
2. Consider the “Research Ethics Regulations” and the common standard at the point of the misconduct;
3. Comprehensively consider the intention of the relevant person, quantity and quality of the outcome of misconduct, customs and distinctiveness of the artificial intelligence and humanities academia, and benefits gained from research misconduct;
4. To determine the customs and distinctiveness of the artificial intelligence and humanities academia, it is necessary to consider whether the act is expressed as a prohibited act in research institutes such as universities, or whether there is a widespread perception in the artificial intelligence and humanities academia that this

act is misconduct.

Article 27 (Research misconduct investigation procedures and period)

1. The procedures for verifying research misconduct are as follows.
 - ① Preliminary investigation
 - ② Main investigation
 - ③ Judgment
2. The preliminary investigation is carried out by the subcommittee, and the main investigation is carried out by forming the Investigation Committee, and procedures may be added if necessary.
3. If the relevant person sufficiently acknowledges the suspicion about the research misconduct, the main investigation may begin without the person undergoing the preliminary investigation.
4. The preliminary investigation shall be completed within 30 days of the report, and the result of the judgment shall be notified to the informant within 10 days after the completion of the preliminary investigation. If the main investigation is not to be conducted, specific reasons shall be included in the document of notification. However, this may be omitted in the case of an anonymous report.
5. All investigations after the start of the preliminary investigation shall be completed within six months. If there is any objection to the preliminary investigation

result or judgment, the informant or the person under investigation may file a written objection within 30 days, which must be handled within 60 days unless there are special reasons.

Article 28 (Research misconduct verification principle)

1. The Research Ethics Committee of the Institute is responsible for proving the misconduct. However, if the data requested by the Committee is damaged by the person under investigation or the person under investigation refuses to submit such data, the person under investigation is held responsible.
2. The Committee shall guarantee the right and opportunity of the informant and person under investigation to state an opinion, raise an objection or defend oneself, and inform that person of related procedures and schedule in advance. In this case, the person under investigation shall also be informed of the details of the relevant report.

Article 29 (Protection of informant and person under investigation)

1. In principle, the informant shall submit specific evidence in writing, oral statement, telephone, e-mail, etc., in real name. The director of the Institute shall protect the informant from disadvantages in positions or discrimination in working terms due to the informant's report. The identity of the informant shall not be subject to information disclosure.
2. The person under investigation refers to the person who is assumed to have committed or participated in research

misconduct, and the testifier or witness is not included as a person under investigation in the investigation process.

3. The reputation or rights of the person under investigation shall not be violated in the investigation process, and the relevant suspicion shall not be disclosed to the public before the judgment. The Committee shall inform the person under investigation of the relevant procedures and schedule, and the person under investigation shall faithfully accede to the Committee's investigation.

Article 30 (Main investigation)

1. The main investigation is a procedure to prove the fact of the misconduct and must be carried out by forming the Investigation Committee.
2. The Investigation Committee shall give the informant and the person under investigation an opportunity to state their opinions, and if they do not comply, it is deemed that they have no objection.

Article 31 (Formation of the Investigation Committee, etc.)

1. The chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee shall organize the Investigation Committee of five or more members including one chairperson for the main investigation.
2. The following requirements shall be met in case of organizing the Investigation Committee or a verification organization.
 - ① At least 20% of the Investigation Committee members shall be outsiders instead of members from

the Institute (if there are five members, there may be one outsider).

② At least 50% of the Investigation Committee members shall be specialists in the relevant research field, including at least one specialist who does not belong to the Institute.

Article 32 (Exclusion, recusal, avoidance, etc. of the Investigation Committee members)

1. In any of the following cases, the relevant person shall not be a member of the Investigation Committee for the relevant case.

① Current or previous relatives of the informant or person under investigation according to Article 777 of the Civil Law

② Those who are in a teacher–student relationship with the informant or person under investigation, or have conducted or are conducting joint research

③ Others who may damage the fairness of the investigation

2. The chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee shall notify the informant (if in real name) of the list of the Investigation Committee members before initiating the main investigation, and shall accept the request of the informant if he or she requests recusal of the Investigation Committee members with justifiable reasons. This shall not apply in cases where contacts cannot be made due to the informant’s circumstances, in which case

the relevant contents shall be included in the report of the investigation results.

3. If the Investigation Committee members are involved in the works to be investigated, they shall apply for avoidance.

Article 33 (Authorities of the Investigation Committee)

1. The Investigation Committee may request attendance of the informant, person under investigation, witness, and testifier for the statement, in which case the person under investigation must comply.
2. The Investigation Committee may request submission of data to the person under investigation, and restrict entry of the concerned party to the Institute offices or take measures to preserve relevant data with the approval of the director of the Institute to preserve evidence.
3. The Investigation Committee may suggest that the director deliver the details of violation to the head of the institute to which the person under investigation belongs, determining the degree of violation. The director shall deliver the implementation status to the Investigation Committee.

Article 34 (Determination)

1. “Determination” refers to the director’s act of finalizing the investigation results and notifying the informant and person under investigation of the results in writing.
2. If the Investigation Committee ultimately determines that the person under investigation committed the

research misconduct, the chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee reports this to the editor-in-chief and director based on the written report of the Investigation Committee, and the director takes measures for disciplinary procedures at the relevant committee.

3. All investigations from the preliminary investigation to the determination shall be completed within six months. If it is deemed difficult to complete all the investigations within this period, the chairperson of the Research Ethics Committee shall inform the institute to receive the reported facts, informant, and person under investigation of the reasons, and extend the period.

Article 35 (Objection)

1. If the informant or person under investigation has objections to the result of the preliminary investigation or determination, they may file for a written objection to the director within 30 days of the notification of the result.
2. Unless there are special reasons, the director shall handle the objection under Subparagraph ① within 60 days of the application.

Article 36 (Measures against research misconduct)

1. The director shall take appropriate measures against research misconduct after completing all procedures for the determination and objection of the research misconduct.
2. The content of the measures against research misconduct shall not be contrary to the internal regulations of the

Institute, related laws, and social awareness in general. The director shall consider whether the measures such as determination of disciplinary action are proportionate to the research misconduct.

Article 37 (Record keeping) The records generated during the investigation process shall be kept for at least five years.

Article 38 (Disclosure of documents, etc...) The relevant reports and list of the Investigation Committee members may be disclosed if necessary. However, if the Research Ethics Committee finds that there may be disadvantages to the investigators, the list of Investigation Committee members, witnesses, testifiers, consultants, and others may not be disclosed.

Chapter 4 Implementation of research ethics education

Article 39 (Research ethics education) The Research Ethics Committee shall provide research ethics education at least once a year for members of the Institute.

Article 40 (Submission of the pledge of research ethics regulations in journal submission) Members of the Institute shall submit a written pledge when submitting articles that the articles comply with the research ethics regulations and bylaws of the Institute.

Supplementary provisions

(Effective date) These regulations shall be effective from Vol. 1 of the “Journal of Artificial Intelligence Humanities” (published on April 30, 2018).

(Effective date) These regulations are applied and come into force from August 14, 2019.