

The Japan Society for Technology of Plasticity
Ethical Policy Regarding Submission and Review of Papers

1. Responsibility of authors

1.1 Requirements of paper

A paper to be submitted must satisfy the terms and conditions stated in the instructions to authors. The submission of papers for commercial purposes is not permitted.

1.2 Coauthors

All researchers who significantly contributed to the completion of the paper and who share responsibility for its contents may be included as coauthors; the range of coauthors is limited to such people. The inclusion of people merely for courtesy should be avoided. People who have passed away may be included as authors if they satisfy the above conditions (their statement of agreement is not required). All authors must agree to the publication of the paper.

1.3 Duplicate submission

Papers that essentially include the same contents must not be submitted to multiple journals that require the submitted papers to be original. There are two exceptions. An original research paper published in the Journal of JSTP, written in Japanese, can appear again as a translated paper with the same contents written in English in Journal of Materials Processing Technology, JMPT, (Elsevier) and in Materials Transactions, MT, (The Japan Institute of Metals and Materials), via peer review processes that meet their standards. This is based on the special agreements with the editorial boards and publishers of those journals. The statement that the paper is an English translated version of previously published paper originally written in Japanese is surely included in the paper later published in JMPT or MT.

1.4 Provision of sufficient information

The authors must show their reasoning process by clearly indicating the background, including previous research, and the sources of information necessary for other researchers to reproduce, examine and evaluate the research. In addition, the authors must carefully review other papers and indicate the sources when other papers are cited.

1.5 Caution when citing other papers

When information from other papers is cited, the authors must pay attention to the existence of copyrights. When the copyright of others is violated by the contents of a paper, the authors shoulder full responsibility for the violation.

1.6 Caution when criticizing other papers

The authors are allowed to critically cite and describe papers of other researchers as part of their academic justification, but may not criticize a paper or defame or cast aspersions on the research of others without a clear foundation.

1.7 Prohibition of data fabrication, tampering, and plagiarism

The submitted paper must not contain any fabricated or manipulated data.

Moreover, it is prohibited to plagiarize data from other papers.

1.8 Handling of unpublished data of other researchers

Describing the unpublished results, data, and ideas of other researchers without following the appropriate process or citing the sources is plagiarism and is prohibited.

1.9 Protection of human rights of respondents and subjects

In the research preceding the writing of a paper, the authors must not violate the human rights or other rights of people who are the target of the investigation, and they must protect the life, health, privacy, and dignity of subjects in experiments. Papers containing data obtained from experiments related to life and living organisms must contain statements describing the compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki (a statement of ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects), as well as the ethical codes, laws, and regulatory criteria and standards, for example, "This study was approved by the ethical committee or animal experiment committee of the institution".

2 Responsibility of reviewers

2.1 Consciousness of reviewer's role

The role of reviewers is extremely important in the judgment of whether a paper is to be accepted for publication or rejected. Reviewers must review any paper impartially and promptly while considering the importance of their role.

2.2 Declining to review paper

The reviewer must promptly decline to review a paper in the case of a conflict of interest with the authors or their paper. The reviewer must also promptly decline when he/she considers the completion of the review within the determined period to be impossible.

2.3 Ensuring objectivity of review

The review must be objective and logical from the viewpoints of usefulness for the development of engineering and industry, originality, and reliability. The reviewer must

strictly refrain from subjective and illogical judgments stemming from a personal perspective or personal feelings towards the authors or their paper.

2.4 Consideration for the authors

When reviewing papers, the reviewer must take great care concerning the personal character and intellectual independence of the authors, and avoid descriptions that may suggest a neglect of such considerations. The reviewer must not criticize the authors personally.

2.5 Confidentiality

The reviewer must not reveal to others the fact that he/she was requested to review a paper or part of its contents.

2.6 Prohibition of utilization of papers for own benefit

The reviewer must not utilize the contents of a paper for his or her own benefit until the paper has been published.

2.7 Report to editorial board

When the reviewer finds that the contents of a paper are or may be the same as those of a paper already published, and that the paper contains or may contain fabricated, tampered, or plagiarized data, he/she must promptly report the finding to the editorial board members.

2.8 Review report (comments)

The reviewer must write the comments logically so that the members of the Editorial Committee and author(s) can understand them.

Particularly for papers judged to be rejected, the reasons must be explained explicitly and appropriately.

3. Responsibility of Editorial Committee

3.1 Impartial management of Editorial Committee

(1) The Editorial Committee must comply with ethical principles and make a decision on the acceptance/rejection of papers impartially and promptly to maintain the quality of the journal.

(2) The Editorial Committee must make a decision on the acceptance/rejection of the submitted papers and judge their significance regardless of the race, religion, ethnicity, gender, age, nationality, occupation, affiliation, and political conviction of the author(s).

(3) The Editorial Committee is responsible for judging the acceptance/rejection of papers

on the basis of the reports from reviewers. When the contents of a paper are considered to be unsuitable for the journal, the Editorial Committee can reject the paper without a review process.

(4) A member of the Editorial Committee must not be concerned with the examination of a paper of which he/she is the author or a coauthor.

(5) If objective evidence of errors in the contents, conclusions, and references of a published paper is found, the Editorial Committee must notify the author(s), requesting a written response, and take appropriate measures, such as the publication of errata.

3.2 Selection of reviewers

The reviewers must be selected impartially. People who have a conflict of interest with the paper should not be selected as reviewers.

3.3 Confidentiality of members

The members of the Editorial Committee must not reveal to others information regarding the review (excluding the case of asking other experts for advice). Members must report the names of anyone who were asked for advice regarding the review.

3.4 Objection

When the authors of a rejected paper express their dissatisfaction with the review result, the Editorial Committee must promptly examine the validity of the objection. The result of the examination must be reported to the authors. Appropriate measures must be taken when the objection is judged to be valid.

3.5 Response to report of malpractices in research

The Editorial Committee must promptly take appropriate measures upon receiving reports of a suspicion of double submission, defamation or aspersions regarding the citation, fabrication, tampering, or plagiarization of data, and other violations of the ethical policy, from the Reviewers.

10th September 2019 (accepted by executive board)