

Korea Journal Publication Guidelines

Chapter 1. General Provisions

Article 1. (Purpose) The purpose of these Guidelines is to determine matters concerning the publication of the periodical, *Korea Journal* (*KJ* hereafter), in accordance with Item 1, Article 2 of the Rules on the Publication of Printed Materials of the Academy of Korean Studies (the *AKS* hereafter).

Article 2. (Definition) The terms used in the Guidelines are defined as follows:

1. The “paper” means a writing produced to theoretically validate the author’s scholarly arguments or hypotheses based on appropriate procedures and form, or to verify them with replicable experimental results and statistical analysis.
2. The “book review” means a writing which introduces a book of academic value to the reader and presents the critique of the book author.
3. The “Managing Editor” refers to the staff member who is responsible for who oversees editorial and other matters with regard to the publication of *KJ*.

Article 3. (Scope of Application) The Guidelines can be applied to matters that are not addressed dealt with in various rules of the *AKS* in regards with the publication of *KJ*. If it is specifically necessary, it may be effectuated on approval of the “Publisher” after consideration by the Editorial Board. Here the “Publisher” is regarded as the “President of the Academy of Korean Studies” (the President hereafter).

Article 4. (Publication Interval and Dates) *KJ* is published, in principle, four times a year on the last days of March, June, September and December.

Article 5. (Composition of *KJ*) ① Research outputs published in *KJ* are crea

tive writings in the field of Korean Studies in the following categories:

1. Papers

2. Book reviews

② Papers referred to in No. 1, Item 1, are divided into unsolicited ones which are submitted voluntarily by authors and published after review, and solicited ones whose writing is invited by the Editorial Board after determining the topics and authors.

③ Book reviews referred to in No. 2, Item 1 are divided into unsolicited ones which are published on the voluntary submission by the author, and solicited ones whose writing is invited by the Editorial Board after determining scholarly books to be reviewed and the author(s).

Article 6. (Copyrights) The copyrights of papers and book reviews published in *KJ* belong to the Academy.

Chapter 2. The Editorial Board

Article 7. (Composition of the Editorial Board and Others) ① The Editorial Board is established in accordance with Article 15 of the Rules on the Publication of Printed Materials, in order to determine matters of importance with regard to the editing of *KJ*.

② The Editorial Board consists of ten to twenty members, including an Editor-in-Chief and a Deputy Editor-in-Chief.

③ The Editor-in-Chief is appointed by the President from reputed scholars in the field of Korean Studies who have experiences in the editing of international academic journals.

④ The Deputy Editor-in Chief is appointed by the President from reputed scholars who have demonstrated outstanding academic activities in Korean Studies.

⑤ Other Editorial Board members are appointed by the President from Korean and international scholars who have demonstrated outstanding academic activities in Korean Studies on recommendation by the Editor-in-Chief, the Deputy Editor-in-Chief, or the Managing Editor.

⑥ If the Editor-in-Chief is unable to perform his/her duties for unavoidable reasons, the Deputy Editor-in-Chief acts as the delegate. If the Deputy Editor-in-Chief is unable to act as Editor-in-Chief, an Editorial Board member who is designated by the President acts as the delegate.

⑦ The Editor-in-Chief, the Deputy Editor-in-Chief, and other Editorial Board members serve for a term of two years and may continue to serve in their capacity upon the completion of the first term.

⑧ The Editorial Board should meet at least once every year.

⑨ The Editor-in-Chief and the Deputy Editor-in-Chief may be paid an activity allowance within the scope of budget, and the amount is determined separately by the President.

Article 8 (Editor-in-Chief's Duty) The Editor-in-Chief performs the following duties:

1. Conduct prior reviews of papers and recommend and select paper reviewers
2. Perform the final review of papers and book reviews to decide on their publication
3. Determine special edition topics and their authors
4. Write or solicit the editor's note for each edition
5. Decide on the rejection of unsolicited papers suspected of misconduct in research
6. Call and preside Editorial Board meetings

Article 9 (Deputy Editor-in-Chief's Duty) The Deputy Editor-in-Chief performs

ms the following duties:

1. Conduct the prior review of papers and recommend paper reviewers
2. Propose and consider special edition topics and recommend their authors
3. Recommend scholarly books for book review and their reviewers
4. Other matters entrusted by the Editor-in-Chief

Article 10. (Other Editorial Board Members' Duty) Other members of the Editorial Board members perform the following duties:

1. Recommend paper reviewers
2. Review papers
3. Propose special edition topics and recommend their authors
4. Recommend scholarly books for book review and their reviewers
5. Other matters delegated by the Editor-in-Chief concerning the prior review

Article 11. (Suspension of Service of Duty and Dismissal of Editorial Board Members) If any of the following is applicable to the Editor-in-Chief, the Deputy Editor-in-Chief, or other members of the Editorial Board, the President can suspend their service of duty or dismiss them:

1. Voluntary request of withdrawal
2. Insincerity in the performance of duty
3. Indictment and declaration of a sentence in a penal case
4. Tarnishment of the dignity of the Editorial Board or *KJ*

Chapter 3. Review of Papers and Book Reviews

Article 12 (Unsolicited Submission and Receipt of Papers) ① One who wants to submit an unsolicited paper or a book review to *KJ* needs to submit a manuscript and a curriculum vita describing one's research achievement a

nd career for which there is no fixed form.

② The number of unsolicited writings submitted by an author (the first author, if there are more than one author) cannot exceed one paper or two book reviews per year.

③ Resubmission of a paper or a book review which has already been decided as “Reject” in the review is restricted.

Article 13. (Manuscript Requirements and Form) ① If the manuscript has previously been presented in various types of academic events such as seminars and forums or on the Internet, the author should inform in the manuscript the event name or the Internet site, the organizing institution or organization, and the date and place.

② All manuscripts should be written using the Microsoft Word program.

③ The length of the manuscript is limited to 7,000–9,000 English words for a paper, and 2,000–3,000 English words for a book review.

④ A paper should have a title, an abstract, keywords, the author’s affiliation, the main text, footnotes, and references. A book review should have the title of the book under review, its author, the publisher, the publishing year, and the main text.

⑤ English transcription of Korean follows, in principle, the Romanization system of the National Institution of Korean Language.

⑥ For co-authored papers having more than one author, the first author is responsible for paper submission, representing his/her co-author(s).

⑦ The first author mentioned in Item 6, same Article, is regarded as the one whose name precedes that (those) of the other author(s), while the co-authors can designate and specify the corresponding author based on a mutual agreement.

⑧ If an unsolicited paper or book review does not meet the Manuscript

Requirements and Form in Items 1 to 7, same Article, the Managing Editor can revise, withhold, or return the manuscript before the initiation of prior review.

Article 14. (Review Principles) ① The Editor-in-Chief decides on the publication of papers through the process of prior review, the first round of review, and the second round of review. For a book review, a reviewer who is recommended by the Editorial Board submits review comments, based on which the Editor-in-Chief makes the final decision on its publication.

② The review of submitted papers is made using blind review, concealing the author's personal identification information and financial support for the research. For a solicited paper and solicited book review, however, the author's name may be open to the reviewer.

③ Persons who are or were involved in the review process should maintain the confidentiality of the author's and reviewer's personal identification information and the review results.

Article 15. (Review Criteria) ① The review of papers employ the following criteria:

1. Creativity and persuasiveness of verification
2. Propriety in structure and content (clear description of sources and appropriate provision of the abstract, tables and figures, references, and Romanization)
3. Understanding of prior researches and academic contribution of research outcomes
4. Readability of English sentences (logical, clear sentences and accurate command of style and grammar)

② There are no separate review criteria for book reviews.

Article 16. (Review Procedure) ① The prior review is carried out as the fol

lowing:

1. The Editor-in-Chief performs the prior review of unsolicited papers submitted based on the criteria in Article 15 and decides for each paper whether to “Continue the review process,” to “Suspend the review process,” or to “Return the manuscript to the author(s).”
2. Papers determined to “Suspend the review process” in the prior review are returned to the author(s) for revision based on prior review comments, and may be resubmitted for the second last round of prior review.

② The first round of review proceeds as the following:

1. For each paper decided “to Continue the review process” in the prior review, the Editor-in-Chief selects two or more reviewers to form a Paper Review Committee, taking into consideration the author’s alma mater and current affiliation.
2. The Managing Editor sends the papers concerned to reviewers who have been selected in accordance with No. 1, same Item, to request the review. The reviewers complete the First-Round Paper Review Form (Form No. 1) including review opinions and submit it to the Editor-in-Chief within a month from the date of receiving the request. If a reviewer does not submit the Paper Review Form within a month from the date of receiving the request for no special reasons, the Editor-in-Chief can select another reviewer to ask for review.
3. The review opinions referred to in No. 2, same Item, have the following categories:
 - i) Accept: When the paper is evaluated as publishable without revision as it meets the requirements of a paper in content and form;
 - ii) Minor Revision: When the paper is reasonable in its development of ma

atters of point in content and form, but requires reconsideration or revision in some parts;

iii) Major Revision: When the paper is not reasonable in its basic direction and development of matters of point and requires fundamental reconsideration or revision; and

iv) Reject: When the paper is, obviously, not up to the basic standard of a scholarly paper in content and form, or does not correspond to *KJ's* editorial guidelines.

③ The Editor-in-Chief consolidates review opinions of the Paper Review Committee and makes a final decision on the review result using the table below. The Managing Editor informs the author of the final review result of the paper.

| Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Review Result | Conduct the Second Round of Review by: |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| Accept | Accept | Accept | - |
| Accept | Minor Revision | | - |
| Accept | Major Revision | Minor Revision | Reviewer 2 |
| Minor Revision | Minor Revision | | Reviewer 1 or Reviewer 2 |
| Accept | Reject | Major Revision | Invite Reviewer 3 |
| Minor Revision | Reject | | |
| Minor Revision | Major Revision | | Reviewer 2 |
| Major Revision | Major Revision | | Reviewer 1 or Reviewer 2 |
| Major Revision | Reject | Reject | - |
| Reject | Reject | | - |

④ Papers assessed as “Minor Revision” or “Major Revision” in the first-round review as per Item 3, same Article, can have the second round of review as follows:

1. The author whose paper is determined as “Minor Revision” or “Major Revision” should submit a revised paper and a revision summary within thirty days from the date of receiving the first-round review result in order to have reconsideration or the second-round review. If the author does not submit them within the due date, it is

considered as his/her withdrawal of the intent to publish the paper.

2. The second-round review of a paper that is evaluated as “Minor Revision” or “Major Revision” is made by one of the two first-round reviewers or the third reviewer. If neither is able to do the second-round review, an Editorial Board member may review the revised paper and the revision summary to determine “Accept” or “Reject” and then complete and submit the Second-Round Paper Review Form (Form No. 2) to the Editor-in-Chief.

Article 17. (Decision on Paper Publication) ① The Editor-in-Chief consolidates the reviewers’ review opinions on unsolicited papers and decides on their publication.

② If any of the following conditions is found to be applicable to a paper which has been assessed as “Accept” according to the review procedure, the Editor-in-Chief decides to “Reject” it.

1. If an unsolicited paper is factually confirmed to dissatisfy the review criteria in Article 15;
2. If a misconduct of research is identified in an unsolicited paper; or
3. If the author does not fulfill the duties specified in Article 19.

Article 18. (Review Fee) A review fee is paid to reviewers who have completed review in accordance with the Guidelines on the Execution and Management of the Expenditure Budget.

Article 19. (Author’s Duty and Others) ① The author is responsible for the content of the paper and the accuracy of materials, citations and sources used.

② The author should fulfill the requests of the Managing Editor in the process of editing and proof-reading for each of the following:

1. Revision and complementation of paper content or its readability;
2. Identification/confirmation of and clear description on sources, citations, tables, figures, photographs and copyrights; and
3. Description on presentation or publication of the paper in a prior occasion(s) and obtainment of research fund for paper writing.

Chapter 4. Special Topics

Article 20. (Topic Selection for Special Editions) Topics for *KJ* Special Editions are selected from issues relating to Korean Studies and are decided through consideration by the Editorial Board.

Article 21. (Guest Editor) ① For the publication of a Special Topic edition, a Guest Editor is appointed by the Editor-in-Chief from Korean and international scholars, on the recommendation by the proponent of the Special Topic or the Editorial Board.

② The tasks of the Guest Editor include: submit a proposal on the Special Topic Edition; select manuscripts and authors; receive and collate manuscripts; write *On This Topic*; recommend reviewers of manuscripts for the Special Topic Edition; and review the manuscripts.

③ After the publication of the Special Topic Edition, a fee may be paid to the Guest Editor in accordance with the Guidelines on the Execution and Management of the Expenditure Budget.

Article 22. (Review of Papers for the Special Topic Edition) Papers for Special Topic Editions undergo the same review procedure as unsolicited papers as specified in Article 16 (Review Procedure).

Chapter 5. The Research Ethics Committee

Article 23. (Operation) Matters concerning the establishment and operation of

f the Research Ethics Committee are determined by the President in separate clause. In regards with the ethics of research writing of *KJ*, that of the *Review of Korean Studies* (*RKS* hereafter), an English-language journal published by the Academy, is applied, which is included in the Guidelines for the *RKS* Editorial Board (Attachment 2).

Supplementary Provision

The Guidelines go into effect from the date that it is made public.

[Form No. 1] The First-Round Paper Review Form

Korea Journal
Peer Review Form

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|--|
| Registration No. | | | |
| Manuscript Title | | | |
| Reviewer (Affiliation/Position) | | | |
| Due Date for Review | | Submission Date | |

1. BASIC CRITERIA (Please underline or check the applicable box.)

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | Originality/Persuasiveness of Argument and Evidence | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 2 | Appropriateness of Structure and Content (Proper attribution; Suitability of Abstract, Tables or Figures, and References; South Korean Romanization) | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 3 | Grasp of Existing Research and Contribution to Subject Area | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 4 | Readability of the Prose (Clear and Articulate; Precise Diction and Grammar) | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |

*** A: Very strong; B: Strong; C: Average; D: Weak; E: Very weak**

2. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION (Please underline or check the applicable box.)

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accept | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Revision | <input type="checkbox"/> Major Revision | <input type="checkbox"/> Reject |
|--|--|--|--|

- **Accept:** The manuscript can be published without any revision or further consideration. All the required conditions for publication are met.

- **Minor Revision*:** The manuscript has no major problems in terms of its overall argument, evidence, and structure. But it does require some revisions before it can be published.

- **Major Revision*:** The manuscript has some serious problems in terms of its overall argument, evidence, and structure. These problems must be addressed. If/when the revised manuscript is resubmitted, a comprehensive re-evaluation is required.

- **Reject:** The manuscript does not meet the basic criteria of an academic paper in terms of argument, evidence, or structure, or does not comply with the editorial policy of KJ.

* When the author submits a revised manuscript, one of the peer reviewers who evaluated the manuscript, or a third reviewer, shall determine whether to accept or reject the revised manuscript.

3. REVIEWER'S OPINION (Please state your opinion in at least 300 words.)

Please address the following questions: What is the main problematic, and is it interesting? How compelling is the argument and evidence? Will the manuscript make a significant contribution to the field/subject area? Is the paper well written? Do you have specific suggestions as to how the author might correct flaws and strengthen the argument?

4. COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF (if needed) [These comments will not be delivered to the author(s).]

[Form No. 2] The Second-Round Paper Review Form

Korea Journal
Second Review Form

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|--|
| Registration No. | | | |
| Manuscript Title | | | |
| Reviewer (Affiliation/Position) | | | |
| Due Date for Review | | Submission Date | |

1. BASIC CRITERIA (Please underline or check the applicable box.)

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | Originality/Persuasiveness of Argument and Evidence | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 2 | Appropriateness of Structure and Content <small>(Proper attribution; Suitability of Abstract, Tables or Figures, and References; South Korean Romanization)</small> | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 3 | Grasp of Existing Research and Contribution to Subject Area | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 4 | Readability of the Prose <small>(Clear and Articulate; Precise Diction and Grammar)</small> | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |

*** A: Very strong; B: Strong; C: Average; D: Weak; E: Very weak**

2. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION (Please underline or check the applicable box.)

| | |
|--|--|
| Accept <input type="checkbox"/> | Reject <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|

- **Accept:** The manuscript can be published without any revision or further consideration. All the required conditions for publication are met.

- **Reject:** The revised manuscript still does not meet the basic criteria of an academic paper in terms of argument, evidence, or structure, or does not comply with the editorial policy of KJ.

3. REVIEWER'S OPINION (Please state your opinion in at least 300 words.)

Please address the following questions: Has the author sufficiently addressed the concerns and suggestions in the first review? Is the revised manuscript suitable for publication in terms of argument, evidence, structure, content, and readability? Will it make a significant contribution to the field/subject area?

4. COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF (if needed) [These comments will not be delivered to the author(s).]

Korea Journal 발간 지침

제1장 총 칙

제1조(목적) 이 지침은 한국학중앙연구원(이하 “연구원”이라 한다.) 「출판물간행규정」 제2조제1항에 따른 정기간행물 Korea Journal(이하 “KJ”라 한다)의 발간에 필요한 사항을 정함을 목적으로 한다.

제2조(정의) 이 규정에서 사용하는 용어의 정의는 다음 각 호와 같다.

1. “논문”이란, 저자의 학문적 주장 또는 가설을 적합한 절차와 형식에 맞추어 이론적으로 논증하거나 재현 가능한 실험결과 및 통계분석으로 입증하는 글을 말한다.
2. “서평”이란, 학술적 가치가 있는 책을 독자에게 소개하는 글로서 저자의 비평을 신는 글을 말한다.
3. “편집주간(Managing Editor)”이란, KJ 발간 관련 편집과 사무를 담당하는 직원을 말한다.

제3조(적용범위) KJ의 발간과 관련하여 연구원의 제반 규정에 정하지 않은 사항은 이 지침을 준용하되, 특별히 필요한 경우에는 편집위원회의 심의를 거쳐 발행인의 결재로 시행한다. 이 경우 “발행인”은 “한국학중앙연구원장”(이하 “원장”이라 한다)으로 본다.

제4조(발간횟수 및 발간일) KJ는 연 4회 발간을 원칙으로 하며, 발간일은 3월, 6월, 9월, 12월의 말일로 한다.

제5조(KJ의 구성) ① KJ에 게재하는 연구성과물은 한국학 분야의 창작 저작물로서 다음 각 호와 같다.

1. 논문
2. 서평

② 제1항 제1호의 논문은 저자의 의사에 따라 제출한 논문을 심사하여 게재하는 투고논문과 편집위원회에서 주제와 저자를 정하여 집필을 의뢰하는 청탁 논문으로 구분한다.

③ 제1항 제2호의 서평은 저자의 의사에 따라 제출한 서평을 게재하는 투고서평과 편집위원회에서 서평대상 학술서적과 저자를 정하여 집필을 의뢰하는 청탁 서평으로 구분한다.

제6조(저작권) K에 게재된 논문 및 서평의 저작권은 연구원에 귀속된다.

제2장 편집위원회

제7조(편집위원회의 구성 등) ① K의 편집과 관련된 중요한 사항을 정하기 위하여 출판물 간행 규정 제15조에 따라 편집위원회(Editorial Board)를 둔다.

② 편집위원회는 편집장(Editor-in-Chief) 1인, 부편집장(Deputy Editor-in-Chief) 1인을 포함하여 10인 이상 20인 이내의 편집위원으로 구성한다.

③ 편집장은 국제적 학술 저널의 편집에 참여한 경험이 있는 한국학 분야의 저명한 학자 중에서 원장이 위촉한다.

④ 부편집장은 한국학 분야에서 학술활동이 우수하고 저명한 학자 중에서 원장이 위촉한다.

⑤ 편집위원은 한국학 분야에서 학술활동이 우수한 국내외 학자 중에서 편집장, 부편집장 또는 편집주간의 추천을 받아 원장이 위촉한다.

⑥ 편집장이 부득이한 사유로 직무를 수행할 수 없을 때에는 부편집장이 그 직무를 대행한다. 부편집장이 편집장의 직무를 대행할 수 없을 때에는 편집위원 중에서 원장이 지명하는 사람이 그 직무를 대행한다.

⑦ 편집장, 부편집장 및 편집위원의 임기는 2년으로 하되, 중임할 수 있다.

⑧ 편집위원회 회의는 매년 1회 이상 개최하여야 한다.

⑨ 편집장, 부편집장에게는 예산의 범위 내에서 활동 수당을 지급할 수 있으며, 지급액은 원장이 따로 정한다.

제8조(편집장의 직무) 편집장은 다음 각 호의 직무를 수행한다.

1. 논문 사전심사, 논문심사위원 추천 및 선정
2. 논문·서평의 게재 여부 최종심사
3. 특집 주제 및 저자 확정

4. 각 호 발간사의 집필 또는 집필의뢰
5. 연구부정행위가 의심되는 투고논문의 반려 여부 결정
6. 편집위원회 회의 소집 및 주제

제9조(부편집장의 직무) 부편집장은 다음 각 호의 직무를 수행한다.

1. 논문 사전심사 및 논문심사위원 추천
2. 특집 주제 제안·검토 및 저자 추천
3. 서평 대상 학술서적 및 서평자 추천
4. 기타 편집장이 위임하는 사항

제10조(편집위원의 직무) 편집위원은 다음 각 호의 직무를 수행한다.

1. 논문심사위원 추천
2. 논문 심사
3. 특집 주제 제안 및 저자 추천
4. 서평 대상 학술서적 및 서평자 추천
5. 논문 사전심사에 대해 편집장이 위임하는 사항

제11조(편집위원의 직무 정지 및 해촉) 편집장, 부편집장 및 편집위원이 다음 각 호의 어느 하나에 해당하는 경우에는 원장은 그 직무를 정지하거나 그 직에서 해촉할 수 있다.

1. 스스로 사임을 요청한 경우
2. 직무수행이 불성실한 경우
3. 형사사건으로 기소되어 형이 확정된 경우
4. 위원회 또는 K의 권위를 실추시킨 경우

제3장 논문 및 서평의 심사

제12조(투고 및 접수) ① K에 논문 또는 서평을 투고하고자 하는 자는 원고와 함께 연구 실적 및 경력 기술서를 자유 형식으로 작성하여 제출하여야 한다.

② 저자(2인 이상일 경우 제1저자) 1인당 연간 투고 편수는 논문 1편 또는

서평 2편을 초과할 수 없다.

③ 이미 “게재 불가” 판정을 받은 논문 또는 서평은 재투고를 제한한다.

제13조(원고 요건 및 형식) ① 학술세미나, 포럼 등 각종 행사와 인터넷에서 발표된 원고는 그 행사명, 인터넷 사이트, 주관기관 및 단체, 일자, 장소 등을 원고에 밝혀야 한다.

② 모든 원고는 Microsoft Word 프로그램을 사용하여 영문으로 작성하여야 한다.

③ 원고의 분량은, 논문의 경우에는 7,000-9,000 영어 단어(word)로, 서평의 경우에는 2,000-3,000 영어 단어 범위 내에서 작성하여야 한다.

④ 논문은 제목, 초록, 키워드, 저자소개, 본문, 각주, 참고문헌으로 구성하여야 하고, 서평은 서평 대상 도서의 제목, 저자, 출판사, 출판년도, 본문으로 구성하여야 한다.

⑤ 한국어의 영어표기는 「국립국어원 로마자 표기법」을 원칙으로 한다.

⑥ 2인 이상의 공저 논문의 제1저자는 다른 공동저자를 대표하여 제출 논문에 대한 책임이 있다.

⑦ 제6항에 따른 제1저자는 공동 저자 중 가장 앞에 명기된 저자로 간주하되, 공동저자들은 상호 합의에 의해 교신저자를 지정·명기할 수 있다.

⑧ 편집주간은 투고 논문 및 서평이 같은 조 제1항부터 제7항까지의 원고 요건 및 형식에 부합하지 않을 경우 사전심사 이전에 수정, 보류, 반려할 수 있다.

제14조(심사원칙) ① 논문은 사전심사, 1차 심사, 재심사를 거쳐 편집장이 게재 여부를 확정하고, 서평은 편집위원회에서 추천한 심사위원 1인이 심사 의견서를 제출하고 이를 바탕으로 편집장이 최종 게재 여부를 확정한다.

② 심사는 저자에 관한 인적사항과 연구비 지원 내용을 삭제한 채로 실시한다. 다만 청탁 논문 및 청탁 서평의 경우에는 심사위원에게 저자의 이름을 공개할 수 있다.

③ 심사에 관여하는 자 또는 관여했던 자는 논문 등의 제출자, 심사위원의

인적사항 및 심사결과 등에 관한 비밀을 유지하여야 한다.

제15조(심사기준) ① 논문 심사기준은 다음 각 호와 같다.

1. 논증 과정의 독창성 및 설득력
2. 구조와 내용의 적합성(명확한 출처표기 및 적절한 초록, 표/그림, 참고문헌, 로마자 표기의 작성여부)
3. 선행연구에 대한 이해도 및 연구결과의 학문적 기여도
4. 영어문장의 가독성(논리정연하고 명확한 문장 및 정확한 문체와 문법의 구사여부)

② 서평에 대하여는 따로 심사기준을 두지 아니한다.

제16조(심사절차) ① 사전 심사는 다음 각 호와 같이 진행한다.

1. 편집장이 투고된 논문에 대하여 제15조의 심사기준 부합 여부 등을 사전 심사하고 “심사진행”, “심사보류” 또는 “원고반려”를 결정한다.
2. “심사보류”로 결정된 논문은 사전심사의견을 바탕으로 재수정한 후에 1회에 한하여 재심사할 수 있다.

② 1차 심사는 다음 각 호와 같이 진행한다.

1. 편집장은 “심사진행”으로 결정된 논문에 대하여 저자의 출신학교, 소속기관 등을 고려하여 논문 당 2인 이상으로 심사위원을 선정하여야 한다.
2. 편집주간은 해당 논문을 제1호에 따라 선정된 심사위원에게 송부하여 심사를 의뢰하고, 심사위원은 심사를 의뢰받은 날부터 1개월 이내에 별지 제1호서식의 1차 논문심사서를 작성하여 편집장에게 제출한다. 다만, 심사위원이 특별한 사유 없이 1개월 이내에 논문심사서를 제출하지 않은 때에는 편집장은 다른 심사위원을 선정하여 심사를 의뢰할 수 있다.
3. 제2호의 심사의견은 다음 각 목과 같이 구분한다.
 - 가. 게재 가(Accept): 내용과 형식에 있어 논문의 필수 조건을 갖추고 있어 별도의 보완 없이 게재가 가능하다고 판단되는 경우.

나. 수정 후 게재(Minor Revision): 내용과 형식에 있어 논지 전개에는 무리가 없으나 부분적인 재고나 수정이 요구되는 경우.

다. 수정 후 재심(Major Revision): 논문의 기본방향과 논지전개에 무리가 있어 근본적인 재고나 수정이 요구되는 경우.

라. 게재 불가(Reject): 논문의 내용과 형식이 학술논문의 기본적인 기준에 현격히 미달하거나 *KJ*의 편집방침에 부합하지 않는 경우.

③ 편집장은 논문심사위원회의 심사의견을 종합하여 다음 표와 같이 심사결과를 판정하고, 편집주간은 논문심사결과를 저자에게 통보한다.

| 심사위원 1 | 심사위원 2 | 심사결과 | 재심 |
|---------|---------|---------|---------------|
| 게재가 | 게재가 | 게재가 | - |
| 게재가 | 수정 후 게재 | | - |
| 게재가 | 수정 후 재심 | 수정 후 게재 | 심사위원 2 |
| 수정 후 게재 | 수정 후 게재 | | 심사위원 1, 2중 1인 |
| 게재가 | 게재불가 | 수정 후 재심 | 심사위원 3 위촉 |
| 수정 후 게재 | 게재불가 | | |
| 수정 후 게재 | 수정 후 재심 | | 심사위원 2 |
| 수정 후 재심 | 수정 후 재심 | | 심사위원 1, 2중 1인 |
| 수정 후 재심 | 게재불가 | 게재불가 | - |
| 게재불가 | 게재불가 | | - |

④ 제3항에 따른 심사 결과 “수정 후 게재” 또는 “수정 후 재심” 판정을 받은 논문에 대하여 다음 각 호와 같이 재심사를 진행한다.

1. “수정 후 게재” 또는 “수정 후 재심” 판정을 받은 저자가 논문 게재를 원할 경우에는 심사결과를 통지받은 날부터 30일 이내에 수정 논문과 수정요지문을 제출하여 재검토 또는 재심사를 받아야 한다. 다만, 정당한 이유 없이 기한 내에 이를 제출하지 아니한 때에는 논문 게재 의사를 철회한 것으로 본다.
2. “수정 후 게재” 또는 “수정 후 재심” 판정을 받은 논문은 1차 논문심사위원 중 1인, 또는 제3의 심사위원에게 재심을 진행한다. 해당 심사위원이 재심이 불가능한 경우 편집위원 1인이 수정논문과 수정요지문을 검토하여 “게재 가” 또는 “게재 불가”로 판정하고 편집장에게 별지 제2호서식의 재심사 논문심사서를 작성하여 제

출한다.

제17조(게재여부 결정) ① 편집장은 투고논문에 대한 심사위원의 심사의견을 종합하여 해당 논문의 게재 여부를 결정한다.

② 편집장은 심사절차에 따라 “게재 가” 판정을 받은 논문이 다음 각 호의 어느 하나에 해당하는 경우 “게재 불가”를 결정한다.

1. 투고논문이 제15조의 심사기준을 충족하지 못한다는 사실이 확인된 경우
2. 투고논문이 연구부정행위가 확인된 경우
3. 제19조에 명시된 의무를 다하지 아니한 경우

제18조(심사수당) 심사를 완료한 심사위원에게는 「지출예산집행 및 관리지침」에 따라 심사수당을 지급한다.

제19조(저자의 의무 등) ① 논문의 내용, 자료, 인용의 정확성 및 출처에 대한 책임은 논문의 저자에게 있다.

② 저자는 편집 및 교열 과정에서 다음 각 호에 대한 편집주간의 요청사항을 이행하여야 한다.

1. 논문 내용의 수정·보완 또는 논문의 가독성을 높이기 위한 수정·보완
2. 인용문, 표, 그림, 사진 등의 출처, 저작권 확인 및 명시
3. 기 발표 또는 게재 관련 사항, 해당 논문 집필을 위한 연구비 수혜 사실의 기재

제4장 특집기획

제20조(특집호 주제 선정) *KJ* 특집호 주제는 쟁점이 되는 한국학 관련 주제로서, 편집위원회를 거쳐 결정된다.

제21조(객원기획위원) ① 특집호 발간을 위한 객원기획위원(guest editor)은 특집호 제안자 또는 편집위원회에서 추천받은 해당분야 국내외 학자 중에서 편집장이 위촉한다.

② 객원기획위원은 특집호 기획안 제출, 원고 및 저자 선정, 원고 수합, 특집호서문(On This Topic) 집필, 특집호 원고 심사위원 추천 및 원고 심사 등의 역할을 맡는다.

③ 특집호 발간 후 「지출예산집행 및 관리지침」에 따라 특집기획수당을 지급할 수 있다.

제22조(특집 논문 심사) 특집호 논문도 제16조(심사절차)에 따라 일반 투고논문과 동일한 심사절차를 거친다.

제5장 연구윤리위원회

제23조(운영) 연구윤리위원회의 설치 및 운영에 관한 사항은 원장이 따로 정하며, 모든 저술 연구 윤리는 영문학술지 The Review of Korean Studies (이하 *RKS*)의 편집위원회 지침 [별지2] *RKS* 저술 연구 윤리를 준용한다.

부 칙

이 지침은 공포한 날부터 시행한다.

[별지 제1호서식] 1차 논문심사서

Korea Journal Peer Review Form

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|--|
| Registration No. | | | |
| Manuscript Title | | | |
| Reviewer (Affiliation/Position) | | | |
| Due Date for Review | | Submission Date | |

1. BASIC CRITERIA (Please underline or check the applicable box.)

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | Originality/Persuasiveness of Argument and Evidence | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 2 | Appropriateness of Structure and Content (Proper attribution; Suitability of Abstract, Tables or Figures, and References; South Korean Romanization) | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 3 | Grasp of Existing Research and Contribution to Subject Area | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 4 | Readability of the Prose (Clear and Articulate; Precise Diction and Grammar) | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |

*** A: Very strong; B: Strong; C: Average; D: Weak; E: Very weak**

2. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION (Please underline or check the applicable box.)

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accept | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Revision | <input type="checkbox"/> Major Revision | <input type="checkbox"/> Reject |
|--|--|--|--|

- **Accept:** The manuscript can be published without any revision or further consideration. All the required conditions for publication are met.

- **Minor Revision*:** The manuscript has no major problems in terms of its overall argument, evidence, and structure. But it does require some revisions before it can be published.

- **Major Revision*:** The manuscript has some serious problems in terms of its overall argument, evidence, and structure. These problems must be addressed. If/when the revised manuscript is resubmitted, a comprehensive re-evaluation is required.

- **Reject:** The manuscript does not meet the basic criteria of an academic paper in terms of argument, evidence, or structure, or does not comply with the editorial policy of KJ.

* When the author submits a revised manuscript, one of the peer reviewers who evaluated the manuscript, or a third reviewer, shall determine whether to accept or reject the revised manuscript.

3. REVIEWER'S OPINION (Please state your opinion in at least 300 words.)

Please address the following questions: What is the main problematic, and is it interesting? How compelling is the argument and evidence? Will the manuscript make a significant contribution to the field/subject area? Is the paper well written? Do you have specific suggestions as to how the author might correct flaws and strengthen the argument?

4. COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF (if needed) [These comments will not be delivered to the author(s).]

[별지 제2호서식] 재심사 논문심사서

**Korea Journal
Second Review Form**

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|--|
| Registration No. | | | |
| Manuscript Title | | | |
| Reviewer (Affiliation/Position) | | | |
| Due Date for Review | | Submission Date | |

1. BASIC CRITERIA (Please underline or check the applicable box.)

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | Originality/Persuasiveness of Argument and Evidence | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 2 | Appropriateness of Structure and Content <small>(Proper attribution; Suitability of Abstract, Tables or Figures, and References; South Korean Romanization)</small> | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 3 | Grasp of Existing Research and Contribution to Subject Area | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |
| 4 | Readability of the Prose <small>(Clear and Articulate; Precise Diction and Grammar)</small> | | | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A | <input type="checkbox"/> B | <input type="checkbox"/> C | <input type="checkbox"/> D | <input type="checkbox"/> E |

*** A: Very strong; B: Strong; C: Average; D: Weak; E: Very weak**

2. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION (Please underline or check the applicable box.)

| | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accept | <input type="checkbox"/> Reject |
|--|--|

- **Accept:** The manuscript can be published without any revision or further consideration. All the required conditions for publication are met.

- **Reject:** The revised manuscript still does not meet the basic criteria of an academic paper in terms of argument, evidence, or structure, or does not comply with the editorial policy of KJ.

3. REVIEWER'S OPINION (Please state your opinion in at least 300 words.)

Please address the following questions: Has the author sufficiently addressed the concerns and suggestions in the first review? Is the revised manuscript suitable for publication in terms of argument, evidence, structure, content, and readability? Will it make a significant contribution to the field/subject area?

4. COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF (if needed) [These comments will not be delivered to the author(s).]