

Editorial Risk Management System

This risk management system embodies the principles of the Japan Journal of Nursing Science (JJNS) and Journal of Japan Academy of Nursing Science (JJANS) editorial policies and supports both routine editorial operations and crisis management.

1. Purpose

The purpose of JJNS and JJANS editorial risk management is to ensure fair and transparent publishing operations and to safeguard academic integrity and ethics. This system aims to achieve the following:

- 1) Prevent ethical risks in the peer review and editorial process
- 2) Prevent conflicts of interest (COI) and bias among authors, reviewers, and editorial board members
- 3) Ensure transparency and consistency in editorial and publishing decisions
- 4) Provide prompt and appropriate responses to serious issues such as publication ethics violations, defamation, and copyright infringement
- 5) Clarify the scope of responsibilities and decision-making rules for all parties involved in the editorial process

All ethical issues related to editing and publishing will be handled in accordance with the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) guidelines and flowcharts.

COPE Guidance: <https://publicationethics.org/guidance>

COPE Guidance & Tools: <https://publicationethics.org/guidance-and-tools>

2. Confidentiality of Editorial Board Members

Editorial board members must treat submitted manuscripts with strict confidentiality and may not disclose any details to anyone other than assigned reviewers without the author's permission. Discussions conducted confidentially among authors, editors, and reviewers must also remain confidential unless explicit consent is obtained from all parties involved. Exceptions apply in cases where disclosure is necessary, for example, to substantiate suspected plagiarism or misappropriation of intellectual property during peer review. This obligation of confidentiality applies not only during a member's term on the editorial board but also continues after the member has stepped down from the position.

3. Recusal Policy

All editorial board (committee) members must recuse themselves from handling a manuscript whenever a conflict of interest (COI) exists or could reasonably be perceived. Recusal ensures fairness and impartiality in the editorial process and aligns with COPE guidelines.

1) Situations Requiring Recusal

Editors must decline involvement when any of the following apply:

They share the same institutional affiliation with the author(s).

They are engaged in current collaborative research, shared grants, or grant applications with the author(s).

They have co-authored with the author(s) within the past 3–5 years.

They have a close personal relationship or conflict with the author(s).

They are asked only to suggest reviewers despite having a COI.

2) Procedure

Self-disclosure: The editor immediately informs the Editor-in-Chief or Associate Editor.

Withdrawal: The editor is removed from all editorial responsibilities for the manuscript.

Reassignment: Another editor with no COI is appointed.

Documentation: The recusal is recorded internally.

4. Risk Management

JJNS and JJANS classify risks within the editorial process and establishes preventive and responsive measures for each category:

1) Publication Ethics Violations

Prevention: Plagiarism checks at submission; use of AI tools for plagiarism and image manipulation detection

Response: Ethical awareness for reviewers; clear procedures for handling violations

2) Conflicts of Interest (COI) and Bias

Prevention: COI disclosure checklist at submission; COI checks for editors and reviewers (COI to be disclosed: see the reference material)

Response: Reviewer selection avoiding related parties; distributed decision-making

3) Delays or Deficiencies in Peer Review

Prevention: Securing backup reviewers; deadline management system

Response: Monitoring review quality; prompt execution of alternatives

4) Errors in Editorial Judgment

Prevention: Reference to COPE Core Practices and ICMJE Recommendations; mandatory statistical review under certain conditions

Response: Deliberation among multiple editors; record-keeping of decisions

5) Legal Issues (Copyright, Defamation, etc.)

Prevention: Copyright verification at submission; risk checks during editing

Response: Legal consultation; referral to external agencies when necessary

5. Response Flow When Issues Arise

1) Detection of Issues

Reported by reviewers, editors, readers, authors, or external organizations

(1) Examples:

- Plagiarism, data fabrication, improper citation
- Copyright infringement, defamation, privacy violation
- Undisclosed COI

(2) Initial response

- Reporter informs the Editor-in-Chief (EIC) and Associate Editor
- Details documented (time, reporter, issue)

2) Fact-Finding

- Responsible: EIC + Associate Editor
- Consultation as needed: legal advisors, external ethics committees, society ethics committee, COPE

- Verification:

- Review manuscripts, reviewer comments, and submission documents
- Notify authors in writing with a deadline for response
- Seek external expert opinion if necessary

3) Consideration of Emergency Measures (if needed)

- Before publication: place manuscript on hold
- After publication: temporarily suspend online availability
- Report to publisher or relevant institutions as necessary

4) Editorial Decision

(1) Factors

- Severity (e.g., plagiarism, fabrication)
- Intent (deliberate or accidental)

- Academic impact

(2) Examples of responses:

- Minor citation error: publish erratum
- Plagiarism or data falsification: retract article
- Defamation or copyright violation: publish apology; pursue legal procedures if necessary

5) Notification to Authors and Stakeholders

- Formal written notice issued under the EIC's name
- Clear statement of reasons and procedures in cases of retraction or correction
- Authors' rebuttals or explanations documented

6) Publication and Record of Actions

- Report to editorial board; record in meeting minutes
- Share with publisher
- Consider recurrence prevention measures

7) Sanctions Against Authors (in cases of serious misconduct)

- Restriction from submitting to JJNS or JJANS for two years
- Formal notification to affiliated institutions
- Publication of a retraction notice

6. Article Retraction

Decisions and procedures regarding article retraction in JJNS and JJANS will follow the Retraction Guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Retraction will be implemented promptly and transparently to maintain the integrity of the academic record.

Material: COI to Be Disclosed

Category	Examples
Personal relationships	Close friendships, family relationships, mentor–mentee relationships, or personal rivalries that may affect objectivity.
Professional relationships	Employment at the same or closely affiliated institutions; current or recent collaborative research; co-authorship within the past 3–5 years; joint grant applications or funding.
Financial relationships	Receiving honoraria, consulting fees, research funding, or holding stocks or other financial interests in entities that may be affected by the publication outcome.
Intellectual or academic	Conducting competing research; holding strong theoretical or

interests	academic positions that could bias judgment; having research or professional interests that may benefit or be disadvantaged by the manuscript's publication.
Institutional relationships	Institutional affiliations or partnerships that have close ties to the authors' institutions, including financial or strategic relationships.