

## ***Journal of Athletic Training*** **Procedures for Handling Ethical Misconduct**

Publishing and research misconduct may include but are not limited to the following:

- Plagiarism
- Dual submission
- Redundant, or duplicate publication of previous work (see [JAT CSE Redundant Pub Policy](#))
- Falsification of data
- Authorship deception
- Failed conveyance of conflict of interest

Publication misconduct can be identified by many parties, including but not limited to an editor, reviewer, or reader. The following procedures are to be followed in instances where publishing misconduct is suspected.

1. The Editor-in-Chief is to be appraised of the potential misconduct, with the goal of explicitly identifying the ethical infraction.
2. The Editor-in-Chief will initially examine the documents to verify that misconduct may have occurred. Where necessary, the Editor-in-Chief may correspond with the individual who identified the potential misconduct, the author(s) who allegedly violated the publication ethics, or other involved persons. In instances where the Editor-in-Chief believes misconduct has occurred, a publication misconduct review panel will be appointed. Potential panel members will have the opportunity to identify any possible conflicts of interest with the author.
3. If a panel is appointed, the author will be notified and provided the opportunity to explain his or her actions within 30 days.
4. The publication misconduct review panel will consist of at least 3 Section Editors and/or *JAT* Editorial Board members and 2 external reviewers with expertise in the publishing process and/or topical area. The review panel is charged with investigating the issue, verifying the facts in the case, and identifying whether publication misconduct has occurred. The panel will submit a recommendation(s), possible sanction(s), and notifications to the Editor-in-Chief within 60 days. The identity of the panel will remain confidential.
5. If publication misconduct cannot be substantiated, then no further investigation is necessary, and the case review is completed. No sanctions will be levied against the author(s). A letter will be sent to the author(s) with the decision.
6. In instances where the panel identifies that publication misconduct has occurred, an appropriate sanction is identified (see Publication Misconduct Actions and Sanctions), based on the severity of the infraction. The panel's findings and recommendation(s) are submitted to the Editor-in-Chief.
7. The Editor-in-Chief will review the panel's findings and recommendation for sanctions. The Editor-in-Chief may consult appropriate parties for further insights as to the proper course of action.

8. Once a course of action is identified, the Editor-in-Chief will notify the author(s) and appropriate academic and funding agencies of the outcome. Where deemed necessary, the Editor-in-Chief may also notify the NATA Ethics Committee of the violation.
9. The author(s) will have 30 days from receipt of notification to appeal the decision and/or sanctions. The appeal letter must be addressed to the Editor-in-Chief and must provide specific details or new information for the appeal.

### Publication Misconduct Actions and Sanctions<sup>a</sup>

Sanction	Contact	Explanation
No Substantiation of Misconduct	Author(s)	The letter will explain the panel finding to the author(s), documenting that publication misconduct was not found.
Letter of reprimand	Authors(s)	The letter of reprimand will explain the panel's findings to the authors and identify the publication principle violated. It is to be used in instances where the infraction appears unintentional or incidental or when authors appear to have a general misunderstanding of publication principles. The letter will also explain that future instances of misconduct will result in sanctions. The article is either rejected or retracted from the online version of <i>JAT</i> due to the violation of publication principles.
Letter of reprimand and rejection/retraction of article	Author(s) and possibly the institution's administrative officer and/or funding agency	The letter of reprimand will explain the panel's findings to the author(s) and identify the publication principle violated. The letter will assert a strong message to the author(s) and explain that the article is either rejected or retracted from the online version of <i>JAT</i> due to the violation of publication principles. The author(s) is (are) warned that future instances of misconduct may result in more serious sanctions.
Letter of reprimand, rejection/retraction of article, and possible restriction of submission to <i>JAT</i> and suspension of reviewing privileges	Author(s) and institution's administrative officer and/or funding agency  May be referred to the NATA Ethics Committee	The letter of reprimand for a severe violation will explain the panel's findings to the author(s) and identify the publication principle violated. The letter will assert a strong message to the author(s) and explain that the article is either rejected or retracted from the online version of <i>JAT</i> due to the violation of publication principles. The authors are not allowed to submit a manuscript to the journal for a stated period of time. <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The sanctions stated above can be modified as necessary to address the specifics of the situation.

<sup>b</sup> The period of restriction will vary depending upon the severity of the violation. The minimum period will be 6 months.

