

Academic Ethics Policy of NTU Management Review

First Edition: May 20, 2020

Revised: February 28, 2026

Revised: March 18, 2026

I. Academic Ethical Responsibilities of Authors, Reviewers, Editors, Editorial Board Members, and the Publisher

1. *NTU Management Review* (hereinafter referred to as “the Journal”) is published biannually in April and October. The Journal welcomes submissions from all management-related disciplines, including business administration, marketing, information management, human resource management, financial management, international finance, technology and strategic management, and healthcare management, provided that the submitted manuscripts are original academic articles or research cases that have not been previously published in any journal.
2. The Journal adopts a double-blind peer review process under which the identities of authors and reviewers are concealed from one another. Unless otherwise specified, editors, editorial board members, and reviewers are required to maintain the confidentiality of all submitted manuscripts and related materials. Reviewers shall conduct reviews in a fair, objective, independent, and timely manner.

II. Policy on Manuscripts Derived from Conference Papers or Theses

Authors may not submit manuscripts containing substantially similar research content simultaneously to more than one journal or publication. However, the Journal does not regard the following materials as prior publication: abstracts, master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation, and conference papers published in proceedings.

- Where a master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation has been approved but has not yet been formally printed or publicly distributed, portions thereof may be submitted to the Journal. The manuscript must include a statement indicating that “this paper is revised from the author’s master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation.”
- Submission of a portion of the author’s unpublished thesis or dissertation for further analysis, extension, or in-depth investigation shall not constitute plagiarism where the manuscript demonstrates a substantial marginal contribution. In such cases, the manuscript must include a statement indicating that “part of this paper is derived from the author’s thesis.”

III. Similarity Check Procedures and Standards

Beginning in August 2022, all manuscripts submitted to the Journal have been required to undergo a Turnitin similarity check. The editorial office conducts a preliminary similarity screening as part of the initial editorial assessment process.

- Similarity reports shall be provided to the area editor irrespective of the similarity percentage. As a general principle, the acceptable similarity threshold is no more than 15%.
- Where the similarity ratio exceeds 15% but remains below 20%, the editorial office shall notify the corresponding author and request an explanation while simultaneously informing the area editor. The author may decide whether to proceed with peer review. Upon submission of a revised manuscript through the online system, the review process may be resumed.
- Where the similarity ratio exceeds 20%, the editorial office shall conduct a substantive assessment of the manuscript. Unless an exception is approved by a majority vote of the editorial board members, the manuscript shall be rejected during the internal editorial review stage. The editorial board shall further determine whether additional plagiarism investigation procedures should be initiated. The editorial office shall notify the author(s) of the review outcome and any decisions made by the editorial board.
- Similarity arising from material adapted from the author's own master's thesis or doctoral dissertation shall not be subject to the foregoing limitations; however, the editorial office and area editor shall evaluate whether the manuscript demonstrates sufficient marginal contribution.

IV. Principles Governing Authorship Order and Responsibilities

- The identity and order of all authors shall be finalized at the time of submission. Changes to the author list after review results have been issued are strongly discouraged. Requests to add an author must be submitted prior to the second round of review, namely before the editorial office receives the revised manuscript. The corresponding author must provide:
 1. A detailed explanation of the reasons for the requested authorship change, with the contributions of any newly added authors clearly identified in the manuscript.
 2. Written confirmation from all authors consenting to the addition, removal, or rearrangement of authorship, submitted by email or letter.
 3. A specific description of the nature and extent of the newly added author's contribution to the research.

Any addition of authorship shall require approval by at least two-thirds of the

Journal's area editors before the editorial office may proceed with the review process.

- With respect to manuscripts derived from master's theses or doctoral dissertations:
Advisors and co-advisors may be listed as co-authors where appropriate. However, the student author(s) must be listed among the first two authors. Where additional scholars are included as authors, a detailed explanation of their contributions must be provided and is subject to approval by the editorial board.

V. Policy on Duplicate Submission and Plagiarism

Upon discovery of duplicate submission, plagiarism, or other forms of academic misconduct, the Journal shall immediately convene an editorial board meeting to review the matter. Depending on the severity and circumstances of the case, actions may include notification of the corresponding author's affiliated institution, suspension of future submissions to the Journal, issuance of a formal warning, or other appropriate measures.

VI. Use of Generative AI by Authors

Responsibility and Accuracy

Authors bear full responsibility for the originality, accuracy, and integrity of their manuscripts, including all research data, analyses, and viewpoints presented therein. Although generative AI technologies have rapidly evolved, such tools remain subject to limitations, including outdated knowledge, factual inaccuracies, logical inconsistencies, bias, and fabricated content. Accordingly, authors must not rely on AI-generated content without independent verification and scholarly judgement. Content or information generated through AI platforms may be used solely for reference or auxiliary purposes. Authors should avoid reproducing AI-generated content verbatim and must ensure that the use of such tools does not infringe upon the intellectual property rights of others.

Auxiliary Use

The use of generative AI tools for language editing, formatting assistance, or other technical support is permitted provided that such use does not replace the author's academic judgement, critical analysis, or scholarly responsibility, and does not compromise academic rigor or research integrity.

VII. Use of Generative AI by Reviewers

Responsibility and Accuracy

Reviewers bear full responsibility for the accuracy, fairness, and professionalism of

their review comments and recommendations. Although generative AI technologies have rapidly evolved, such tools remain subject to limitations, including outdated information, factual inaccuracies, logical inconsistencies, bias, and fabricated content. Reviewers must therefore exercise independent professional judgement and must not rely on AI-generated content without thorough verification and evaluation.

Confidentiality Obligations

Manuscripts under review may contain unpublished findings, proprietary data, or confidential academic viewpoints that must be strictly protected. Reviewers are obligated to preserve the confidentiality of all materials obtained during the peer review process. Accordingly, reviewers must not upload manuscript content, data, or related materials to external generative AI platforms, in order to prevent unauthorized disclosure, retention, or misuse of unpublished work.

Auxiliary Use

Where generative AI tools are used for language assistance or other limited technical support, such use must be restricted to activities that do not involve confidential manuscript information and must not substitute for the reviewer's independent professional judgement.