

Guideline for Reviewers for *Japanese Psychological Research*

Editorial Board

The review system of the Japanese Psychological Association is volunteer-based and relies on our members' willingness to support the development of Psychology. We ask our reviewers to provide us with reviews that are prompt and just with consideration for the following points.

1. Contact our office to let us know whether you agree to review the assigned manuscript by its due date. If you prefer to review the manuscript without using the reviewer's page, please contact our office using the following contact information.

E-mail: jpaednew@psych.or.jp

2. Please review promptly.

- Please complete your review within four weeks.
- Please consider that delayed reviews may have adverse effects on contributors, especially graduate students and young researchers.
- If on-schedule completion of a review becomes impossible due to unforeseeable reasons, please contact our office through the reviewers' page. You can also contact us using the contact information provided above.

3. Please keep in mind the following points while reviewing the assigned manuscript.

- Authors' names will not be disclosed.
- If you wish to disclose your identity as a reviewer, please clearly include your name in your comments to the authors.
- Please make your recommendation for acceptance or rejection as clear as it can be. In general, revised manuscripts are sent out for review only once and at most twice. We would appreciate it if you could make efforts to reach a definite recommendation (e.g. acceptance or rejection) rather than requesting the author(s) to resubmit their manuscripts.
- Please make your comments respectful to the author(s). In particular, please try not to sound condescending.
- In general, your comments (Result of the Evaluation (Comments to the Author)) will be forwarded to the author(s) as they are. However, please note that your comments may be modified before being forwarded to the author(s) if the editorial board determines that they are inappropriate.
- The ultimate decision about acceptance/rejection of manuscripts belongs to the editorial board. Therefore, please provide your recommendation (A-E) in your report to the editorial board (Reason for Evaluation (Comments to the Editorial Board)) and do not include it in your comments to the author(s) (Result of the Evaluation (Comments to the

Author)).

4. Please note that *Japanese Psychological Research* has two different forms of publication: Original Article, Brief Report and Review. Please keep in mind that these two forms differ in the following ways.

Original Article: In principle, an original article should present research results, theoretical discussion, and a clear conclusion based on the description of problems, experiments, surveys, and case studies. It should also include new methods, skills, and data that are useful for conducting research, such as the development of new experimentation equipment and analysis programs, the creation of new psychological measurement scales, as well as database construction. Articles cannot exceed 10,000 words (excluding tables, figures, and references).

Brief Report: Contain the following contents: (a) an additional examination of an already published report, (b) the discovery of a new fact, (c) a new important observation, (d) a report of a few cases, (e) results to be published quickly or (f) a report based on exploratory ideas. Articles cannot exceed 5,000 words (excluding tables, figures, and references).

Review: A review should focus on recent major themes in psychology, explain primary research status, main achievements and problems, and discuss the significance of current and future studies. “Invited Review” articles are written by request of the Editorial Board. Articles cannot exceed 20,000 words (excluding tables, figures, and references)

These word count limits apply only to the first submission, and must be noted at the time of submission thereafter

It is the author(s)’s decision to submit their papers as an Original Article, Brief Report or Review. However, if you believe that the author(s)’s choice is inappropriate, you have the choice of making a recommendation to the editorial board about the classification of the manuscript in your report. Please do not include your recommendation about the classification of the manuscript in the comments to the author(s) (Result of the Evaluation (Comments to the Author)).

5. Guidelines for writing comments for the author(s) (Result of the Evaluation (Comments to the Author)) and examples comments are provided below. Please change the example comments accordingly when writing your comments.

Please provide a summary of the manuscript at the beginning of your comments.

Example:

This paper investigates/reports experiments about ‘_____’ with respect to ‘_____’. The author(s) found ‘_____’. Based on these findings, they argue that ‘_____’.

Recommendations: Please use the following criteria to determine your recommendation and follow the instructions about writing comments.

‘A’: A manuscript is publishable as it is.

- Please provide comments even if the manuscript is publishable as it is.
- Please state the manuscript’s strengths and weaknesses, if applicable.

Example:

The findings in this paper are significant in terms of ‘_____’. The presentation of the paper is easy to follow and appropriate. It could have included a discussion of ‘_____’ and I hope to see that in the author(s)’s future studies.

‘B’: A manuscript requires minor revision. After revision, the editorial board should decide whether it is appropriate for publication.

- Please state the manuscript’s strengths and clearly point out the parts that need to be changed. Please also state the manuscript’s weaknesses if necessary.

Example:

The findings in this paper are significant in terms of ‘_____’. However, there are some problems in the paper and they need to be addressed.

- Please clearly describe specific problems in the manuscript and your recommendations about them.

Example:

Please consider making the following changes to your manuscript.

- ‘_____’ should be replaced with ‘_____’
- ‘_____’ should be cited.
- ‘_____’ should be described with more detail.
- The expression ‘_____’ is not appropriate.

-There are also typographical errors and errors in numbering of the figures. Please correct them.

‘C’: It should undergo another round of review after it is revised to address the issues discussed in provided comments.

- Please state both strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript and your reasons for

recommending reconsideration of the manuscript after a substantial revision.

Example:

The findings in the paper were analyzed as ‘_____’. However, as pointed out below, the author(s) fail to clearly demonstrate the validity of the analysis and the novelty of the study. Therefore, I must conclude that the paper with its current content and organization is not appropriate for publication as an Original Article/Review in *Japanese Psychological Research*. It needs to be substantially revised to address these points.

- Please clearly describe specific problems in the manuscript and your recommendations about them.

Examples:

“Problems that are similar to the problems analyzed in this paper have been discussed in previous studies such as ‘_____’. Please discuss the relation between your study and these previous studies as well as differences between them.”

“The definitions of the following terms and concepts are not clear and they seem to create confusion with respect to ‘_____’.”

“On page ‘_____’, the author(s) argue(s) that ‘_____’. However, there appear to be a few steps missing from their argument and that makes their argument hard to follow as it is. Please clarify.”

“In order to reach the conclusion that the author(s) argue(s) for, the following alternatives should be considered. In order to strengthen your conclusion, please also discuss ‘_____’.”

‘E’: A manuscript is not publishable.

- Please state your reasons for recommending rejection of the manuscript as specifically and clearly as you can. Please make efforts to mention some good aspects of the manuscript and do not list only the problems.

Example:

“The paper has some promising aspects. However, I have concluded that it is not suitable for publication in *Japanese Psychological Research* for the following reasons.”

“The paper deals with several important issues. Nonetheless, most of the findings discussed in this paper have already been discussed in previous studies (references) and it is not clear whether this study provides novel findings.”

“The issues that are discussed in this paper are intriguing. However, there are inconsistencies between how the specific problems are identified, the methods of the experiments/surveys used, and the results and the analyses, such as ‘_____’. The paper seems to lack consistency and good balance.”

“The methods used in the experiments/surveys are not appropriate because of ‘_____’.

Therefore, their results may not be valid.”

“The paper concludes ‘_____’ from their findings. However, I believe that such a conclusion is untenable because ‘_____’. It appears that use of conditions such as ‘_____’ and more data concerning ‘_____’ are necessary.”

“While the study’s aim is somewhat clear, the main arguments of the paper could not be clearly identified because (a) the format of the paper significantly deviates from the journal’s format and (b) the paper consists of a number of statements that are unclear and ambiguous.”

- Please refrain from “lecturing” how research papers should be or disregarding the study in the manuscript.

Bad Example:

“It is difficult to justify the importance of the study discussed in this paper, as it deals with a topic that is insignificant and irrelevant to the field of Psychology.”

- Please state the reason for recommending rejection of the paper in a clear and concise manner and avoid going into unnecessary details of the problems of the manuscript.

6. Please make sure that past studies by Japanese authors are cited.

Not citing past studies by Japanese authors is a major problem and if this comes to your attention, please point it out to the author. Citing past studies by Japanese authors will significantly contribute to improving the impact factors of *Japanese Psychological Research*.

7. Please review keyword selection.

It is important to select keywords that appropriately represent the manuscript, but if the selected keywords are so idiosyncratic that they are unique to the author, the likelihood that the manuscript is found by searching databases such as PsycINFO will be reduced. If a manuscript is not found by other researchers through keyword search, it will not be cited. Please also make sure that keywords are appropriate from the perspective of ease of keyword search, in addition to other factors.

8. In order to submit your review, please submit it electronically. If you wish to submit your review without using the reviewer’s page, please use the contact information listed in 1.

Thank you for your cooperation.