

Japanese Journal of Public Health Physical Therapy Peer Review Rules

Editorial Board of the Journal

Decided on August 19, 2013

Revised on December 30, 2016

Revised on April 1, 2018

1. The peer review rules will be published on the Journal website. It will not be published in every issue of the journal like the submission rules and writing guidelines.

2. The procedure for peer review is as follows.
 - (1) The author(s) should send the submitted paper and the specified information to the Editorial Board Secretariat (hereinafter referred to as the "Editorial Board Secretariat") by attaching the form specified by the JSME to the e-mail address of the Editorial Board Secretariat written on the JSME website.

 - (2) The Editorial Office will notify the author(s) of the receipt of the manuscript.

 - (3) The Chair of the Editorial Board of the Journal (hereinafter referred to as the "Chair") decides on one editorial board member and sends the review materials to the editorial board member in charge.

 - (4) The Editorial Board member in charge recommends two reviewers based on his/her own authority and judgment to ensure the academic level of the content.

 - (5) The Editor-in-Chief reports the members of the peer review system (the editorial board members in charge and the names of the peer reviewers) to the Editorial Board, decides on the composition of the peer review system with the approval of the Editorial Board, notifies them, and has the peer reviewers begin their review.

 - (6) Within two weeks of receiving the review materials, the reviewers should submit their "Evaluation" and "Comments to the Editorial Board Member in Charge" and "Comments to the Author" to the Editorial Board Member in Charge in accordance with the prescribed procedures in the Review Rules. The results of the review by the reviewers will be

referred to as the "evaluation" and those by the editorial board as the "judgment.

(7) Within two weeks of receiving the reviewers' evaluations and comments, the editor-in-charge should submit the "Judgment," "Comments to the Editorial Board," and "General Comments to the Authors" to the Editorial Office in accordance with the prescribed procedures in the Reviewing Rules.

(8) The editorial board members and reviewers will review the paper in the following four stages.

Accepted for publication.

Accepted with conditions.

Acceptable for publication after revisions (the results of revisions are left to the editor-in-charge).

Re-review After revision, the paper is re-reviewed.

Rejection of the manuscript is not possible.

(9) The editor-in-charge will, in principle, follow the evaluations of the two reviewers when they agree, and will follow the procedures specified in the "Role of the editor-in-charge" when they are not in agreement. If the reviewers suggest a change in the submission category, the final decision will be made by the editor-in-charge and reported to the editor-in-chief.

(10) The revised manuscript of a submission that has been conditionally accepted will be reviewed only by the Editorial Board member in charge, but in some cases, the Editorial Board member in charge may request the reviewers to comment on the revised manuscript.

(11) The Editor-in-Chief confirms the results of the review by the editor-in-charge and discusses with the editor-in-charge and reviewers, as necessary.

(12) The Editorial Office will disclose to the authors the "Results of Judgment" and "General Comments to Authors" of the Editorial Board Members in Charge, and the "Results of Evaluation" and "Comments to Authors" of the reviewers, after obtaining the approval of the Editor-in-Chief. The names of the editorial board members and reviewers will not be disclosed to the authors.

(13) When the editorial board member or reviewer changes, or when it becomes necessary to select a second reviewer, the editorial office will inform the authors of the change with the approval of the editor-in-chief.

(14) The editorial board members and reviewers can confirm their own evaluations, judgments, comments, and the progress of the review by e-mail to the Editorial Office during the review. 3.

3. The deadlines for peer review will be dealt with as follows.

(1) The Editor-in-Chief will send a deadline notice e-mail one week before and on the day of the deadline for peer review.

(2) If the peer review cannot be completed in time by the deadline, the editor-in-charge should contact the editor-in-chief as soon as possible and consult with him/her.

(3) The editor-in-charge should pay attention to the progress of the reviewers,

(3) The editor-in-charge should pay attention to the progress of the reviewers and contact them if necessary.

(4) The chairperson of the editorial board pays attention to the progress of the reviewers and, if necessary, sends reminders and other communications.

(5) If the peer review process is prolonged and no peer review report has been received within three months of the initial request for review, the editor-in-charge may appoint another reviewer to replace the original reviewer. 4.

4. Contributors may file an objection to the review results with the Editorial Board.

5. In principle, the editorial board members in charge are selected from among the members of the Editorial Board. However, if the editor of a special issue is not a member of the Editorial Board, that editor may also be a member of the Editorial Board.

6. Reviewers are selected from among the members of the Society. However, one of the

reviewers may be selected from non-members of the society if the editor-in-charge deems it necessary.

7. In principle, the same reviewer will review all papers with the same submission number. If a paper is resubmitted with a different submission category, it will be reviewed by the first reviewer. However, the reviewer may be replaced at the request of the reviewer or at the discretion of the editorial board member in charge.

Reviewer Role

Editorial Board of the Journal

1. Confidentiality of peer review

Editorial board members and reviewers 1 and 2 must not divulge anything related to the papers they have reviewed, including the fact that they have reviewed the papers.

2. Reviewing Rules

Reviewers who are not members of the editorial board are expected to understand the process of peer review through the "Reviewing Rules of the Japanese Journal of Public Health Physical Therapy.

3. Criteria for peer review

(1) Papers are evaluated in the following four stages. Papers will be evaluated in the following four stages:

Accepted:

Acceptable for publication

Conditional Acceptance:

Acceptable for publication after revisions (the results of revisions are left to the editorial board).

Re-evaluation: The paper is re-evaluated after revision.

Rejection: The paper cannot be published.

(2) Accepted (can be published as-is) means that the paper can be published as-is or with only minor revisions.

(3) Acceptance (can be published as is) means that the paper can be published as is or

with only minor revisions.

(4) If the manuscript is rejected because of peer review, it will be judged as follows. (3)

When a manuscript is rejected because of peer review, it will be evaluated as follows

(5) If the paper is rejected because of peer review, it will be judged as follows.

1. It is not in the field of our research group (research on physical therapy in relation to biological functions, motor functions, physical activities, actions, and public health issues such as human, culture, and society).

2. contains substantive errors.

3. low level of content and not important as a paper.

4. the paper has been published or is known in other media (such as journals) and is not novel.

5. the argument is unclear, and the argument structure is weak, and there is no prospect of improvement even in a revised manuscript.

6. Insufficient elaboration and uniformity of formatting, resulting in an exceptionally low level of formal perfection.

(4) In principle, the reviewers/editors in charge will not re-examine and evaluate/judge the same numbered submission twice in a row.

(5) Even if the manuscript is finally rejected, the authors may revise it and resubmit it as a new submission, in which case it will be accepted as if it were a new submission.

4. Types of submissions

The following types of manuscripts may be submitted: Editorials, Reviews, Original Papers, Short Reports, Activity Reports, Research Notes, Materials, and Letters.

1. Editorial Board Sounding Board

Proposals and suggestions for activities, policies, and trends in physical therapy in public

health. Up to 5 pages

2. Review Article Summaries and commentaries of research and survey papers. Up to 12 pages

3. Original Article, Original research papers and scientific observations. About 10 pages

4. Short Communication A short report on original research or an article on the improvement or proposal of a method. Up to 5 pages

5. Activity Report Public Health Report

A practical report on physical therapy activities in public health. Up to 10 pages

6. Research Note, A report on an important survey or analysis of physical therapy in public health. Up to 10 pages

7. Materials Information, Materials useful for physical therapy in public health. Up to 10 pages

8. Letter

Opinions on published papers, overseas situations, reports on relevant academic meetings, etc. 1 page.

In addition, there are some review articles that seem to have taken the position of "introducing" overseas research to the Japanese public health physical therapy scientific community, which is lagging in its research. However, those with a weak author's own viewpoint or those that merely introduce the research of others are only textbooks and should not be treated as review articles to be published in the Journal.

5. Reviewer 1 and Reviewer 2.

The aim is for two reviewers to look at a submission from different perspectives, and the two reviewers are on an equal footing.

6. If a reviewer decides that he or she is not qualified to review a manuscript after the review process has begun, the reviewer should contact the editor in charge as

soon as possible for advice.

7. Entry of Review Results

In principle, "Comments to Authors" should be written in Japanese. However, in some cases, it may be written in English.

Role of the Editorial Board Member in Charge

1. The following four levels of evaluation will be used in the peer review process.

Accepted: The paper can be published as is.

Conditional Acceptance: The paper can be published after revisions (the results of revisions are left to the editorial board).

Re-review: Re-review after revision.

Rejection: The paper cannot be published.

2. Based on the reports from reviewers 1 and 2, the editor-in-charge proposes to the editorial board the acceptance or rejection of the manuscript and the re-review. At that time, the editor-in-charge should refrain from making new suggestions as much as possible and should limit his or her comments to the minimum necessary. However, if there is a discrepancy between reviewers regarding comments or the direction of revision, the editor-in-charge may provide supplementary explanations, comments, and advice to the author(s) to achieve convergence.

2. Proposals for acceptance or rejection and re-review by the Editorial Board are expected to be based on the following criteria.

3. The reviewers are expected to use the following criteria. However, if the reviewer is not a member of the editorial board, the evaluation method for acceptance or rejection may vary.

4. However, if the reviewer is not a member of the editorial board, the method of evaluation for acceptance or rejection may be unstable, so please carefully consider the "Comments to Authors", especially the rationale for the evaluation, and understand the true intention of the reviewer.

(Acceptance)

If two reviewers evaluate the paper as accepted, the paper is proposed for acceptance. If two reviewers evaluate the paper as unacceptable, the paper is proposed as unacceptable. However, the decision of rejection should be applied only when there are definite and definitive difficulties in the paper.

(Conditional acceptance)

When two reviewers evaluate a manuscript for acceptance or conditional acceptance, the author(s) will be asked to make necessary revisions, and the editor-in-charge will check the results before proposing acceptance. In this case, revisions by the authors should be made within one month (within two weeks in the case of a special issue).

(Re-review)

When the reviewer's evaluation is Acceptance and Re-review, or Conditional Acceptance and Re-review, or both are Pole Review, the following procedures are applied.

- i) The editor-in-charge will inform the author of the review through the Editorial Board and ask the author to submit a revised manuscript within 3 months (within 2 months for special issues) for re-review. If the author(s) have made any changes to the paper, the author(s) will be asked to clearly indicate the changes in the response and resubmit the revised manuscript electronically.
- ii) The editor-in-charge will wait for the revised manuscript and request the reviewers to re-review it. The reviewer who made the initial decision of acceptance, conditional acceptance, or re-review should be requested to re-review the manuscript.
- iii) At the re-review, the reviewer should report the evaluation of acceptance (acceptable for publication), conditional acceptance (acceptable for publication after revision), or rejection (not acceptable for publication), as well as "comments to the author" and, if necessary, "comments to the editor-in-charge". In the re-review, the reviewer cannot choose to re-review the manuscript after revision.
- iv) Depending on the results, the editor-in-charge will decide of (Accept), (Conditional Accept) or (Reject).

(Rejection)

If the reviewers' evaluations are divided into Accepted and Rejected, or Conditionally Accepted and Rejected in either the first or second review, the editor-in-charge will immediately select a third reviewer to review the manuscript and decide based on the results. The third reviewer will evaluate whether the manuscript has been accepted, conditionally accepted, or rejected by referring to the results of the previous reviews. (As a rule, the third reviewer cannot choose to review the manuscript again (after revision). In principle, the third reviewer cannot choose to re-evaluate the manuscript.

If the decision is between re-evaluation and rejection

i) The editor-in-charge will inform the authors of the decision result and the "Comments to Authors" through the Editorial Board and ask them to submit a revised manuscript in response to the comments of the re-evaluation within three months (within two months in the case of a special issue). If the author(s) have made any changes to the paper, the author(s) are requested to clearly indicate the changes in the response and resubmit the revised manuscript electronically. In principle, the reviewers are not required to respond to the rejection evaluation, but if the authors send a response (rebuttal or comments) to the rejection evaluation, the reviewers can view it.

ii) When a response to the decision is received from the author, the editor-in-charge will send the response from the author only to the reviewer who evaluated the paper as re-reviewed and request re-review.

iii) The reviewers will report their evaluations of acceptance (acceptable), conditional acceptance (acceptable after revision), and rejection (not acceptable), together with their "Comments to Authors" and, if necessary, their "Comments to the Editorial Board. iii) In the re-review process, the reviewers cannot choose to re-review the manuscript after revision in principle.

iv) If the result of the re-review is a rejection evaluation, the rejection will be proposed to the Editorial Board.

v) If the result of the re-review is either acceptance or conditional acceptance (rejection), the revised manuscript is forwarded to the third reviewer. v) If the result of the re-review is acceptance or conditional acceptance (rejection), the revised manuscript will be sent to the third reviewer. The third reviewer will evaluate whether the manuscript is accepted,

conditionally accepted, or rejected by referring to the results of the previous reviews.
(As a rule, the third reviewer cannot choose to review the manuscript again (after revision).
Depending on the result of the review, the paper will be either (accepted) or (conditionally
accepted).

Contact address:

jjphpt@outlook.com