

Peer Review Guidelines

1. Introduction

Thank you very much for accepting to review the Kawasaki Journal of Medical Welfare. The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for peer review and to give all members, including contributors, a perspective on the review policy.

2. Expedited peer review

Review should be completed *within two weeks for the first draft*, and *within one week for revised drafts* (second and third drafts), in principle. Due to the fixed publication date of this journal, the review period and the number of times (three times) for review are limited. The deadlines for judging final acceptance is June 20 for Issue 1 and December 20 for Issue 2. If the review process takes too long, the acceptance will be postponed to the next issue or later, to the disadvantage of the authors. We apologize for your busy schedule, but we ask for your prompt review.

3. Prior confirmation of submission rules and writing rules

If the manuscript does not conform to the submission rules or writing rules (Instructions to Authors), the authors will be asked to revise the manuscript. We would appreciate it if you could point out any discrepancies that can be corrected during the peer review process. Information that may lead to the identification of the authors, such as ethical considerations and acknowledgements, are listed separately from the main text, and these details will be checked by the editorial board member in charge, the chair and vice-chair.

4. Careful and clear acceptance/rejection decisions

Acceptance or rejection of a manuscript may affect the career of the contributor. In view of the fact that many of the contributors to this journal are graduate students or in the early stages of their careers, we would appreciate it if you could make a judgment on the potential suitability of the manuscript based on whether the deficiencies identified can be corrected by the author during the review process. However, especially for the second and subsequent drafts, please express your acceptance or rejection clearly so as not to unnecessarily prolong the peer review process.

5. Specific suggestions for revisions required

If there are items that need to be revised, authors are requested to indicate in as much detail as possible which parts of the manuscript need to be revised and in what manner. Authors are also expected to revise the manuscript in the expectation that revisions to the indicated items will lead to adoption of the manuscript. As a general rule, we ask that you make all comments in the first draft as much as possible (see the rules of peer review at the end of this text).

6. Comments on an equal footing

Please cooperate with the peer review from the perspective of academic volunteers and peer reviewers. Please keep in mind that you are on equal footing as a researcher, but this time you are on the side of the reviewer. Please be as polite as possible in your comments, so as not to hurt the feelings of authors as a result.

7. Consideration for the diversity of authors' fields of expertise

Each contributor has training as a researcher in a specific discipline, which may differ from the expertise of the reviewers. Each academic field has its own conventions when writing papers, and we ask that you respect this diversity as long as it does not deviate from the journal's rules of writing. Of course, if there is anything that is clearly unnatural or inappropriate for an academic paper, please do not hesitate to point it out.

8. Duty of confidentiality

The reviewers of this journal are anonymous, and reviewer 1 in particular is double blind. Information about who is reviewing what kind of paper should be shared only within the editorial board and the editorial office. The same applies even after the peer review process is completed.

<Peer review process guidelines>

First review

Major comments on the content of the paper and minor comments on the formatting.

Second review

A comment on whether appropriate changes have been made to the previous comments and a minor comment on the formatting.

Third review

The third peer review is the same as the second, but the decision is either "accept" or "reject"; there is no "re-review" decision.