Receipt of Manuscripts and Procedures for Review

1. Introduction

This document describes the procedures for receipt, review, and publication of manuscripts by the Editorial Board of the Kawasaki Journal of Medical Welfare. The purpose of this document is to explain the current procedures to contributors, reviewers, and members, and to give them a better understanding of the process. Please note that the procedures will be revised according to the actual situation.

2. Receipt of entries

The Editorial Board of the Kawasaki Journal of Medical Welfare publishes the Journal twice a year, and we ask you to submit your entry (application for submission) through the Online Submission and Peer Review System by the end of July and January, respectively. Only manuscripts that have been submitted by the deadline will be considered for review. There is no limit to the number of submissions, so you may submit multiple manuscripts at the same time.

3. Receipt of manuscripts

Manuscripts are accepted through the Online Submission and Peer Review System with submission deadlines set approximately two months after the entry submission deadline (March and September). Manuscripts should be prepared using the designated format.

4. Determination of reviewer and editorial board members in charge

The Editorial Board determines the reviewer and the editorial board members for each manuscript after the chair and vice-chair discuss and propose one reviewer and one editorial board member for each manuscript, taking into consideration the content of the manuscript, the author's desire for review and the burden on the reviewers. Reviewers are selected based on their expertise in the subject matter of the manuscript (hereinafter referred to as "expertise-based reviewers"). The editorial board members give priority to submissions from their own departments, but may also take charge of manuscripts submitted from other departments when the number of submissions from a particular department is large.

5. Request for peer review

Once the Editorial Board decides on the editorial board members in charge and reviewer (candidates), the editorial board members in charge will make a request to the reviewer. In the unlikely event that the reviewer does not accept the request, the chair and vice-chair will discuss, and another reviewer will be selected and asked to review the manuscript as soon as possible. If the reviewer accepts the review, we ask the reviewer to submit the review results within two weeks as a rule. If there is a delay, the editorial board member in charge will be contacted to ensure the review is processed in a suitable time frame.

6. Peer review system

A reviewer is selected based on his/her expertise and a member of the editorial board is placed in charge of the manuscript. The editorial board member in charge is also responsible for reviewing. Each reviewer checks the manuscript and decides whether it is acceptable and whether revisions are necessary. However, there are cases in which the expertise of the reviewers does not necessarily match that of the authors. In such cases, the review results are submitted after at least a formal check is made and the reviewers' judgment based on their expertise is respected.

7. Content of review

Reviewers will make decisions on acceptance, re-review, or rejection of manuscripts, and will point out areas that need revision. The peer review is anonymous. Reviewers will be provided with a separate set of guidelines for peer review and asked to comment from their perspective based on these guidelines. While practices in the author's field of expertise may be reflected in the preparation of the manuscript and figures/tables, the reviewers will be asked to make suggestions to keep the manuscript within the scope of the writing rules (Instructions to Authors).

8. Notification of review results

The reviewers will submit their reviews to the editorial board. The chair and vice-chair will assess both reviews and determine the contents of the notification to the author. If there are matters, mainly in the format of the manuscript, that are not pointed out by the reviewers but require correction, the chair and vice-chair may add separate comments.

9. Third reviewer

In addition to the two main reviewers, a third reviewer may be appointed. This is mainly the case when the reviewer and the editorial board member in charge have widely different judgments about acceptance or rejection (for example, one rejects the manuscript and the other accepts it), or when the manuscript is considered to require careful judgment in terms of ethics. In the case of appointing a third reviewer, the chairperson, vice chairperson, and editorial board member in charge will consult with each other. In addition, the secretariat will inform the authors of the possibility of a delay in the notification of the review results to the author.

10. Author revision and reviewer re-review

If the review results indicate that corrections are necessary, the author will be required to make the necessary corrections and submit, within two weeks. The resubmission requires two documents, i.e. a document stating each correction (page #, line #) and the specific corrections made in response to each correction, as well as a revised manuscript with the corrected sections highlighted. The revised manuscript will be reviewed again by the editorial board members in charge and the reviewer, unless the reviewers deem it unnecessary to review the revised manuscript. The results of re-reviews for the second and subsequent rounds must be submitted within one week.
In principle, the second revisions must be submitted within one week. If the revised manuscript is not submitted by the prescribed deadline, and no submission is received within one week thereafter, the Editorial Board shall determine whether the peer review process will continue. If the revised manuscript is not submitted without a valid reason, the peer review process shall be terminated. However, if the author has notified the Editorial Board in advance and the Editorial Board determines that the reason is justified, an extension of the submission deadline may be granted.

11. Limitations on the period and number of peer reviews

Since journals are published twice a year, it is necessary to ensure that there are no significant delays in the publication of the journal. In particular, the second issue of each volume must be published by the end of the fiscal year for accounting purposes. Therefore, the deadline for peer review to be considered for inclusion in each issue is set at 5:00 p.m. on June 20 for the first issue and December 20 for the second issue (or the following day if it falls on a Saturday or Sunday). If the deadline is exceeded, the peer review will continue, but the article will be published in the next issue even if it is accepted. In principle, however, the number of peer reviews will be limited to three. If the manuscript is not accepted after the prescribed number of peer reviews, it will be judged as unacceptable and returned to the author.

12. Re-submission of manuscripts not accepted within the prescribed number of peer reviews

Papers that are not accepted within the prescribed number of peer reviews (three times) may be resubmitted for the next issue. In this case, please inform the secretariat that the manuscript was previously submitted. Papers that were voluntarily withdrawn by the author during the peer review process may be re-entered in the same manner.

13. From acceptance of manuscript to publication

If a manuscript is accepted after peer review, the author will be requested to submit the final manuscript and necessary files for publication. The author will proofread the manuscript once, and the editorial board members responsible for the manuscript will also review it. After the second proof, the manuscript will, in principle, be checked only by the secretariat and the chair and vice-chair. Separate reprints will be arranged through communication between the secretariat and the author.

The author bears academic responsibility for the content of a manuscript accepted after peer review. Revisions during the author proofreading stage are limited to corrections of typographical errors, consistency of figures and tables, and minor factual inaccuracies. Withdrawal of an accepted manuscript is generally not permitted. The Editorial Board may exceptionally allow withdrawal only when it determines that the reason constitutes a serious and unavoidable issue, such as a research ethics concern or a defect affecting the validity of the paper itself. Reasons related to an author's academic judgment, such as insufficient literature review or reconsideration of the argument structure, do not qualify as grounds for withdrawal after acceptance. If an author repeatedly fails to comply with the Submission Rules, internal editorial policies, or instructions of the Editorial Board, the Editorial Board may take appropriate measures, including rejection of submissions or suspension of the author's submission privileges for a specified period.