

## Peer Review Guidelines for *Gengo Kenkyu* (partial)

October 1, 2022

### Points to consider when conducting a peer review

- Peer review should be conducted from the following perspectives:
  - How much does the study contribute to the advancement of linguistic research?
  - Is the thesis novel and original?
  - Does the submission reference previous research appropriately?
  - Is appropriate evidence presented for the study’s claim?
  - Is the argument logical and clear?
  - Is the argument complete and of an appropriate length?
- Please select one of the following “Review Results” decision categories (A-D). Based on the selected review results and on the comments of the two reviewers (or three reviewers if a third-party reviewer is involved), the Editorial Committee will make a final decision as to the category (A-D) into which the submitted paper falls. The Committee will proceed with the review following the “Response after Committee Acceptance/Rejection Decision” details presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Review Results

Decision	Criteria	Response after Committee Acceptance/Rejection Decision
<b>A - Accept</b>	Can be published without revision or with only very minor revisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A deadline is set; the contributors are instructed to submit the final manuscript for submission and a revision report.</li> </ul>
<b>B - Revise and resubmit</b>	Publication is expected to be possible if the areas of concern that have been indicated are revised over a period of <u>approximately two months</u> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A deadline is set; the contributors are requested to submit a revised version of the manuscript and a revision report.</li> <li>• During the revision period, the journal will also provide instructions on ethical considerations, including the statement that the manuscript will be considered as “currently submitted to <i>Gengo Kenkyu</i>” and may not be submitted to any other journal.</li> <li>• In the case of resubmission of revised manuscripts, the Editorial Committee will, in principle, check the revisions, but may ask reviewers to check as well, depending on the nature and extent of the revisions.</li> <li>• As a general rule, revisions may not be checked more than twice.</li> </ul>
<b>C - Rewrite and resubmit</b>	Although it would be difficult to publish at this stage, there are some evaluable parts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A deadline will be set; the contributors will be asked to resubmit the rewritten manuscript with a revision report.</li> <li>• During the rewriting period, the journal will also</li> </ul>

	of the manuscript. If the manuscript is rewritten over a period of <u>approximately 6 months</u> , the manuscript can be expected to be categorized as “A: Accept” or “B: Revise and resubmit.”	<p>provide instructions on ethical considerations, including a statement that the manuscript will be considered as “currently submitted to <i>Gengo Kenkyu</i>” and may not be submitted to any other journal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When a rewritten manuscript is resubmitted, in principle, the same reviewers will be asked to review the manuscript again.</li> <li>• The reviewers’ new determinations will be either “A: Accept,” “B: Revise and resubmit,” or “D: Reject.” The category “C: Rewrite and resubmit” will not be assigned.</li> </ul>
<b>D - Reject</b>	There are fundamental issues with the manuscript. Even if it is rewritten over a period of <u>approximately 6 months</u> , the manuscript is unlikely to be categorized as “A: Accept” or “B: Revise and resubmit.”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review process has been completed; the contributors are notified of the rejection of the manuscript.</li> <li>• The rejected paper will not be accepted for resubmission after revision. Only a new manuscript with a different (not the same or similar) theme or topic will be accepted for submission.</li> </ul>

- In principle, the acceptance or rejection of papers will be determined as presented in Table 2. In the case of a third-party review, the decision will be based on the comments of the three reviewers. The Editorial Committee may, at its discretion, make a different decision after thoroughly examining the reviewers’ comments.

Table 2 Acceptance/rejection model

Peer reviewer determination	Acceptance/rejection
A, A	A
A, B	B
A, C	Third-party peer review
A, D	Third-party peer review
B, B	B
B, C	C
B, D	Third-party peer review
C, C	C
C, D	D
D, D	D

- If you think that there is a strong possibility that the paper will be publishable if the author changes the submission category (from “Article” to “Forum” or from “Review Article” to “Book Review/Introduction,” for example) and rewrites the article substantially, the final review determination will be “C” (Rewrite and resubmit). Add this comment in the “Comments to Editorial Committee Members” section of the review: “*Publication is possible if the submission category is changed.*” If the Editorial Committee decides that a category change is appropriate, the contributors and the reviewers will be notified of that decision.

(Reference) Categories of Submitted Papers

- Research papers
  - Forum: A paper that is incomplete, but that is original and solid in conception and direction and has significant potential for future development
  - Book review article: A critical discussion of another person’s publication, including original recommendations, not exceeding 20 pages
  - Book review/introduction: A short review of another person’s publication, not exceeding 10 pages
- The review results report, which summarizes the acceptance/rejection decision and the reviewers’ comments, will be sent to the reviewers as well as to the contributor(s) (anonymously). If you do not want other reviewers to be notified of your comments, please inform the Editorial Committee member in charge. In the case of a third-party review, however, the Editorial Committee will disclose the comments of the other two reviewers to the third reviewer at its discretion. Please note that reviewers’ comments are for submissions that have not yet been accepted for publication, so please be careful not to share them with others.
  - If there are any objections from the submitter regarding the content of the peer review, please respond to them or take other actions as appropriate.
  - Please disclose any conflicts of interest that could affect an objective review to the editors and others when you are asked to review, and decline to review if necessary.