



Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology
Guide for Screening and Reviewing English Manuscripts

July 1, 2015

The Editorial Board

I. General

(Purpose)

1. The Editorial Board of the Atomic Energy Society of Japan (hereafter referred to as "AESJ") has established subjects related to screening and reviewing manuscripts submitted to the *Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology* (hereafter referred to as the "JNST") as this *Guide for Screening and Reviewing of English Manuscripts* (hereafter referred to as the "Guide"), based on Clause 8 of the By-laws of the Journals of AESJ (0801-02), with the following goals.

- (1) Attracting many subscribers to contribute to academic research and technical development in peaceful uses of nuclear power and radiation.
- (2) Keeping academic and technical levels of contributed papers at high quality.
- (3) Receiving high recognition both domestically and internationally.
- (4) Increasing motivation for authors, both domestically and internationally, to submit manuscripts.

(Scope of Screening and Reviewing)

2. This guide sets the guidelines and criteria for screening and reviewing of manuscripts submitted to the JNST (Manuscript types of JNST are, Review, Rapid Communication, Article, Technical Material, and Letter to the Editor).

(Announcements to the Editors and Reviewers)

3. The Editor-in-Chief of the journal must keep all editors and reviewers informed about this Guide, through Editorial Board reports or e-mail communications.

(Confidentiality)

4. All editors and reviewers have a duty to keep the confidentiality of the name of the editor who is in charge of screening, and the names of reviewers who are reviewing a submitted manuscript, as well as the contents of the submitted manuscript. No editor should inform any author of these members' names. All editors should be careful that no reviewer knows



the names of other reviewers.

II. Associate Editor Screening of Manuscripts

(Duties of the Editor-in-Charge)

1. One Editor-in-Charge (hereafter referred to as the “Associate Editor”) is appointed in charge of screening one submitted manuscript. The Associate Editor performs the following duties:

- (1) Selecting reviewers-in-charge (hereafter referred to as the “Reviewer”) for review of the submitted manuscript.
- (2) Preparing a Decision Letter and Manuscript Screening Report to report the screening result to the corresponding author.
- (3) Receiving opinions and inquiries made by the authors and Reviewers to the Editorial Board and responding to them.
- (4) Taking necessary measures to keep a timely reviewing period.
- (5) Attending to other matters related to manuscript screening.

(Appointment of the Associate Editor)

2. The Principal Editor appoints the Associate Editor from the Editorial Board members, with consideration of the specialized field of the submitted manuscript as well as the situation of screening work of other papers.

As a general rule, the Principal Editor does not select the Associate Editor from the same organization(s) as the author(s), or from persons receiving an acknowledgement in the manuscript. (Within the Japan Atomic Energy Agency (JAEA), Institutes and Centers are considered to affiliate with the same organization.)

The appointment of the Associate Editor should follow the separately defined “Procedure Manual for Appointment of Manuscript Screening and Reviewing Members (in Japanese).”

(Recommendation of the Associate Editor by the Corresponding Author)

3. The Principal Editor may consider candidates for Associate Editor recommended by the corresponding author of the submitted manuscript for appointment. However, the final responsibility for appointment belongs to the Principal Editor. The appointment of the Associate Editor from the author’s candidates should follow the procedure described in II.2.

(Response to Unexpected Problems during the Reviewing Process)

4. The Associate Editor is responsible for keeping the timely reviewing period. When the



Associate Editor is unable to perform the stated duties (for example, due to extended absence on a business trip), the Associate Editor should select an Acting Associate Editor and report this to the Editor-in-Chief and the Editorial Office. When any other unexpected problems are encountered, the Associate Editor should similarly report them to the Editor-in-Chief and the Editorial Office.

III. The Reviewer

(Duties of the Reviewer)

1. As a general rule, two Reviewers are assigned to be in charge of reviewing one manuscript. The Reviewer prepares the score sheet and manuscript reviewing reports, and supplies any other necessary materials to the Associate Editor to be used in judging whether or not to publish the manuscript. The review of the manuscript by the Reviewer is done only once in the screening process.

(Appointment of the Reviewer)

2. As a general rule, the Associate Editor does not appoint the Reviewers from the same organization(s) as the author(s), or persons receiving an acknowledgement in the manuscript. (Within the Japan Atomic Energy Agency (JAEA), Institutes and Centers are considered to affiliate with the same organization.)

The Associate Editor appoints the Reviewers with consideration of such factors as the specialized field, number of manuscripts previously reviewed and compliance with the review period deadline.

The appointment of the Reviewers should follow the separately defined "Procedure Manual for Appointment of Manuscript Screening and Reviewing Members (in Japanese)."

(Appointments from Other than Registered Reviewers)

3. If necessary, the Associate Editor can ask persons who are not registered reviewers to review a manuscript; these persons are not limited to AESJ members. In this case, the referee qualification standards as described in "Procedure Manual for Appointment of Manuscript Screening and Reviewing Members (in Japanese)" should be applied.

(Prohibition of Concurrent Positions)

4. The Associate Editor cannot concurrently serve as a Reviewer.

(Appointment of Additional Reviewer(s))



5. When the judgments whether or not to publish are very different between the two Reviewers, the Associate Editor may select one or more additional Reviewers. This selection should follow the procedure described in III.2 to III.5. However, even when the judgments whether or not to publish are very different between the two Reviewers, the Associate Editor is not obligated to select additional Reviewer(s), rather the Associate Editor may take the responsibility of deciding whether or not to publish.

(Response to Unexpected Problems during the Review Process)

6. When any unexpected problems are encountered, the Reviewer should quickly report them to the Associate Editor and the Editorial Office.

IV. Manuscript Screening Standards

(Basic Policy for Screening)

1. In addition to the basic policy for reviewing described in V.1, the Associate Editor screens the manuscript in consideration of the following points:

- (1) The Associate Editor bears full responsibility for reviewing and screening, including making the judgment of publication, appointing and removing of the Reviewers, evaluating the reviewing remarks, and monitoring the reviewing progress.
- (2) The judgment of whether or not to publish by the Associate Editor is made at the first screening.
- (3) The Associate Editor respects the opinions of the Reviewers. However judgment of publication is the responsibility of the Associate Editor.

(Judging Standards in Manuscript Screening)

2. The Associate Editor judges suitability for manuscript publication by referring to the score sheets and manuscript reviewing reports sent by the Reviewers and prepares the Decision Letter and manuscript screening report, in the name of the Editor-in-Chief, to report the manuscript screening result to the author. If the manuscript is judged as “Rejected”, the result is reported to the editorial advisor (hereafter referred to as the “Advisory Editor”).

The categories of suitability for publication are: “Accepted”; “Minor Revision”; “Major Revision”; and “Rejected”, as described in V.6. When the Associate Editor can realistically assume that the author will reply with reasonable answers to the correction comments of the screening remarks, the manuscript is categorized as requiring “Minor Revision” or “Major Revision”. Other guides and standards for screening are analogous to those in V. Manuscript Reviewing Standards.



(Rejected for Publication before or during Screening)

3. The Associate Editor may make the decision “Rejected” for publication, before or during screening if there is clear reason according to the standards described in V.7.

(Manuscript Screening Remarks)

4. The Associate Editor should make manuscript screening remarks in the Decision Letter and designated Manuscript Screening Report, in consideration of the following items:

- (1) The format of screening remarks conforms to the format of the reviewing remarks described in V.5. When the manuscript is judged as “Rejected”, the reason(s) should be clearly described. When the manuscript is judged as requiring “Major Revision”, the mandatory comments requesting addition(s) and correction(s) described in V.5(2), on which the decision of publication is made, should be concise and as few as possible.
- (2) When the Associate Editor considers that the rejected manuscript can be accepted after necessary corrections, the Associate Editor can recommend that the author resubmit a changed manuscript, by indicating clearly the reason(s) for “Rejected” for publication and the place(s) requiring correction. In this case the Associate Editor should add that the resubmitted manuscript will be treated as a newly submitted manuscript and screened again.
- (3) All or part of the remarks prepared by the Reviewers may be included in the screening remarks. However, the responsibility for their inclusion belongs to the Associate Editor.

(Remarks Regarding Manuscripts Related to the Fukushima NPP Accident)

5. The Associate Editor confirms a manuscript is “Fukushima NPP Accident-Related” as described in V.11. When the Associate Editor judges the manuscript does not belong to this category even if the author has submitted it as such, or the Associate Editor judges the manuscript belongs to this category even if the author has not submitted in as such, the Associate Editor should state this in the screening remarks and report it to the Editorial Office.

In the first case that the manuscript does not belong to the category, the Associate Editor tells the author by a screening remark that the manuscript is treated as a general manuscript.

In the second case that the manuscript belongs to the category, the Associate Editor asks the author if he/she wants addition of the subtitle: “Fukushima NPP Accident-Related” on the title page of the manuscript.



(Screening Period)

6. The screening period is 10 days. The Associate Editor should prepare the Decision Letter and Manuscript Screening Report within this period. If more than this time passes, the Editorial Office or the review progress management group will ask the Associate Editor to check the status of the screening process.

(Report to Reviewers)

7. The Associate Editor reports the judged suitability for manuscript publication to the two Reviewers, if necessary. Particularly when the judgment differs from that of the individual Reviewer, this report is mandatory.

(Rescreening)

8. The Associate Editor examines the author's answers and the revised manuscript when the original manuscript is classed as needing "Minor Revision" or "Major Revision". If the Associate Editor judges the answers and corrections are reasonable, the revised manuscript is "Accepted" for publication. Reasonable answers here include counterarguments from the author directed to the screening remarks. If the Associate Editor does not receive answers or corrections, or the Associate Editor determines that answers from the author are not reasonable, the revised manuscript is "Rejected" for publication and the specific reasons are indicated.

If the Associate Editor cannot make a decision as to whether any answer and correction from the author are reasonable, the Associate Editor may consult, at his/her discretion, with the Reviewers and other experts, but such consultation should be avoided as much as possible. It should be kept in mind during any consultation that the Editorial Board bears responsibility for confidentiality until publication. If the consultation shows that the answer is reasonable, or that the answer cannot be proven unreasonable, the manuscript is "Accepted" for publication.

The Associate Editor does not communicate again, as much as possible, with the author regarding whether any answer and correction are reasonable or not.

(Deadline for Submitting the Revised Manuscript)

9. The deadline for submitting the revised manuscript is within 3 months (1 month for a Rapid Communication), when the original manuscript is returned as "Minor Revision" or "Major Revision". If the revised manuscript is not submitted by this deadline, the Associate Editor considers the manuscript as "Expired" and reports this to the Editorial Board.



V. Manuscript Reviewing Standards

(Basic Policy for Reviewing)

1. The manuscript review is performed according to the standards defined in this Guide. The Reviewers should review the manuscript in consideration of the following points:

- (1) In order to find new themes of study and to secure diversity in academic fields, a manuscript is basically “Accepted” for publication, unless there is a clear reason for “Rejected” such as a contradiction in its reasoning.
- (2) The purpose of review is not to improve the contents related to the basis of the manuscript, but to supply materials to the Associate Editor to be used in judging whether or not to publish it. The authors bear full responsibility for the contents and composition of the manuscript. The Reviewer should not edit the contents of the manuscript.
- (3) The Reviewer has no responsibility for English language editing. Inquiries about individual English expressions should be made only when they are necessary to clarify understanding of the submitted manuscript for the reviewing purpose. If the manuscript is generally understandable, but needs some improvement of English expressions, simple notes including typing and minor grammatical errors may be written on the score sheet or reviewing report.
- (4) The submitted manuscript itself is the material to be reviewed. The Reviewers should refrain from requesting easily done additional experiments and analyses, and from making comments which may be misunderstood as instructions for manuscript writing.
- (5) When the Reviewers prepare their remarks, special considerations should be given to neither enforce a subjective preference, nor to lead to an emotional misunderstanding.

(Judging Standards for Content)

2. The Reviewers judge suitability of manuscript content by the items below.

For all manuscripts, suitability should be judged by Items (1), (2), (3), (5) and (6). In addition, suitability should also be judged by Item (4) for Articles, and Items (4) and (7) for Rapid Communications.

When the Reviewers judge unsuitability in some items, they should give the reason as a remark in the comment box of the score sheet or in the reviewing report, and request an answer by the author. In this case, the judgment of publication in V.6 should be “Major Revision in Contents”, “Major Revision both in Contents and English Presentation”, or



“Rejected”.

If the Reviewers judge that a change of manuscript type of the submitted manuscript is appropriate, “Rejected” is selected and resubmission is recommended to the author.

If the Reviewers judge that the manuscript does not fulfill the content requirement (1) of the JNST, “Rejected” is selected, and an appropriate journal may be recommended to the author. If the Reviewers find obvious misconduct such as submission to multiple journals, plagiarism, falsification and fabrication, “Rejected” is selected before or during reviewing according to the rules of V.7.

Items for judgment of suitability

- (1) Having suitability to the JNST which has the goal of contributing to academic research and technical development in peaceful uses of nuclear power and radiation (I.1 of this Guide)
- (2) Not being published or submitted to other publications
- (3) Having scientific and technological (industrial) value and usefulness
- (4) Having originality
- (5) Being accurate and reliable (This includes misconduct such as plagiarism, falsification and fabrication.)
- (6) Presenting a degree of completion which includes a description of the relationship with previous research
- (7) Offering value and urgency for priority publication

(Judging Standards for English Expressions)

3. In judging suitability of English expressions, the Reviewers consider grammatical correctness and simplicity of expression to allow easy understanding of the contents. If there are questions or comments on a specific part, the Reviewers write this in the comment box of the score sheet or in the manuscript reviewing report. If reviewing is difficult because English expressions are severely inadequate, “Rejected” is selected and the manuscript is returned before or during review based on V.7.

(Judging Standards for Formatting and Writing of the Manuscript)

4. The Reviewers judge suitability of the formatting and writing of the manuscript based on the “Instructions for Authors.” When they judge the writing is not appropriate, the reasons should be written as remarks in the comment box of the score sheet or manuscript reviewing report. If the deviation is too large, the manuscript may be returned as “Rejected” based on V.7, before or during the reviewing process.



(Format of Reviewing Remarks)

5. Reviewing remarks, in principle, should be written in the designated score sheet or reviewing report according to the following four items:

- (1) Overall judgment

As comments on manuscript contents

- (2) Comments that of revisions are mandatory and these revisions are necessary to judge suitability of publication.
- (3) Comments besides (2) which are related to optional opinion and proposal
- (4) Comments which are related to English expressions

The language for the review remarks can be made in English or Japanese, but either one will be prepared upon the author's request.

(Judgment of Whether or Not to Publish)

6. The Reviewers select appropriate items from the list below for the judgment of publication and write them in the score sheet.

- (1) Accepted
- (2) Minor Revision only in English Presentation
- (3) Minor Revision in Contents
- (4) Minor Revision both in Contents and English Presentation
- (5) Major Revision in Contents
- (6) Major Revision both in Contents and English Presentation
- (7) Rejected

"Accepted" is selected, if the Reviewers judge the manuscript under review can be published without correction. "Minor Revision" or "Major Revision" is selected if there are comments.

"Minor Revisions" of (2), (3) and (4) are selected if the manuscript is suitable for publication but there are optional opinions and proposals of correction stated by the Reviewers. In this case, as a standard, making the corrections in the noted places is the responsibility of the authors. The Associate Editor should confirm the revised version of the manuscript of "Minor Revision".

"Major Revisions" of (5) and (6) are selected by the reviewers, if the suitability for publication cannot be judged and mandatory comments (V.5(2)) for the judgment are made. When the Associate Editor judges the manuscript as "Major Revision", the Associate Editor judges suitability for the manuscript publication again based on the response from the author and the revised manuscript.



(“Rejected” for Publication)

7. If “Rejected” is selected, the Reviewers should clearly describe the reason(s) for “Rejected” in the comment box of the score sheet or the manuscript reviewing report.

The manuscript can be rejected before or during the review, if there is clear reason.

The following are rules in this Guide for judging a manuscript to be “Rejected”:

- (1) The contents do not fulfill the manuscript review standard (V.2).
- (2) For rule (1), the change of manuscript type may be suitable (V.2).
- (3) For rule (1), the submission to other journals may be suitable (V.2).
- (4) For rule (1), misconduct, such as submission to multiple journals, plagiarism, falsification and fabrication, is clearly found.
- (5) The review is difficult because English expressions are severely inadequate (V.3).
- (6) The formatting and writing of the manuscript deviate extremely from those described in the “Instructions for Authors” (V.4).
- (7) The re-review by Reviewers is necessary due to major required corrections at the time of the first reviewing (V.8).
- (8) There is no response to the manuscript screening remarks or when the response and corrections are not reasonably made (IV.8, Manuscript Screening Standards).

(Number of Review Times)

8. Review by the Reviewers is done only once; re-review is not performed. The Reviewers judge the suitability for publication described in V.6 by the first review, and prepare score sheets and the manuscript reviewing reports.

Only the Associate Editor does the second and subsequent screens, in which the author’s responses to the Reviewers’ questions and requests for correction, made in the initial review, are checked. If the Associate Editor then judges that further significant corrections and re-review by the Reviewers are necessary, the Associate Editor rejects that manuscript and gives the reasons for it.

(Reviewing Period)

9. The reviewing period is 3 weeks, except for a Rapid Communication which is 10 days. The Reviewers should prepare the score sheets and the manuscript reviewing reports within this period and return them to the Associate Editor. If more than this time passes, the Associate Editor, the Editorial Office or the review progress management group will check the status of the review process by inquiring of the Reviewers.

(Required Manuscript Reviewing Remarks)



10. When the Reviewers select judgment items, except for the category of “Accepted” for publication, they should give the reasons as a remark in the comment box in the score sheet or manuscript reviewing report.

When they select the category of “Major Revision”, specific comments (V.5(2)) requiring to judge suitability for publication should be given.

If the rejected paper can be accepted after necessary corrections, they can recommend resubmission to the author by giving clearly the reasons for rejection and places for required corrections.

(Remarks Regarding Manuscripts Related to the Fukushima NPP Accident)

11. The Reviewers confirm the contents of the manuscript are belonging to the “Fukushima NPP Accident-Related” category, which describes the accident at the TEPCO Fukushima NPP and its effects as well as research results performed for decommissioning of the Fukushima NPP.

The scientific technology which can be applied to NPP accidents in general, such as accident analysis, contaminated waste treatment, and decommissioning technology, cannot be categorized as “Fukushima NPP Accident-Related” unless they are directly connected to the Fukushima NPP.

When the Reviewers judge the manuscript belongs to the “Fukushima NPP Accident-Related” category, they state this as a remark in the comment box of the score sheet or the manuscript reviewing report.

VI. Opinion and Inquiry from Reviewers and Authors

(Opinion and Inquiry from Reviewers)

1. When a Reviewer gives an opinion or makes an inquiry to the Editorial Board by attaching it to the manuscript reviewing report, or when a Reviewer makes an inquiry about the review of a specific manuscript, the Associate Editor is responsible for replying to that Reviewer. The Associate Editor circulates this inquiry to all Editorial Boards members and consults with related editors, if needed, and replies to the Reviewer.

(Opinion and Inquiry from Authors)

2. When the author gives an opinion or makes an inquiry to the Editorial Board by attaching it to the answers to the reviewing remarks, or when the author sends a letter to the Editorial Board on the manuscript screening, the Associate Editor is responsible for replying to that author, using the process analogous to that described in VI.1.



(Objection to Screening Results)

3. When a strong objection to the publishing judgment or a request to replace the Associate Editor is received, the Associate Editor forwards these to the Editor-in-Chief.

If needed, the Editor-in-Chief may replace the Associate Editor and the Reviewer(s), and a new screening and review will be carried out.

(Consultation on Provisional Publication Judgment)

4. If an objection to the provisional publication judgment of "Rejection" made by the Associate Editor is received from the Advisory Editor, the Editor-in-Chief makes a judgment at the Executive Editorial Board meeting. The Editorial Office may work to support the provisional publication judgment by consulting with the Editor-in-Chief.

VII. Changes of This Guide

(Revision and Abolition Procedures)

1. The Editorial Board makes decisions on revision and abolition of this Guide.

Supplements

1. This Guide became effective on July 1, 2015.