



Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology
Points of Attention for Screening and Reviewing Manuscripts (Reviewers)

July 1, 2015
The Editorial Board

“To Reviewers”

1. Review by the Reviewers is done only once.

Only the Associate Editor does the second and subsequent screenings, in which the author’s responses to the Reviewers’ questions and requests for correction, made in the initial review, are checked. When re-review by the Reviewer is necessary due to significant corrections being required by the first reviewing, the Reviewer selects “Rejected” and recommend resubmission.

During the second and subsequent screenings, only if the Associate Editor cannot make a decision as to whether response and corrections from the author are reasonable, the Associate Editor may consult, at his/her discretion, with the original Reviewers.

2. Minor Revision or Major Revision is selected only if Reviewers expect the author can answer the comments.

“Rejected” is selected if Reviewers expect the author cannot respond to the comments reasonably.

3. The decision by the Associate Editor can be different from that of the Reviewers.

When the Associate Editor determines the suitability for manuscript publication, at the Associate Editor’s discretion, by referring to the judgment and comments provided by the two Reviewers, the Associate Editor may reach a different decision from that of the Reviewers. When the Associate Editor’s decision is quite different from that of the Reviewers, the Associate Editor reports this to the Reviewers.

4. Reviewers should not edit the contents of the manuscript.

The authors bear full responsibility for the contents and composition of the manuscript.

5. No English language editing should be carried out.

The Reviewer has no responsibility for English language editing. If the Reviewer thinks that



the Associate Editor should judge suitability for manuscript publication, due to the fact that English expressions are not clear, “Major Revision” should be selected and this should be noted on the manuscript review report or Comments to the Author shown in the ScholarOne Manuscript System.

If review is difficult because English expressions are severely inadequate, “Rejected” should be selected and the manuscript should be returned to the Associate Editor without further action by the Reviewer.

Reference items abstracted from “Guide for Screening and Reviewing English Manuscripts”

I. General

(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.

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.

(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.

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 Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology (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" are 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 journal 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 re-submission 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.