

Guidelines for Peer Review

Japan Academy of Diabetes Education and Nursing Editorial Committee

1. Procedures for peer review

- 1) If you have approved of the request for a specialist peer review, please register for peer review evaluation by the due date specified by the office in accordance with the peer review standards.
- 2) Notify the office immediately if the peer review is not expected to be completed by the specified due date.
- 3) The academy's peer review system involves review by two specialist reviewers and one reviewer from the editorial committee, with the final determination made by the editorial committee. The reviewers are asked to review each submitted article twice at most. We ask that your engagement in the peer review continued until the two reviews are completed.

2. Peer review must be conducted according to the academy's rules of submission and peer review standards (attached).

For articles by researchers who are thought to be inexperienced in writing articles, when the article is poorly presented but the contents are thought to be appropriate for publication in the journal due to the contribution to diabetes education and nursing, the review should be conducted constructively and with educational purpose to the extent possible.

One of the following must be selected on whether or not the article should be published:

1. Accepted without conditions
2. Accepted with conditions
 - 1) May be published after correction without re-review, without changing the type of article
 - 2) May be published without correction with a change in the type of article
-> Clarify the type of article recommended for the change (original article, review, short communication, field report, other documents)
 - 3) May be published after correction and without re-review, and with a change in the type of article
3. Re-review required after correction
 - 1) Re-review required after correction without changing the type of article
 - 2) Re-review required after correction with a change in the type of article
-> Clarify the type of article recommended for the change (original article, review, short communication, field report, other documents)
4. Rejected

3. Enter the rationale for the review result in the peer review system.

4. If there are corrections to be made, enter specific details (for example, specify the page and row, and where and how to make the correction), avoiding abstract expressions as much as possible.

5. Duplicate and simultaneous submissions

Publication of an article with details identical to those published in another journal (duplicate submission) and simultaneous submission of an article to another journal (simultaneous submission) are prohibited. Notify the editorial committee if anything suspicious is observed.

6. Other items, precautions

- 1) List all problems in the first review and avoid pointing out new problems in the second review.
- 2) You must not disclose the details of the article, results of the peer review, or your identity as a peer reviewer.