

Peer Review Standards and Key Points for Review

I . Peer Review Standards

Original articles: Research papers on diabetes education and nursing considered to be of academic value due to the presentation of novel findings that are highly original and reliable

Reviews: Articles that provide a comprehensive review involving a multifaceted summary of findings or a reference overview on a specific theme related to diabetes education and nursing

Short communications: Novel articles that are thought to contribute to the development of diabetes nursing through prompt publication

Field reports: Practice of diabetes education and nursing that is considered worthy for presentation due to its practical value

Others: Documents contributing to the improvement and development of diabetes education and nursing, etc.

II . Key Points for Peer Review

1. Theme of the article
 - Does the theme reflect the details of the article?
2. Format of the article
 - Is the objective of the article clear?
 - Is the method of achieving the objective appropriate and recorded clearly?
 - Are the results obtained appropriate and presented accurately?
 - Do the results obtained promote appropriate discussion?
 - Are the descriptions provided logical, without reaching far-fetched conclusions?
3. Ethical considerations
 - Is the method of obtaining approval for research from the subjects explained clearly?
 - Is consideration being provided to avoid disadvantages or a burden to the subjects?
 - Is privacy protected?
 - Is there any infringement of copyright?
4. General matters
 - Is the point of argument consistent? (Consistency in the concepts, definition, arguments, and descriptions used)
 - Does the article contribute to the research and practice of diabetes education and nursing?
 - Has the literature been used appropriately?

*The following must be considered for original articles ~~and short communications~~:

1. Title
 - Does the title clarify what the research is trying to find out and on whom it is conducted?
2. Abstract
 - Does the abstract contain information on all of the research design, subjects, research sites, analytical methods, primary results, and discussion?
 - For quantitative research projects, does the abstract clarify the information on variables used as the primary outcome, the variables used as the primary factors, and the confounding factors?
 - Are the details of the English abstract for an original article consistent with those in the Japanese abstract? (Proofreading of English text should be recommended as necessary)
3. Keywords
 - Do the keywords accurately reflect the details of the article?

(Search is facilitated by the inclusion of terms from Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) by the National Library of Medicine)
4. Introduction/background
 - Is sufficient explanation provided on the importance of the research topic (extent of the problems, impact on the patients and families, etc.)?
 - Is sufficient explanation provided on the necessity of the research with consideration for previous research projects on similar topics?
 - (If applicable) Is the theoretical framework that the research relies on sufficiently explained?
5. Research objective
 - Is the objective consistent with the introduction/background?
 - Does the objective explain what the research aims to clarify?
 - Is the objective described in complete sentences rather than abbreviated sentences that end in nouns?

6. Conceptual framework, schematic diagram, research hypothesis (if applicable)
 - Are these consistent with the research objective?
 - Are the correlations and causal relationships between the illustrated variables appropriate for the hypothesis?
7. Definition of the terms (if applicable)
 - Are detailed and accurate explanations provided on the concepts and primary keywords handled in the study?
8. Research method
 - Is the method consistent with the research objective?
 - Are detailed and specific explanations provided to the extent possible with regards to when, where, how, and by whom the process is conducted, and what is involved, covering all of the subject selection, the data-collection method, and the intervention method (if applicable)?
 - Is the analytical method appropriate?
9. Ethical considerations
 - Is the ethical consideration described in accordance with the article submission checklist ?
10. Results
 - Is the research method followed?
 - Are the interpretations and discussion of results excluded from this section?
 - Are the numerals in the figures and tables consistent with those in the main text?
 - For qualitative research projects, does this section include specific data that act as the rationale for the extracted themes and categories?
11. Discussion
 - Is the discussion consistent with the research objective?
 - Are the results interpreted in comparison with the results of previous research projects with a similar objective?
12. References
 - Is the display method shown in the submission rules strictly followed?

Revised on August 1, 2012 (the Fourth Term Editorial Committee)
Revised on October 1, 2018 (the Eighth Term Editorial Committee)
Revised on September 26, 2021 (the 11th Term Editorial Committee)