

Editorial Committee of the Journal of the Japanese Educational Research Association: *Educational Studies in Japan* Paper Screening Guidelines

Enacted March 2025

I General submitted papers and research notes

1. Screening framework

- (1) The screening of papers and research notes (below, “papers” shall include research notes as well) shall be done by two Editorial Committee members and one external reviewer for each paper.
- (2) The two Editorial Committee members responsible for screening each submitted paper shall be assigned by the *ESJ* editorial coordinator, with attention to member preferences and specializations.
- (3) The external reviewer for each paper screening shall be selected by the *ESJ* editorial coordinator from Association members, with attention to specializations, research work, and author preferences (when listed on SOLTI as of submission).
- (4) Anyone affiliated with the same university and/or research office as the author, or otherwise considered to be close to them such as having worked on research projects together, shall not be assigned as a reviewer.
- (5) The reviewers and authors shall be mutually anonymous during the screening.

2. Screening method

- (1) The following submitted papers shall be considered “Refused.”
 - Papers exceeding the wordcount stipulated in the *Manuscript Submission Guidelines*
 - Papers where the text in figures/diagrams/tables is too small to be made out
 - Papers which have changed the submission template
 - Papers which overlap by roughly 60% or more (based on the results of a similarity judgment tool) with papers published in other publicly released media (including those in other languages as well as doctoral theses publicly available in university repositories, etc.). In addition, even if “Received” based on overlap of less than 60%, if the screening finds that core content overlaps with other published papers, the paper will be considered “Rejected.”
 - Papers which, although judged by the Editorial Committee to be roughly the same in content as previously “Rejected” papers, do not include a reply sheet to the comments provided upon rejection
- (2) Two Editorial Committee members (first and second reviewers) and one external reviewer shall each evaluate each submitted paper on a 10-point scale, adding comments explaining their evaluation, and submit the results to the Editorial Committee.
- (3) Based on the numerical evaluations and comments on each submitted paper, the Editorial Committee shall decide which papers to accept at its November discussion meeting. As a guideline for acceptance, papers with a total of 21 points or more from the three reviewers shall be “Accepted for publication” (including those “Accepted for publication conditionally”), those with 18 to 20 points shall be subject to “Re-screening,” and those with 17 points or fewer shall be “Rejected.”
- (4) At a minimum, the following points shall constitute criteria for paper screenings.
 - Appropriately based on previous research
 - Clear reason for selecting the research target provided
 - Accurate analysis and interpretation of the research target (historical materials, survey data, etc.)
 - Clear explanation of the paper’s contribution to educational research
 - Consistent title and content
 - Accurate mechanics

3. Schedule post-submission

In principle, screening (Editorial Committee) and decision on papers to be published shall take place as below.

Educational Studies in Japan

Published once a year: End of August: Submission deadline → September/October: Reviewing → November: Editorial Committee meeting → January: Decision on papers to be published → End of

March: Publication

4. Organization and notification of screening results

- (1) For papers “Accepted for publication,” “Accepted for publication conditionally,” and to be “Re-screened,” the first reviewer shall promptly organize the opinions of the three reviewers in a writeup of the screening results and points for revision, confirm them with the *ESJ* editorial coordinator, and have the secretariat notify the author through the SOLTI online submission system. Points for revision shall be outlined as clearly and specifically as possible.
- (2) For “Re-screening,” the author shall revise the paper and fill in the reply sheet within one month in accordance with the points for revision and resubmit through the SOLTI online submission system. If the resubmission time exceeds one month, the paper shall be considered “Re-screened” for the following issue. The original two reviewers from the Editorial Committee shall re-screen the revised paper and decide whether it can be published. For papers “Accepted for publication conditionally” as well, similar to “Re-screening,” the two reviewers from the Editorial Committee shall decide whether the revised paper meets the conditions and whether it can be published. When the result of re-screening is “Rejected,” the author may submit a further revised paper to subsequent issues, but must include a reply sheet with regard to the revisions.
- (3) For papers “Rejected,” the numerical evaluation and comments of the three reviewers shall, upon confirmation with the *ESJ* editorial coordinator, be sent to the author through the SOLTI online submission system. “Rejected” papers may be resubmitted to subsequent editions, but when covering essentially the same topics and content, must be accompanied by a reply sheet addressing the original comments.

II Special editions

Special editions are composed of requested papers as well as papers and research notes submitted for the special edition. *ESJ* calls for submissions to the special edition in each issue. The topic is announced in the previous issue, one year in advance. Requests are made in each issue of *ESJ*.

II—1. Requested papers

1. Paper requests

- (1) The Editorial Committee drafts a list of potential authors suitable for subtopics and potential subtopics of the special edition topic.
- (2) Potential authors are informed of the special edition topic and subtopics and asked to contribute a paper.
- (3) Those who indicate willingness to do so receive a formal request for submission.

2. Screening method

- (1) Criteria for screening and refusal shall be similar to those for generally submitted papers.
- (2) Each requested paper is evaluated by two Editorial Committee members (first and second reviewers) on a basis of “Accepted for publication” (including “Accepted for publication conditionally”), “Re-screening,” or “Rejected”; their judgments and comments on the reasons therefor are submitted to the Editorial Committee.
- (3) When both reviewers’ evaluation is “Accepted for publication,” the paper will be published. When one or both of the reviewers’ evaluation is “Re-screening,” or when one of the reviewers’ evaluation is “Rejected,” the paper shall be “Re-screened” after revision. When both reviewers’ evaluation is “Rejected,” the paper will not be published.

3. Organization and notification of screening results

- (1) The organization and notification of screening results shall be similar to those for generally submitted papers.

II—2. Papers and research notes submitted for special editions

1. Screening framework/screening method

- (1) Similar to those for generally submitted papers.

2. Organization and notification of screening results

- (2) When papers “Re-screened” or “Accepted for publication conditionally” are “Rejected” on the basis of the results of re-screening, further revised papers may be submitted to subsequent issues, but must be accompanied by a reply sheet addressing the revisions. In this case, they will be treated as generally submitted papers rather than special edition papers.