Socio-Science Review Process Regulations

1. (1) All submitted manuscripts will be evaluated for publication and assigned to one of the following categories by the Editorial Board:

   (a) "Unconditional acceptance";

   (b) "Conditional acceptance, with minor revisions";

   (c) "A non-committal invitation to submit a revised version";

   (d) "Outright rejection (resubmission of the same manuscript will not be accepted)".

   (2) The Editorial Board must meet the ethical responsibilities of publication by conducting a fair review process. The Editorial Board members must adhere to publication ethics, specifically the "COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) Code of Conduct for Journal Editors" (http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines).

   (3) The review process adopts a strictly double-blind peer review system in which the reviewer's name and the author's name will remain anonymous.

2. (1) The Editor-in-Chief will analyze the submitted manuscript with duplication content checking software to ensure it was not plagiarized, then an editor (handling editor) will be assigned by the Editorial Board.

   (2) When a submitted manuscript is suspected to be plagiarized, the Editor-in-Chief will call a meeting of the Editorial Board to discuss the appropriate handling of the article in question. Specifically, we will take actions considering the COPE flowchart (http://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts).

3. (1) When the handling editor recommends rejection of the manuscript without a review process (desktop rejection), he/she must provide the Editorial Board with a document indicating the grounds for the rejection.

   (2) If the Editorial Board accepts the recommendation in 3. (1), the Editorial Board will convey the rejection decision, along with the basis for rejection, to the corresponding author.

(3) If the Editorial Board rejects the recommendation in 3. (1), the board will assign a new handling editor.

4. If the submitted manuscript undergoes a review process, the handling editor will assign the paper to the appropriate reviewers. In principle, two reviewers will be assigned and the review should be completed within two months after assignment. The reviewers are required to abide by publication ethics.

5. (1) A review report should consist of three parts: ① the outline of the paper and its academic value (contribution, originality, novelty, etc.); ② comments relating to the content such as the main results, methodology and hypothesis; and ③ comments such as suggestions on a correction and citation. They must send the report to the handling editor. A copy of this report will also be sent to the author.

(2) Along with the review report, reviewers must inform the handling editor of their recommendation in the form mentioned above in 1. (1) (a) to (d). This evaluation should not be sent to the author.

(3) If the review report is not sent within the designated period, the handling editor may send a reminder to the reviewer to encourage prompt submission.

6. (1) When the reviewers' evaluations concur, the handling editor may submit the review report, the review record (section editor's name, affiliation, review request date, and date of receipt of the review report), and the evaluation to the Editor-in-Chief.

(2) When the reviewers' recommendations is split, the handling editor may

a) Submit the recommendation of the reviewer he/she considers appropriate along with a statement of reasons for this decision;

Or

b) Assign a third reviewer and submit a recommendation which takes into account the three recommendations from the other reviewers along with a statement of the reasons for the recommendation.

7. Upon receiving the recommendation from the handling editors, the Editorial Board will make a decision and the Editor-in-Chief will promptly convey to the corresponding author the board's decision with a review report.

8. If the decision is an unconditional acceptance, the submitted manuscript will be sent for publication.

9. If the decision is 1. (1) (b) or (c), the corresponding author may submit a revised version of the manuscript. In such a case, the author is required to attach a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point raised by each of the reviewers.

10. (1) If the decision is 1. (1) (b) and the revised manuscript has been submitted, the Editorial Board will require the handling editor to check the revised content. If the revisions are deemed sufficient, the revised manuscript will receive an unconditional acceptance.

(2) If the handling editor finds the revisions insufficient, he/she may draw up a statement of reasons for the decision. The Editor-in-Chief will send the statement of reasons to the author and request a second revision.

11. (1) If the decision is 1. (1) (c) and the revised paper has been submitted, the Editor-in-Chief will follow the procedures stated from section 2 above.

(2) In principle, the same handling editor will be assigned to the manuscript.

(3) In principle, the previous reviewers will also be assigned.

(4) If the result of the second review is (c), the manuscript will in principle not be accepted for publication.

12. If the author has any doubts in terms of publication ethics regarding the review process or the board's decision, he/she may file an objection with the Editorial Board. Upon receiving relevant facts from the author, the Editor-in-Chief will convene an Editorial Board meeting. The Editorial Board will consult on proper measures and take appropriate actions according to proper publication ethics and notify the author. If the author objects to the decision made by the Editorial Board, he/she may file an objection with the Institute for Advanced Social Sciences steering committee.

Appendix: This regulation will come into effect on May 21, 2015.

Appendix: This regulation will come into effect on December 22, 2015.

Appendix: This regulation will come into effect on November 1, 2016.

Appendix: This regulation will come into effect on July 2, 2024.

Appendix: This regulation will come into effect on October 3, 2024.