

Peer Review Guidelines for

Journal of Inter-Regional Studies: Regional and Global Perspectives (JIRS)

Waseda ORIS, Committee of Journals and HP

16 June 2017

The committee sets out peer review procedures for the manuscripts (research articles and research notes) submitted to the *Journal of Inter-Regional Studies: Regional and Global Perspectives (JIRS)* as follows.

The editorial board will select two peer reviewers for each manuscript. The reviewers are usually researchers who belong to or work with Waseda ORIS, but this is not always the case. In principle, authors will receive review results from the editorial team within one month after their submission. The format of the review report can be modified by reviewers.

Reviewers are requested to pay particular attention to the following criteria when evaluating the manuscript.

1. Clarity of the research question and the answer
2. Appropriateness of the literature review
3. Logical consistency of the argument
4. Appropriateness of the research method
5. Originality of the research findings
6. Format and clarity of writing

These are guidelines, however. The reviewers are expected to make an overall assessment of the manuscript from academic and pedagogical perspectives.

Reviewers make one of the three evaluations:

1. Accept
2. Revision
3. Reject

Authors may express their opinions on the results of the review. They can communicate with the reviewers only through the editorial team of the journal.

If necessary, the Journal and HP Committee of Waseda ORIS can revise these Peer Review Guidelines.

Peer review report for manuscripts submitted to
Journal of Inter-Regional Studies: Regional and Global Perspectives (JIRS)

Reviewer's name :

Date/Month/Year :

I hereby submit a report on the manuscript, entitled (**Title of the manuscript here**) .

Overall assessment: **please circle one of the three options below.**

- 1 Accept
- 2 Revision
- 3 Reject

Please explain the main reasons for your evaluation. Especially in the case of minor revision or major revision, please make concrete suggestions to the author.

Please tick one box for each criterion.

S: Excellent

A: Very good

B: Satisfactory

C: Unsatisfactory

1. Clarity of the research question and the answer

S []	A []	B []	C []
------------	------------	------------	------------

2. Appropriateness of the literature review

S []	A []	B []	C []
------------	------------	------------	------------

3. Logical consistency of the argument

S []	A []	B []	C []
------------	------------	------------	------------

4. Appropriateness of the research method

S []	A []	B []	C []
------------	------------	------------	------------

5. Originality of the research findings

S []	A []	B []	C []
------------	------------	------------	------------

6. Format and clarity of writing

S []	A []	B []	C []
------------	------------	------------	------------