

Peer Review Guideline  
for  
Journal of Next Generation Forum, Organization for Regional and Inter-regional Studies

Editorial board  
Organization for Regional and Inter-regional Studies  
Waseda University  
10<sup>th</sup> November, 2016

Peer review of papers submitted to the Journal of Next Generation Forum will be conducted as follows.

Two referees will be chosen from researchers involved in Organization for Regional and Inter-regional Studies (the Organization) activities by the Editorial board. If necessary, it is possible to ask researchers from outside the Organization to conduct peer reviews. Peer review reports, as a general rule, will be communicated to the author by the editor within one month after submission. Report format may be changed if necessary, depending on the referee.

Referees evaluate submitted papers based on the following standards.

1. Question setting and clarity of response
2. Suitability of organization of previous research
3. Consistency of argument logic
4. Suitability of research method
5. Creativity with knowledge
6. Grammatical accuracy (including written expression and choice of terms)

However, the above standards are the clear general rules and referees comprehensively screen based on these from academic and educational points of view.

Referees give one of the following evaluations as the result of peer review.

- 1 The original manuscript can be published as is
- 2 The manuscript can be published with conditions (with instructions for revision)
- 3 The manuscript can be published as research notes
- 4 The manuscript cannot be published

It should be noted that it is possible for the submitting author to give their opinions on the results of the peer review. Responses from referees to submitting authors will be announced by the editorial desk.

This Peer Review Guideline may be revised by the Editorial board if necessary.

Peer Review Report for  
Journal of Next Generation Forum, Organization for Regional and Inter-regional Studies

Referee Name:  
(DD/MM/YYYY)

Date of Peer Review:

( Title of the manuscript ) has been peer reviewed and evaluated as follows.

- ① Whether publication is possible or not (circle one)
- 1 The original manuscript can be published as is
  - 2 The manuscript can be published with conditions (write instructions for revision in the space below or attach in a separate document (free format))
  - 3 The manuscript can be published as research notes
  - 4 The manuscript cannot be published

Please write the main reasons for your decision above.

Put a circle in the brackets for individual evaluation of peer review standards.

1. Question setting and clarity of response

Excellent [       ]	Good [       ]	Adequate [       ]	Not Adequate [       ]
------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------

2. Suitability of organization of previous research

Excellent [       ]	Good [       ]	Adequate [       ]	Not Adequate [       ]
------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------

3. Consistency of argument logic

Excellent [       ]	Good [       ]	Adequate [       ]	Not Adequate [       ]
------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------

4. Suitability of research method

Excellent [       ]	Good [       ]	Adequate [       ]	Not Adequate [       ]
------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------

5. Creativity with knowledge

Excellent [       ]	Good    [       ]	Adequate [       ]	Not    Adequate [       ]
------------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

6. Grammatical accuracy (including written expression and choice of terms)

Excellent [       ]	Good    [       ]	Adequate [       ]	Not    Adequate [       ]
------------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------