

## Referee-Reading Guideline

The Japanese Journal of Evaluation Studies Editorial Board,  
The Japan Evaluation Society  
Approved on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2005

### 1. Content of the Referee-Reading Guideline

This Referee-Reading Guideline is to provide explanation of the main publication judgment, procedure of the referee-reading, to the members who submit the manuscript and for the members who are requested to conduct referee-reading in order to carry out the procedure efficiently and effectively.

### 2. Purpose of Referee-Reading and the Responsibility of the Author

Referee-reading is necessary for the editorial board to make decisions of whether submitted manuscripts are appropriate to publish in the Japanese Journal of Evaluation Studies or not.

If there is doubt or obscurity identified in manuscripts during the referee-reading corrections may be required. Therefore, referee-reading also contributes to the improvement of the submitted manuscripts. However, although the manuscripts are requested corrections, the author is still solely responsible in regards to the contents and it is not attributed to the referee-readers.

Referee-readers are two persons who are requested by the editorial board depending on the specialty or the field of the submitted manuscript. People who are not members of this academic society also may be requested.

### 3. Items of Consideration in Referee-Reading

Five points are considered in referee-reading, however, the importance of each may be different depending on the type of manuscript.

- (1) Importance and utility of the theme
- (2) Originality of the study
- (3) Structure of the logic
- (4) Validity of verification and methodology
- (5) Contribution to evaluation theory and practice

- For the article, all of above five are considered.
- For the research note, especially (1), (2), (3), and (4) are considered.
- For the report, especially (1), (3), and (5) are considered.
- For the review, especially (3) and (5) are considered.

### 4. Attentions in submission of manuscript

Besides above five viewpoints, basic completeness as a paper is also considered, for example;

- appearance of the paper is organized
- written according to the writing manual
- described simply and distinctive
- verification data is appropriately used
- notes and references are corresponding with the text
- terminology is appropriately used
- no wording and grammatical mistakes
- no errors and omission
- no punctuation mistakes

- expression in English abstract is appropriate
- word count is according to the manual

The above mentioned forms and contents are also considered. There have been cases in which graduate students and practitioners posted without organizing the manuscripts as a paper. On those occasions, referee-reading was not conducted. Necessary consultation is strongly recommended prior to submission.

## 5. Judgment Cases in Referee-Reading

(1) In the case of the manuscript which is considered acceptable for the publication but is not yet complete:

The referee reader should evaluate carefully whether the paper can contribute to the development of evaluation theory or evaluation studies.

- Verification is lacking but the theory and formulation are useful for academic development.
- Analysis lacking but useful for formation and promotion of new theory.
- The literature review is not of a high standard but, the overall study is meaningful.
- Comparative study is not up to standard but is meaningful as an example of application.
- Analysis is lacking but it is meaningful as an evaluation of socially and historically important cases.
- Analysis is lacking but it is meaningful as an evaluation of particular social activities.
- Organization and expression are not up to standard as a paper but the contents are worthy to evaluate.
- Logic is not strong enough but useful in practice.
- The paper has significance as a report.

(2) In case of the manuscript which is considered as difficult for publication:

- Awareness of the issue or setting of the problem is indecisive.
- Understanding or analytical framework of notion of basic terminology is indecisive or inappropriate.
- There is a lack in credibility of data for the grounds of an argument.
- There is no clear point of an argument or appropriateness of proof.
- Organization of the paper and presentation (terminology, citation, chart, etc) are inappropriate (or not consistent).

## 6. Judgment

The final decision will be made on publication at the standing editors committee following one of four patterns (listed below). However, these judgments are not based on the number of errors but on the strength of the overall report. In the case of (3) and (4), there is a possibility to be published as a different type of paper. If it is published as a different type of paper, major rewrite concerning the number of words may be required.

- (1) The paper will be published.
- (2) The paper will be published with minor rewrite.
- (3) The paper will be published with major rewrite, however as a different type of paper (review, article, research note, or report).
- (4) The paper will not be published; however there is the possibility that it will be published as a different type of paper (review, article, research note, or report).