Review Procedures for *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology*

(Objective)

**Article 1:** In order to maintain recognized international academic standards for its contents, the Japanese Society of Cultural Anthropology establishes the following review procedures for its academic journal, *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology*. The editorial board of the journal is responsible for their application.

(Referees)

**Article 2:** For an article, the editorial board will obtain reviews from at least two parties who are academically qualified as peers. As a rule, one referee should be an overseas scholar while the other should be a domestic member of the Society.

(Referee's anonymity)

**Article 3:** The referees should be anonymous.

(Review contents)

**Article 4:** The referee will be given the following checklist for the review:

I  **Content**
1) Is the theme of this article appropriate to the field of Cultural Anthropological/ Ethnological Studies?
2) Is the article an original contribution to the field of Cultural Anthropological/ Ethnological Studies?
3) Is the article adequately researched?
4) Is there adequate use of materials and evidence?
5) Is the conclusion persuasive?
6) Are the explanations logical and complete?
7) Is the article complete in all respects?

II  **Quality of writing**
8) Is the title appropriate?
9) Is the writing clear and intelligible?

III  **Structure**
10) Is the overall structure of sections and subsections appropriate?

IV  **Figures and tables**
11) Are there adequate figures and tables?
12) Do the figures and tables contribute substantively to the article?
13) Are the captions of figures and tables properly given?

V  **References**
14) Are the references adequate and properly cited?
VI Abstract

15) Is the abstract appropriate to the article?

Article 5: The referee will be asked to rate the article according to the following criteria.
A: The article is ready for publication.
   A1. The article is ready for publication.
   A2. The article would be ready for publication after minor revisions.
B: The article needs to be revised and to be reviewed again.
   B1. Some points in the article need to be revised.
   B2. The article needs substantial revision.
C: The article should be rejected.
   C1. The article is not original.
   C2. The article is below international academic standards.
   C3. The article is incomplete in some respects.
D: The referee is not able to evaluate the article.
   D1. The article needs to be reviewed by specialists in other fields of study.

Article 6: The referee will be asked to write an overall assessment in reference to the checklist.

Article 7: The editor shall inform the author of the referees’ reports.

(From review to publication)

Article 8: The editorial board shall make the final decision on the publication of the articles
   based on the referees' reports.

(Amendments to these procedures)

Article 9: These procedures may be amended by the board of the Japanese Society of Cultural Anthropology.

Date of implementation

These procedures shall be effective from May 21, 2005.