

Review Regulations

Japanese Society of Social Psychology

Article 1 (Manuscript Submission)

Manuscripts submitted to the Society shall be processed by the Editorial Office in accordance with the following procedures.

1. The Editorial Office shall verify whether the submitted manuscript meets the submission requirements as set forth in the Submission Guidelines.
2. If the submitted manuscript is determined to meet the submission requirements, the Editorial Office shall notify the author of the date of receipt and confirm the following points:
 - Whether the author has already published a substantially overlapping manuscript.
 - Whether the author intends to publish a substantially overlapping manuscript.
 - Whether there is any suspicion of duplicate submission.
3. If the author has published or intends to publish a substantially overlapping manuscript, the Editorial Office shall request that a copy of that manuscript be sent to the Editorial Office.
4. If there is suspicion of duplicate submission, the Editorial Office shall request consultation with the Editor-in-Chief, Associate Editor-in-Chief, and the Primary Reviewer (if already assigned) based on three criteria— distinctiveness/non-duplication, informativeness, and accessibility—and shall proceed to review only those manuscripts recognized as original manuscripts.
5. When a previously rejected or withdrawn manuscript is resubmitted, the Editor-in-Chief and Associate Editor-in-Chief shall consult with reference to the previous review materials, and shall proceed to review only those manuscripts that can be judged as substantially new works.

Article 2 (Manuscript Review)

Manuscripts submitted to the Society shall be reviewed in accordance with the following procedures.

1. Selection of the Primary Reviewer

The Editor-in-Chief shall appoint one member of the Editorial Board as the Primary Reviewer based on the member's area of expertise. If the author or a co-author is the Editor-in-Chief, or a student under the Editor-in-Chief's supervision, the Associate Editor-in-Chief shall appoint the Primary Reviewer.

2. Selection of Reviewers

The Primary Reviewer shall obtain the preliminary consent of two reviewers and recommend them for appointment. Reviewers shall in principle be members of the Society; however, in certain fields, one non-member may be appointed.

3. Desk Rejection Prior to Formal Review

Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding article, the Primary Reviewer may request a desk rejection (i.e., a rejection decision made prior to formal external review). The following procedures shall apply to desk rejections:

- (1) If the Primary Reviewer determines that the manuscript under review has a low likelihood of acceptance even after formal review, the Primary Reviewer may submit a written statement to the Editor-in-Chief setting out the grounds for this determination, and request a desk rejection.
- (2) Upon receipt of a request for desk rejection from the Primary Reviewer, the Editor-in-Chief shall consult with the Primary Reviewer and the Associate Editor-in-Chief regarding the appropriateness of the request. Depending on the content of the manuscript, the Editor-in-Chief may include one or more additional Editorial Board members in this consultation.
- (3) If the consultation concludes that the Primary Reviewer's determination is appropriate, the

manuscript shall be rejected without further review. The outcome of the consultation shall be communicated to the author by the Editor-in-Chief as the decision of the Editorial Board.

4. Request for Review

The Editor-in-Chief or Associate Editor-in-Chief shall request review of the manuscript from the reviewers based on the recommendations made by the Primary Reviewer under Article 2, Paragraph 2. Information that could identify the author—including the author's name, institutional affiliation, position or status, and acknowledgments—shall be removed from the manuscript prior to its transmission to the reviewers. The Editor-in-Chief or Associate Editor-in-Chief may return the assignment to the Primary Reviewer if they determine that a recommended reviewer is not appropriate.

5. Review Period

The review period shall be, in principle, one month.

6. Manuscript Evaluation by Reviewers and Report of Review Outcomes

Reviewers shall conduct a multi-faceted evaluation and provide an overall evaluation (A through D) using the manuscript review evaluation form (evaluation criteria), and shall report to the Primary Reviewer their evaluative rationale, comments including suggested revisions, and whether re-review is considered necessary.

7. Primary Reviewer's Decision Regarding Acceptance

The Primary Reviewer shall determine, based on the reviewers' evaluations, whether the manuscript is to be accepted, rejected, or revised. However, if the reviewers' opinions are divided, the Primary Reviewer may exercise independent judgment, including the addition of a third reviewer. The third reviewer shall be requested to conduct the review without being informed of the evaluations of the other reviewers.

Article 3 (Review Outcome)

When the Primary Reviewer has determined under Article 2, Paragraph 7 that a manuscript is to be accepted or rejected, the Primary Reviewer, the Editor-in-Chief, and the Associate Editor-in-Chief shall confer; if they reach agreement, this shall constitute the decision of the Editorial Board, which shall be reported at the subsequent Editorial Board meeting. In cases where the Primary Reviewer, Editor-in-Chief, and Associate Editor-in-Chief fail to reach agreement—regardless of whether the decision is acceptance or rejection—the matter shall be deliberated and decided by the Editorial Board.

Article 4 (Manuscript Revision)

When the Primary Reviewer has determined under Article 2, Paragraph 7 that revision is required, the following procedures shall apply. These procedures may, in principle, be repeated up to three times. If acceptance does not appear attainable after three rounds of revision, the manuscript shall be rejected.

1. The Primary Reviewer shall compile the reviewers' comments into the Primary Reviewer's comments and transmit them together with the individual reviewers' comments to the author, requesting revision.
2. An author requested to revise their manuscript shall, in principle, submit the revised manuscript within two months (a one-month extension may be granted upon request).
3. The Primary Reviewer shall determine whether the revised manuscript is to be accepted, rejected, or revised again.
4. For revised manuscripts, including cases where the reviewers have indicated that re-review is necessary, or where the Primary Reviewer independently determines that re-review is necessary, the same reviewers shall be requested to conduct a re-review, and the Primary Reviewer shall determine, based on their evaluations, whether the manuscript is to be accepted, rejected, or revised again.

Article 5 (Notification of Decision and Final Determination)

When the acceptance or rejection of a manuscript has been determined, the Editor-in-Chief shall promptly notify the author of the decision. At the next Editorial Board meeting, the Primary Reviewer or the Editor-in-Chief shall report on the content of the manuscript and the review process for the purpose of improving future review and editorial operations.

Article 6 (Notification of Decision to Reviewers)

Upon completion of the review, the Editor-in-Chief shall provide the reviewers with the review materials (comments and evaluation forms of the Primary Reviewer and the reviewers) and invite their opinions on the review outcome. If any reviewer raises concerns, these shall be, in principle, addressed without changing the review outcome, but shall be taken up at an Editorial Board meeting.

Article 7 (Review of Research Ethics)

Reviewers shall require authors to state in their manuscripts that, in studies involving deception, debriefing was provided in principle; if not, authors must state the reason for its omission. In case studies, reviewers shall require authors to avoid descriptions that could violate the privacy of or cause harm to informants, to obtain permission for the publication of research findings, and to state these matters in the manuscript. The Editorial Board, Primary Reviewer, and reviewers shall also assess ethical matters in their review.

Article 8 (Independence and Fairness of Review)

Direct communication between authors, the Primary Reviewer, and reviewers regarding review-related matters is prohibited. All such communications must be conducted through the Editorial Office. However, under special circumstances, direct communication between the Primary Reviewer and reviewers may be permitted with the prior approval of the Editor-in-Chief.

Article 9 (Author Appeal Regarding Review Decisions)

If an author disagrees with a review decision, the author may file an appeal with the Editor-in-Chief on one occasion only. The Editor-in-Chief must promptly communicate the conclusion of the Editorial Board regarding the appeal to the author.

Supplementary Provisions

1. Amendments to these Regulations shall be made upon resolution by the Executive Board and approval by the Board of Directors.
2. These Regulations shall come into force on July 17, 2004.
3. As part of the comprehensive revision of 2018, the amendment dated November 1, 2013 was deleted.
4. These Regulations shall come into force on August 27, 2018.
5. These Regulations shall come into force on October 1, 2025.