

How to Submit a Paper for Publication to the *Japanese Journal of Risk Analysis*

Enacted by the Executive Board on June 26, 2020

Revised by the Executive Board on March 31, 2022

You can check the latest status of new submissions and other details at the Online Submission and Review System on the SRAJ website:

https://iap-jp.org/sraj/journal_e/login

I. Submission procedure

1. Follow the procedures of the submission system to enter information about the paper and author/s.
2. When entering basic information, specify the category of document being submitted in accordance with the Submission Rules.

Original Articles (free of charge up to 10 pages)

Original, previously unpublished papers that summarize the results of theoretical or empirical research relating to risk whose contents contribute to academic, societal, or industrial development

Short Articles (free of charge up to 8 pages)

Papers that conform to any of the following definitions:

- A news report or progress update of ongoing research on risk-related theory or research findings
- A report of important administrative experience or data of material value that contributes to the development of risk research
- A report of a practical operational method, innovation, or business plan proposal, for societal implementation of risk research

Reviews (free of charge up to 12 pages)

Papers designed to offer wide-ranging knowledge in a specific risk-related field or across multiple associated fields

Topics (free of charge up to 8 pages)

- Topical reports about risk-related research, assessment, technology, business, or relevant academic societies
- Reports of the contents of sessions of the Annual Conference of the SRAJ or other risk-related symposium

Letter to Editors (free of charge up to 10 pages)

Letters expressing opinions and thoughts relating to risk, comments on papers published in the Journal, or minor additions or corrections to one's own paper

Book Reviews (free of charge up to 4 pages)

Reports about books or publications relating to risk

Any other type of requested manuscript (not listed above) should be sent directly to the Editorial Secretariat and Editor-in-Chief or to your editor-in-charge.

3. When you enter your manuscript information, select at least one field to describe the contents of the manuscript. The Editorial Committee member in charge and reviewers will be assigned based on this selection. Select "Not applicable" only in the case of Editorial or Book Reviews.

- Environmental and health risk
- Climate change and disaster risk
- Engineering and technology risk
- Economic and insurance risk
- Infectious disease risk
- Systemic risk
- Ecological risk
- IT and cyber risk
- Risk perception and communication
- Risk analysis and assessment methods
- Risk management and risk policy
- Risk governance
- Regulatory science

- Risk comparison and risk trade-off
- Risk countermeasures and crisis management
- Societal implementation of risk analysis
- Other risk analysis-related topics

4. After creating the manuscript (in MS Word) in accordance with the Manuscript Preparation Guidelines (including the main text, title, abstract, and keywords), convert the file to PDF format. Make sure to upload the manuscript as a PDF file.

Note 1) For some types of submitted documents, the review process will be conducted blindly. For this reason, make sure to delete the names and affiliation information of all authors before converting the file to PDF. Also, take care to delete names and affiliations from the properties of the PDF file before submitting it.

5. After it is confirmed that the manuscript has been submitted in accordance with the Submission Rules and Manuscript Preparation Guidelines, the Editorial Secretariat will officially receive the manuscript, assign it a Submission No., and send a receipt notification to the contributor by email.

6. The Editorial Committee decides whether to start reviewing the document. If a document is judged to require peer review, an Editorial Committee member (editor-in-charge) will be assigned to lead the review and the peer review process will begin. You can check the status of a review by logging into the Online Submission and Review System on the SRAJ website.

Note 2) Contributors should carefully read the Submission Rules and Manuscript Preparation Guidelines and prepare their manuscript in accordance with the instructions. If you send a manuscript that does not comply with the rules and guidelines, you will create unnecessary work for editorial staff and you yourself will have to make additional effort to revise the manuscript. The publication of the submitted document will also be delayed.

II. Process after submission (in case of Original Articles, Short Articles, and Reviews)

1. Communication of review results

Manuscripts are reviewed by reviewers engaged by the Editorial Committee. (As a rule, two reviewers are engaged), but if there is a difference of opinion about acceptance or rejection, one more reviewer will be added.) The review process will be conducted anonymously. The Editorial Committee will make one of the following decisions (A to D) based on the results of the review.

A: Accept the manuscript as is (accept)

B: Accept the manuscript after a minor revision is made in response to the comments of peer reviewers (minor revision)

C: Re-review the manuscript after it is significantly revised in response to the comments of peer reviewers (major revision)

D: Reject the manuscript (reject)

It is not possible to publish the paper in the *Japanese Journal of Risk Analysis* by making only minor revisions that can be completed in a short time. (In this case, reviewers' comments will be sent to you, so make sure to examine them. We strongly recommend that you revise the paper and resubmit it. The manuscript will be considered a new submission.)

2. Notifications (email)

You will be sent a notification email to your registered email address according to the outcome (A to D) at the following times. In the case of A (accept), when proofreading is completed; in the case of B (minor revision), when a revised manuscript is requested; in the case of C (major revision), when a revised manuscript is requested; and in the case of D (reject), when rejection is confirmed. Note that the acceptance (date) of the paper will be established when the review is completed in the case of A and when the revised manuscript has been submitted and the response to the review results is judged to be satisfactory in the case of B.

(If a revised manuscript is not submitted, a reminder will be sent to the registered email address in the fourth month. After six months have passed, the manuscript will be deleted from the system.)

3. Submitting a manuscript for printing

Accepted manuscripts should be revised for layout and appearance by changing the format according to the Manuscript Preparation Guidelines (e.g., how to write references) and then sent to the SRAJ Editorial Secretariat <srj-edit@kokusaibunken.jp> as an email attachment instead of using the Online Submission and Review System. The subject of the email should be “Society for Risk Analysis Japan Paper Submission SRA XXXX (Submission No.)” Whenever you contact the Editorial Secretariat, make sure to quote the applicable Submission No. Please make the layout or appearance-related revisions promptly, in accordance with the instructions of the Editorial Secretariat. If the submission is not completed by the specified deadline, acceptance will be canceled.

4. Journal publication

Accepted papers will be published in the next (possible) issue of the *Japanese Journal of Risk Analysis*.

III. Peer review process

1. Peer reviews and other reviews are conducted by the Review Committee Chair, the editor-in-charge, and reviewers.
2. Reviewers are selected for each paper by the Review Committee Chair and the editor-in-charge. Manuscripts that do not require peer review are reviewed by the Editor-in-Chief and the Review Committee Chair.
3. The Editorial Committee will confirm whether a submitted paper is subject to peer review as a *JJRA* paper.
4. If a paper is subject to peer review, the Editor-in-Chief will assign a member of the Editorial Committee to serve as the editor-in-charge of the paper.
5. The editor-in-charge will check the information about the paper and the paper for review (manuscript), and request candidate reviewers to review the paper. (As a rule, there are two reviewers, but if there is a difference of opinion regarding acceptance or rejection, one more reviewer will be added.)

6. The candidate reviewers will view the abstract of the paper for review by clicking a URL in an email from the editor-in-charge. From the same website, they will then reply to indicate whether they accept or reject the review.

7. Reviewers who accept to undertake the peer review will be able to download detailed information about the paper for review.

8. The reviewers start reviewing the paper.

9. When the reviewers finish their reviews, they will create a report on the website dedicated to reviewers. If they have any comments, they can write them in the comments field before uploading their review report.

10. The editor-in-charge checks the review report and the comments of the reviewers and in some cases adds his/her own additional comments, before making a review decision (accept / minor revision / major revision / reject).

11. If a revision is requested, the author will send the revised manuscript to the editor-in-charge by email at a later date.

IV. Guide to Reviewing Research Papers (Original Articles/Short Articles) (for reviewers)

1. Reviews and inquiries

Peer reviewers should consider the following matters.

(1) Is the scope of the paper appropriate for this journal (scope)?

(2) Are there any obvious errors (correctness)?

(3) Does the paper contribute to academic, societal, or industrial development (usefulness)?

(4) Is the paper easy to understand (clarity)?

(5) (Especially for Original Articles) Does the paper contain any new or novel elements (originality)?

It is the policy of this Journal to actively accept academic reports as well as reports with interdisciplinary content that include societal or industrial applications.

Considering the interdisciplinary nature of risk research (the purpose for which the SRAJ was established), when making judgments, special attention should be paid to whether the paper can be understood by researchers and readers in other fields. (It may be necessary to include advice or recommendations on issues of expression, e.g., summarization style, use of idiomatic language). Since the inquiry needs to consider deficiencies in the paper, be careful not to provide excessive guidance about content, such as requesting new descriptions that deviate significantly from the contents of the submitted manuscript. Also, to reduce the number of days required for reviewing, do not omit any questions in your initial inquiry. As a rule, you should reach a conclusion on acceptance or rejection in no more than two reviews.

2. Returning papers

If more than one reviewer finds a paper unacceptable in accordance with criterion (1) in the previous section, the paper will be returned. When a paper is returned, the reasons for the judgments made independently by the reviewers will be attached. For this reason, please cooperate by observing the following points.

- (1) Indicate the reason for rejection in a document, using easy-to-understand language.
- (2) If the contents of the paper are publicly known or have been published previously, make sure to provide specific references as evidence.
- (3) Take care to avoid subjective and personal opinions, especially in the assessment of usefulness (criterion (3) above).

3. Submissions to other journals

If it is found that before publication in this Journal (*JJRA*) a paper with the same contents has been submitted to another “public publication,” the paper will not be published in the Journal, as a rule. However, the definition of “public publication” here includes domestic and foreign books, journals, and the bulletins of a government agency, educational institution, company, etc., and, as a rule, it excludes any materials like abstracts or proceedings for oral presentations at academic conferences or study

meetings of the SRAJ or other academic societies, and materials similar to patent gazettes and other kinds of patent publications.

4. Judgment results by criteria

The overall judgment should be selected using the review system. For details about judgment results by criteria, refer to “Overall Assessment” below and describe the reason for your review results in the free-response field on the system.

Overall assessment

(1) (Especially for Original Articles) Is there originality? (any new contents? / any advances in generality or practicality? / even if results are as expected, is there any significant point of verification?)

(2) Is the paper useful (academic/societal/industrial)?

(3) Does the paper offer any new theories, experimental techniques, technologies, etc., worthy of attention?

(4) Is the title of the paper appropriate?

(5) Are the contents of the abstract sufficient?

(6) Is the paper too long for the contents it offers?

(7) Is the text of the paper clearly written and does the paper offer sufficient detailed information (about purpose/significance/results/assumptions and conditions/logic and calculation process/figures and tables, etc.)?

(8) Is the scientific terminology appropriate?

(9) Are the logic, formulas, and experimental procedures scientifically reliable enough?

(10) Are all of the research findings that need to be reported included in the paper, or is only a part of the research reported?

5. Reviewer comments (introduction and suggested revisions)

In the comments field where the results of judgments by criteria are described above, indicate (1) overall comments and (2) specific comments. Also, for each specific comment, indicate the applicable part of the paper (e.g., page, line, figure/table number) and write your opinion and the reason for your judgment for each comment.