

Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering (JAABE)

Review Guidelines

Decided by the JAABE Editorial Committee on September 9, 2005

1. Review Method

Papers submitted to JAABE are subject to review in accordance with the following criteria. The review is carried out by the Field Editor who makes a judgment of acceptance based on the evaluation made by the referees.

(I) Review Criteria

With respect to the JAABE paper (hereinafter called "the Paper"), its author shall be solely responsible for the contents and representations. The details of the review criteria applied for the referee's evaluation and Field Editor's judgment are as follows.

a) Overall direction

Originality:

Either the introduced concept/method or the discovered facts/rules should be original. This includes a modification of those already known and application from different fields.

Novelty:

It should be based on a novel idea, with extensive potential for development.

Expansibility:

It should have potential for the elucidation of new facts which could revise established theory, or provide an opportunity for exploitation of the new study areas or study/technology systems.

Usefulness:

It should provide valuable and useful information for technological improvement, implementation or scientific significance.

Credibility:

The basis/point of the argument, study method and materials should be substantiated or appropriate, and the study results should be reproducible.

Completeness:

It should lead to demonstrable or appropriate results and conclusions based on a certain theme, and should be complete in itself.

b) Description/representation method

i) Appropriateness and consistency of the point of the argument should be maintained without leap of logic.

ii) The method of experiments/surveys should be appropriate for their purpose(s), and be ethical.

iii) Positioning in relation to past related studies should be clarified.

iv) Appropriate representations should be used to sufficiently summarize the object of the paper.

v) Appropriate terms for the concerned field should be used in a correct manner, or otherwise sufficient definitions given. Figures and tables should correctly represent their contents, without unnecessary descriptions which are made redundant by the text.

vi) The reference citation should be made by clearly stating when literature first appears, with due consideration given to their copyrights.

vii) It should be neutral in terms of commercialism, without over use of names such as those of corporations, products and facilities/institutions.

(II) Referee's Evaluation

Referees will objectively carry out an evaluation in accordance with the review criteria, following the item of the Referee's Report (Form 1). Each referee shall evaluate the paper as either "accepted", "changes required" or "rejected". Evaluation reasons and comments

shall be stated in Form 2.

1) Accepted;

When the content and representation of the paper is acceptable for publication in accordance with the Review Criteria above.

2) Changes required;

When the content and representation of the paper requires revision in accordance with the Review Criteria.

3) Rejected when the paper falls under one of the following;

(a) When the content does not satisfy the Review Criteria and is considered not worthy of publication.

(b) When the content and representation do not satisfy the Review Criteria, and require fundamental rewriting.

(c) When the content is considered not suitable for the Paper.

(d) When the paper does not comply with the conditions of submission.

(III) Field Editor's Judgment of Acceptance

The Field Editor will make a judgment of acceptance of the paper, based on the evaluation ("accepted", "changes required" or "rejected") made in principle by two or more referees.

* In the case that such evaluation is reported by only one referee or is not reported at all, the Field Editor (or an Editor appointed by the Field Editor) shall carry out a review on their behalf, and make a judgment within the designated review period for the publication issue concerned.

[Preliminary Judgment]

The Field Editor shall make a preliminary judgment of the paper as either "accepted", "changes required" or "rejected".

1) Accepted;

When the content and representation of the paper is acceptable for publication in accordance with the Review Criteria above.

2) Changes required;

When the content and representation of the paper require revision in accordance with the Review Criteria. The Field Editor shall inform thereof to the author, and make a final decision based on the revised paper.

3) Rejected when the paper falls under one of the following;

(a) When the content does not satisfy the Review Criteria and is considered not worthy of publication.

(b) When the content and representation do not satisfy the Review Criteria, and require fundamental rewriting.

(c) When the content is considered not suitable for the Paper.

(d) When the paper does not comply with the conditions of submission.

* Provided however that in the case that the Field Editor was unable to make a decision, an Editor appointed by the Field Editor may carry out a review, and make a judgment within the designated review period for the issue concerned. In the case that an additional review by one or more referees is necessary, it may be deemed as an exceptional 'carrying over case' for further review for the following issue with the appointment of a new referee(s).

Basic Patterns of the Preliminary Judgment based on the review evaluation by two referees*; Referees 1 and 2)

(* In the case that the evaluations are reported by three referees at the same time, the judgment shall be carried out in principle by applying the following. For example, when the

three evaluations are all different as “accepted”, “changes required” and “rejected”, apply the following pattern C or X.

A. “Accepted”

When the **two evaluations are “accepted”**, it is in principle judged as accepted, however the Field Editor may judge it as “changes required”.

B. “Changes required”

When **one of the evaluations is “accepted” and the other “changes required”, or when two are “changes required”**, it is in principle judged as “changes required”. (Following revision, the Field Editor shall make a final judgment.)

C. “Accepted”/“Rejected”

When **one of the evaluations is “accepted” and the other “rejected”**, it is judged as “accepted” when the former evaluation is deemed more appropriate, and judged as “rejected” when the latter evaluation is deemed more appropriate. However the Field editor may judge as “changes required”.

X. “Changes required”/“Rejected”

When **one of the evaluations is “changes required” and the other “rejected”**, it is in principle judged as “rejected” when the former evaluation indicates a significant degree of revision is necessary, and the latter evaluation is deemed appropriate. While it may be judged as “changes required” when the former evaluation indicates that it would be of a satisfactory level worthy of publication when revised, and the latter evaluation does not suggest hopelessly poor quality. When the **two evaluations are “rejected”**, it is in principle judged as rejected.

Referee 1 \ Referee 2	Accepted	Changes required	Rejected
Accepted	A	B	C
Changes required	B	B	X
Rejected	C	X	X



The Field Editor will make a “judgment” and put together a review based on the evaluation made by Referees 1 and 2.

The preliminary judgment shall conclude as either “accepted”, “changes required” or “rejected”.

Accepted	Changes required	Rejected
----------	------------------	----------



Revision of the Paper



[Final Judgment]

Judgment of the revised paper by the Field Editor

Accepted	Rejected
----------	----------

The Field Editor shall make a judgment on the revised paper as well as the author's reply to the review, upon their submission.

The final judgment shall be concluded as either “accepted” or “rejected”

- 1) Accepted when the revised and resubmitted paper meets the Review Criteria.
- 2) Rejected when the revised and resubmitted paper does not meet the Review Criteria.

2. Notification of Review Result

Following completion of judgment of the paper, the Field Editor shall inform the author of the review result.

3. Deadline for Submission of the Revised Paper

The revised paper, which has been judged as “changes required”, should be submitted by the date designated by the Field Editor.

4. Miscellaneous

- (1) The Field Editor shall take care of any problems which require immediate solution, and shall then report thereof to the Editorial Committee.

Appendix:

1. Referees

- (1) The Field Editor shall select and appoint referees.
The Field Editor may reject the paper without the review process, when he/she judges the paper to be of extremely low quality.
- (2) The Field Editor in the relevant field shall draft an allocation for review of papers in the relevant field, while requesting the Contact Editor of each institution to select referees.
 - a) Selection of referees for papers submitted from the three institutions
 - Two referees from the author's country
 - One referee from a country other than the author's
 - b) Selection of referees for papers submitted from those other than the three institutions
 - One referee each from the three institutions (the Architectural Institute of Japan, the Architectural Institute of Korea and the Architectural Society of China)
- (3) In the case that any referee appointment is declined, the Contact Editor in the relevant field shall reselect another referee.
- (4) The referee shall not disclose any information relating to the review process to any other parties.