

JMSJ Guide for Reviewers

1 January 2024

Robust peer review is crucial to the quality and reputation of scholarly journals. The *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan* (JMSJ) is extremely grateful to reviewers for contributing their time, effort and expertise to this important process. This Guide for Reviewers provides advice for our reviewers on preparing and submitting their reviews.

About JMSJ

JMSJ is a bimonthly, international journal for the publication of research in all areas of meteorology. The journal's broad scope includes meteorological observations, modeling, assimilations, analyses, global and regional climate research, satellite remote sensing, chemistry and transport, and dynamic meteorology including geophysical fluid dynamics. In particular, JMSJ welcomes papers related to Asian monsoons, climate and mesoscale models, and numerical weather forecasts.

JMSJ publishes original research Articles, Invited Review Articles, and Correspondence, which are submitted by authors from around the world. All published articles undergo the journal's rigorous but fair single-blind peer review process. A full explanation of the peer review process is included in the Guide for Authors. Further details such as the Aims and Scope, journal policies, and the Guide for Authors, are available from the JMSJ website at <https://jmsj.metsoc.jp/>.

Conflict of interest

A robust peer review process relies on reviewer feedback that is both fair and objective. If there are actual, perceived or potential circumstances that could influence a reviewer's ability to act impartially, a conflict of interest exists.

The Editor in charge will try to avoid conflicts of interest when inviting reviewers to assess a manuscript. However, it can often be difficult or impossible to identify potential bias. If you have been invited to review a manuscript, please consider if your ability to judge it fairly and objectively might be influenced by circumstances such as:

- having a financial interest in the work or the outcome of the manuscript
- working on the same topic or in direct competition with any of the authors
- having seen or commented on drafts of the manuscript.

A conflict of interest may not be apparent until after you have accepted the invitation to review and have begun your assessment of the manuscript. If, at any time during the review process, you believe you may have a conflict of interest with a manuscript you are reviewing, please contact the Editorial Office immediately.

Turnaround times

JMSJ aims to provide authors with efficient peer review and rapid editorial decisions. We ask you to complete your reviews within the timeframes below.

Articles	1 month
Review Articles	2 months
Correspondence	3 weeks

Please let the Editorial Office know as soon as possible if you expect your review to be delayed. This helps us to keep authors informed and to make alternative arrangements if necessary.

Confidentiality

Unpublished manuscripts

Reviewers should treat all manuscripts in full confidence throughout the peer review process. Please follow these guidelines:

- Do not disclose your role in reviewing the manuscript.
- Do not discuss or share the manuscript with those who are not directly involved in the peer review process.
- Do not use any information from an unpublished manuscript in your own research or publications.
- Do not cite any unpublished manuscripts or their contents.
- Do not contact the authors during the peer review process without first obtaining the Editor in charge's approval.
- Check with the Editor in charge before consulting colleagues (either within or outside your own research group) about the manuscript, to ensure that you do not inadvertently violate confidentiality or impartiality.

JMSJ recognizes that invited reviewers may wish to provide training to PhD students or post-doctoral staffs by involving them in the review process. To ensure that their involvement does not violate the confidentiality of the review process, the invited reviewer must inform the PhD students and/or post-docs of these guidelines and let the Editor in charge know their full names and positions. The invited reviewer is ultimately responsible for the quality and accuracy of the review.

Reviewer identity

The journal maintains the confidentiality of reviewers' identities at all times. A reviewer's name will be disclosed by journal staffs only if the reviewer specifically asks for such disclosure or they sign their reviewer reports.

Writing your review

A good review is concise yet comprehensive. It serves two main purposes: to provide the Editor in charge and Editorial Committee with enough information to determine whether the manuscript should be published in the journal; and to give authors feedback on their manuscript and, if necessary, advice on how to improve it.

When writing critical comments, make sure they are constructive and are aimed at the research, not the researchers. If you make assertions of fact, provide supporting evidence. The journal reserves the right to your comments, without reference to you, if they contain personal attacks, offensive language, or confidential information.

Reviews are separated into three parts in ScholarOne: multiple-choice questions, comments to the author(s), and comments to the Editor in charge.

Multiple-choice questions

These questions concern your overall impressions of the manuscript, such as your recommendation on its suitability for publication. The answers to these questions are shared only with the Editor in charge and Editorial Committee, not the author(s).

Comments to the author(s)

Ideally, your review should include:

- a short summary of the manuscript and its findings
- a general overview of the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses
- numbered comments that address specific criticisms about the manuscript.

When preparing your comments, consider the following aspects of the manuscript:

- Relevance: Does the work fit the journal's scope and readership?
- Originality and significance: Is the work new and important?
- Scientific rigor: Are the approach, methods, design and analysis all sound?
- Ethical standards: Have scientific and publishing ethical standards been upheld, to the best of your knowledge?
- Written quality: Is the manuscript clearly and logically presented in comprehensible English?

The following questions may help you to assess each part of the manuscript:

- Title
 - Does the Title accurately reflect the manuscript's main findings?
- Abstract
 - Does the Abstract adequately describe the background or context of the work, the objectives of the research project, the methods used, the main findings, and their relevance?
- Introduction
 - Does the Introduction provide adequate background and context for the work?
 - Have the authors presented their hypotheses clearly?
- Methods
 - Did the authors use appropriate methods and statistical analyses?
 - Have the authors described the methods in enough detail to allow others to replicate them?
 - Have the authors clearly explained and/or mitigated any caveats or limitations in their approach?
- Results
 - Have the authors explained their results clearly and adequately?
 - Is each table and figure necessary? Are any missing?
 - Are the tables and figures complete and easy to interpret?
- Conclusions
 - Are the Conclusions supported by the results?
 - Have the authors considered any alternative explanations for their results?
 - Have the authors made unsupported claims or inappropriate speculations?
- General
 - Are all cited references relevant and necessary? Has any relevant literature been omitted?
 - Is the manuscript clearly written?
 - Have the authors adhered to established codes of publication ethics?
 - Are there any errors in fact, methodology, analyses or interpretations?
 - Has the manuscript been published previously, in part or in whole, in any language?
 - Is the text in the Acknowledgments section suitable?

Comments to the Editor

Helpful comments to the Editor include:

- a summary of your comments to the author(s), to help the Editor in charge quickly assess your review.
- your recommendation regarding publication in the journal. Setting out clear arguments for or against publication is more helpful than simply stating your recommendation to accept or reject the manuscript.
- if it is not suitable for publication, any advice on how the manuscript could be improved to encourage resubmission in the future.
- any concerns you may have about potential ethical violations in either the research or the manuscript.

Comments to the Editor in charge are kept confidential and are not shared with the author(s).

Submitting your review

Submit your review to JMSJ using the link provided in the invitation email or by logging in to your account on the journal's ScholarOne website at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jmsj>. If you encounter any difficulties, please contact the Editorial Office.

Next steps

Please keep a copy of your review. If you recommended revision, the Editor in charge may invite you to comment on the manuscript when it has been revised.

At JMSJ, the Editorial Committee makes the final decision on each manuscript, based upon the recommendation of the Editor in charge. The Editorial Committee's role is to oversee the process and provide comments that help clarify any issues with the manuscript. You will receive a copy of the decision letter along with all reviewers' comments to the authors. Reviewers' identities remain confidential unless a reviewer has signed their review.

Contact details

Editorial Office, Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan
The Meteorological Society of Japan
c/o Japan Meteorological Agency
3-6-9 Toranomom, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-0001 JAPAN
E-mail: jmsj@metsoj.jp