

**Peer Review Policies**  
(Last update date: 1-May-2020)

**1. Purpose of the peer review**

The goals of the peer review are to evaluate the submitted manuscripts fairly and objectively, and to determine whether or not the manuscript is academically appropriate for publication in EXPLOSION and Science and Technology of Energetic Materials (STEM).

**2. Manuscripts that are subject to peer review**

Peer review will be carried out for ALL submitted manuscripts that are submitted for publication in EXPLOSION and STEM.

**3. Procedure of peer review**

Peer review is carried out by the peer reviewer not disclosed to the author.

The procedure of the peer review is as follows.

- (1) Reception of the submitted manuscript by the Editorial Office
- (2) Selection of the reviewer by the Editor-in-Chief
- (3) Report of peer review results (accept or reject) from the reviewer to the Editor-in-Chief
- (4) Decisions and notices by the Editor-in-Chief
- (5) Correction and re-review decision

**4. Reviewer's decision**

Reviewers will be determined by the following procedure.

The Editor-in-Chief selects peer review candidates in the field appropriate to the content of the submitted manuscript from among the JES members and request for a peer review.

If the requested peer reviewer candidate accepts the review, that person will be appointed as a peer reviewer of the manuscript.

If the peer review candidate does not accept, the Editor-in-Chief will select a new candidate and make another peer review request, and repeat the same procedure until the peer reviewer is appointed.

**5. Period of review**

The review period is usually within 60 days of notifying the author that the reviewer has made the decision.

If it is decided that the review will require more time than usual, the Editor-in-Chief may decide to extend the review period.

**6. Review criteria and acceptance**

Reviewers make efforts to make fair and objective evaluations while fully considering the research situation in the relevant field of the submitted manuscript.

Then, based on these evaluations, the judgment of accepting or rejecting the submitted manuscript is made comprehensively.

Reviewers shall report to the Editor-in-Chief the results of the review in accordance with the format prescribed by the Editorial Committee.

**7. Decision of acceptance and notification**

Whether or not the submitted manuscript would be accepted for publication will be decided by the judgment of the Editor-in-Chief, based on the report of the review result from the peer reviewer.

Acceptance decisions are:

- (1) Accept as it is
- (2) Accept with the minor revision
- (3) Accept with the major revision and need additional review
- (4) Reject

However, the peer reviewer also considers whether or not the acceptance of the submitted manuscript is possible by the measure of changing the paper category (e.g. change from Research paper to Letter), and it shall be commented in the report on the result of the peer review.

The decision will be immediately notified to the author.

The review results will not be disclosed to anyone other than the author.

### **8. Treatment of manuscripts that was judged as (2)**

For the manuscript judged as (2), the author shall correct the manuscript in accordance with the instructions of the reviewer and Editor-in-Chief, and submit the corrected manuscript by the designated deadline.

The Editor-in-Chief will review the submitted revisions and accept it if it is confirmed that sufficient revisions have been made.

If the correction is insufficient, the Editor-in-Chief will ask the author again for correction.

In addition, the Editor-in-Chief may decide to re-evaluate the revised manuscript.

### **9. Treatment of papers that was judged as (3)**

For the manuscript judged as (3), the author must correct the manuscript with due consideration given to the reviewer and Editor-in-Chief, and submit the corrected manuscript by the designated deadline.

As a general rule, the submitted revised manuscript will be re-reviewed by the same peer reviewer as the first review.

Thereafter, the same procedure as the first review will be carried out until the manuscript is judged as (1), (2) or (4).

Japan Explosives Society  
Editorial Board