

## **Peer Review Guidelines of *Advances in Resources Research***

Resources Economics Research Board  
Established on November 25, 2020  
Revised November 29, 2021

### **1. Purpose**

Manuscripts submitted to *Advances in Resources Research* (ARR) will be peer-reviewed following these guidelines.

The purpose of peer review is to objectively evaluate whether a submitted manuscript (articles and reviews) contributes to research in natural resources (energy, food, and water resources) and related fields and is worthwhile to be published in ARR, and to provide the editorial committee with materials for deciding whether or not to publish it. In addition, peer review exists to encourage the improvement of the submitted manuscript, not to exclude various opinions, and unify speech. In addition, the authors' race, religion, ethnicity, sex, age, nationality, occupation, affiliation, and political beliefs should not be taken into account in determining the manuscript to be submitted.

### **2. Confirmation of posting requirements**

The editorial committee will check whether the submitted manuscript meets the requirements outlined in the "Posting Rules" and the "Writing Guidelines". A contribution manuscript that meets the contribution requirement and is accepted is notified to the authors of the acceptance.

### **3. Peer review system**

Peer review shall be conducted anonymously.

In principle, the submitted manuscript should be reviewed by one chief reviewer and one sub-reviewer.

### **4. Peer review procedure**

- (1) The editorial committee shall appoint reviewers.
- (2) The reviewers submit the review results and comments to the authors to the editorial committee within two months of receipt of the review manuscript.
- (3) The reviewers review the manuscript in four stages:
  - A. Available
  - B. Can be revised and published
  - C. After amendment and reexamination

D. Not available

(4) In principle, the editorial committee follows the reviewers' evaluations when they agree. If they do not agree with each other, the chairman of the editor-in-chief decides after consultation with the editorial committee.

(5) The review results will be communicated to the authors within two weeks.

## **5. Reviewers**

Fairness must be ensured in the selection of reviewers. Therefore, persons belonging to the same institution as the author (including co-authors), persons stated in the acknowledgment, and persons who have direct business interests with the authors cannot be reviewers.

The requirements for reviewers are, in principle, (a) a doctor, (b) a professor or associate professor, and (c) three or more works as leading or equivalent authors in domestic and foreign journals on natural resources and related fields. Meet the plural conditions above.

## **6. Peer review criteria**

Contributed manuscripts are considered from the viewpoint of the following publication standards in deciding whether to publish them.

(1) Significance and value

Having new knowledge (novelty)

Opening up new possibilities to develop (creativity)

Having important knowledge (importance)

having scientific or technical contributions (usefulness)

(2) Structure and content

Clarify the purpose of the research

Use of research methods that meet research objectives

Study methods should be used appropriately

Sufficient and appropriate consideration based on the research results

The overall structure and text must be logical, consistent, and consistent

Appropriate citation of relevant documents

There is no ethical problem

No double posting.

## **7. Obligation of reviewers**

The reviewers shall immediately decline a peer review request if: (1) there is a potential conflict of interest; (2) a non-technical peer review manuscript; or (3) it appears impossible to complete the review within the deadline.

The reviewers should conduct the review objectively and logically based on the quality and value of the refereed manuscript, with due respect for the authors' intellectual independence.

The reviewers shall not divulge the fact of the request to others. In addition, refereed manuscripts are treated as confidential and are not permitted to be shown or consulted by others. In addition, reviewers are prohibited from using unpublished material in peer-reviewed manuscripts.

The reviewers state their peer-reviewed opinions clearly and logically. Peer review comments should not be personally critical of authors. Also, the review opinion should assert the reviewers' subjective opinion and should not require any modification of the authors' point of view.

### **8. Method and deadline for submitting amendments**

When submitting a draft, the authors shall specify the content of the draft corresponding to the general comment by the chief reviewer and submit it to the editorial committee with a written response in any format. Rebuttal to peer review comments may also be included.

In principle, the deadline for submitting a revised draft shall be two months or less. If the revised draft is not submitted within the deadline, the editorial committee shall request the authors to submit a written statement of reasons. If reasonable grounds are found in the content of the revised draft, a new deadline shall be decided by the editorial committee.

### **9. System and the deadline for review**

In the case of conditional acceptance, the editorial committee shall determine whether the conditions have been appropriately met, and in the case of revision, the results of the review shall be reviewed under the supervision of the chief reviewer (including a sub-reviewer if necessary).

The period of review shall be within one month in the case of a review that includes a sub-reviewer and within two weeks in the case of the only chief reviewer.

### **10. Notification**

If a decision is made to allow publication, the editorial committee will reconfirm the examination procedures and formal requirements and notify the authors. If a decision is made to prohibit publication, the editorial committee will promptly notify the authors after confirming that there are no deficiencies in the examination procedure.

### **11. Authors' objection**

Authors may file a complaint with the editorial committee within two weeks of receipt of the notice regarding the review results or the decision to publish. The editorial committee shall respond to the objection within two weeks of receipt of the objection and respond to the authors.