



Peer Review Statement  
*European Journal of Japanese Philosophy*  
Chisokudō Publications, Journals Division

The primary concern of the Editorial Board of the *European Journal of Japanese Philosophy* (EJJP) is to ensure that all articles published in our journal meet the highest standards of academic research, both in content and style. To this end, the editorial process of the EJJP is guided by a set of principles widely followed in the academic world.

Our Editorial Board is constantly engaged in raising its ethical as well as academic standards by taking into consideration both the “[Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors](#)” and the “[Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](#)” provided by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). Moreover, our peer reviewing process is oriented according to the guidelines provided in the handbook on “[Best Practices for Peer Review](#)” published by the Association of American University Presses (AAUP).

The peer reviewing process is composed of the following steps:

1. The author submits a research manuscript for review.
2. In the first “proposal review stage,” the core members of the editing team do an initial review of the article and decide if it is ready for the next phase.
3. If the article is judged to be eligible for the next phase, a member of the editorial team is commissioned to find suitable peer reviewers.
4. The article then enters the second stage of “blind peer review.” Here the article is anonymized and sent to at least two experts in the relevant field. This is to ensure that no personal prejudice or partiality obstructs the objectivity and neutrality of the review, and that a qualified judgement is passed on the quality of the paper.
5. The article is returned to the editor in charge, together with an assessment of its quality and a recommendation on whether to “accept,” “revise,” or “reject” the article. The peer reviewers are obliged to support their recommendation by providing a well-founded argumentation as well as comments on the original text.
6. If a clear majority of opinion is reached at this point, the editor sends the results back to the author together with instructions on how to proceed. In the case of a conflicting in assessment among the peer reviewers, the article is reassessed, either by other members of the editorial board or new peer reviewers, until a majority decision is reached.

If a submission has been “accepted,” it enters a final stage of review regarding possible improvements to be made before publication. Where “revision” is advised, the author is given ample time to rework the article and resubmit it for consideration. If a submission has been marked for “rejection,” it cannot be considered for publication in its present form, but upon thorough revision, it may be resubmitted at a later date.

Standards of expected ethical behavior apply to all parties involved in the act of publishing: the author, the journal editor, the peer reviewer and the publisher.

Posted 1 March 2020  
Chisokudō Publications, Nagoya, Japan