

Research in Dance and Physical Education

- Guideline for Reviewers -

Article 1 (Objective) This document lays out the guidelines for reviewing a manuscript submitted to Research in Dance and Physical Education (RDPE), an English academic journal (hereinafter “Journal”) published by the Global Research Institute for Arts& Culture Education (hereinafter “Institute”).

Article 2 (Review Procedure)

1. The chief editor should screen submitted papers for compliance with the paper submission guideline and proceed to examine only those papers eligible for review (hereinafter “eligible papers”).
2. Two reviewers should be appointed to review each eligible paper.
3. After completing paper reviews, editorial members should provide general evaluations of the papers and the chief editor should give final approval.
4. The editorial board makes final publication decisions.

Article 3 (Selection of Reviewers)

1. One editorial board member, nominated by the chief editor of the Journal, should recommend two reviewers.
2. Reviewers should be recommended by the editorial board member and appointed by the chief editor.

Article 4 (Review Period) Appointed reviewers should review submitted papers and complete review reports within ten days.

Article 5 (Dismissal of Reviewers) If appointed reviewers fail to submit review reports within ten days, the chief editor may cancel the review requests. In such cases, the papers in review should be returned to the editorial board.

Article 6 (Review Outcome)

1. Reviewers should apply one of the following ratings in their reviews: “approved,” “corrections required,” “revise and resubmit for further examination,” and “reject.”
 - 1) Approved: The paper meets the required standards for publication without needing any corrections or modifications.
 - 2) Corrections required: The paper meets the required standards for publication in terms of the nature and quality of work, but a number of corrections and clarifications are necessary.
 - 3) Revise and resubmit for further examination: The paper does not ~~currently~~ meet the standards required for publication—the nature and quality of the work is inadequate and/or insufficient
 - 4) Reject: The nature and quality of work in the paper is weak, has serious errors, or differs little from previously published papers.
2. Papers rated “reject” by one or both reviewers will be referred to the editorial board committee for re-examination (a third review).
3. For papers rated “corrections required,” authors will be asked to make the corrections specified in the reviewers’ reports. Once the revised paper is resubmitted, reviewers will rate the paper again based on whether the authors have made the necessary corrections and/or additions.
4. For papers rated “revise and resubmit for further examination,” authors will be asked to submit a revised paper for further review by the original reviewers.
5. For papers subject to a third reviews, authors will be asked to submit a revised paper for re-review by the third reviewers.
6. For papers rated “reject,” authors will be notified of the decision and given specific reasons.
7. The table below summarizes the review decision-making processes.

Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Overall decision
Approved	Approved	Approved
Approved	Corrections required	Corrections required
Corrections required	Corrections required	Corrections required
Approved	Revise and resubmit for further review	Revise and resubmit for further review
Corrections required	Revise and resubmit for further review	Revise and resubmit for further review
Revise and resubmit for further review	Revise and resubmit for further review	Revise and resubmit for further review
Approved	Reject	Third review (reviewer C)
Corrections required	Reject	Third review (reviewer C)
Revise and resubmit	Reject	Reject (re-submission is allowed)

for further review		
Reject	Reject	Reject (re-submission is not allowed)

Third Review		Further review by one reviewer		Further review by two reviewers	
Reviewer C	Overall decision	Reviewer A or B	Overall decision	Reviewers A and B	Overall decision
Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved, Approved	Approved
Corrections required	Corrections required	Corrections required	Corrections required	Approved, Corrections required	Corrections required
Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject	Corrections required, Corrections required	Corrections required
				Reject by one reviewer	Reject (re-submission is allowed)
				Reject	Reject (re-submission is not allowed)

Article 7 (Paper Corrections)

1. When the review decision indicates that the nature and quality of work in the paper do not meet the Journal's standards, reviewers may ask the author(s) to correct and supplement the paper in accordance with the paper submission guideline and ask for the raw data utilized for the research analyses.
2. Authors who fail to comply with reviewers' requests within one week should re-submit their papers for the next issue of the Journal.

Article 8 (Announcement of the List of Reviewers) The list of reviewers will not be made public.

Article 9 (Announcement of a Review Decision) Review decisions will not be made public except to the authors.

Article 10 (Official Appeal to a Review Decision) Authors who disagree with review outcomes may raise objections in writing within a week of the dispatch of review decisions and request re-reviews. Formal objections can only be made once and the editorial board will review and decides whether

to grant the re-review request. When it grants re-review requests, the editorial board should notify authors of the re-review decisions within a week.

Article 11 (Convocation of the Editorial Board) If necessary, the editorial board can convene to decide whether to accept a paper. The chief editor must be present at such committee meetings.

Article 12 (Sending Review Decision Notifications) The chief editor is responsible for sending review decision notifications to contributors within 3 days of the completion of paper reviews and for ensuring that he or she confirms the review decision online.

Article 13 (Unspecified Matters) Any matter not specified in the above guideline should be referred to the editorial board.

Supplementary provision

1. This guideline for reviewers takes effect on February 06, 2017.
2. The first revised guideline for reviewers takes effect on December 21, 2018.
3. The second revised guideline for reviewers takes effect on February 15, 2019.
4. The third revised guideline for reviewers takes effect on July 23, 2020.
5. The fourth revised guideline for reviewers takes effect on September 18, 2020.