

## **Dos and Don'ts (Ver.1.3)**

### **For Meta-reviewers**

**"Do not throw away gems even if you can pick up stones (Do not reject good papers even if you can pick up bad papers)"**

- (1) Consider to accept papers with 60% completion rate and do not require them with 90% completion rate; publish papers that provide valuable information to members, in addition to excellent papers.
- (2) It is the fundamental basis that valuable papers must not be rejected even if non-perfect papers would be accepted.
- (3) Request persons in different organizations of the meta-reviewer and the authors of the paper. The reviewers should not be in the same organization.
- (4) Judge by listing up conditions for acceptance.
- (5) Meta-reviewers are the last bulwark.
- (6) Be careful to describe acceptance conditions. In the case of regular papers, Checking by meta-reviewers is everything at the first-round review.
- (7) Reasons for rejection are mostly different from acceptance conditions. Be careful to change judgments from rejections to conditional acceptances.
- (8) Some questions about meta-reviewer's judgment could arise in an editorial committee meeting, and furthermore, its approval (final decision) might be postponed.
- (9) The meta-reviewer should not stick to his judgment in an editorial committee meeting (but should listen humbly to the comments appeared there).
- (10) The meta-reviewer should inform the reviewers of IPSJ policies on reviewing.
- (11) The meta-reviewer should agree with the reviewers about the policies and processes on reviewing.
- (12) The meta-reviewer should not only consider the new policies on reviewing are natural enough, but should also keep in mind that it is completely difficult to practice it.
- (13) The meta-reviewer should not always reject manuscripts indeed, while supporting the new policies on reviewing.
- (14) The meta-reviewer should not record the following comments on PRMS.
  - This manuscript had better be rejected in order to avoid some extra overheads on second reviewing.
- (15) Do not make immediate rejection at the first review for lesser effort of reviewing.
- (16) Do not look for the reason for the rejection.
- (17) Do not forget that it may have the second round of inquiry to the authors.
- (18) Be careful not to let the authors say that "I faced many malicious rejections from this journal."

#### **[Meta-reviews are coordinators for biased opinion]**

- (19) Keep in mind that meta reviewers are not "the third reviewers", but coordinators who are required to correct biased opinions by reviewers.
- (20) Consider revising the reviews if they contain suggestions which are too subjective.
- (21) Do not bring reviewers' reports with apparent biases or problematic descriptions to the editorial meeting as they are. In case a meta-reviewer gets such problematic reports which cannot be managed by self, consult chief examiner, first.
- (22) Do not take meta-reviewer's personal preference or opinions about the research topic of the paper into the judgment process.
- (23) Through the meta-reviewer's report, do not give a misunderstanding to the authors that meta-reviewers cannot go against reviewers' decision.
- (24) A meta reviewer can accept a paper which was rejected by both of two referees.
- (25) A meta reviewer cannot reject a paper which was conditionally accepted by both of two referees.

#### **[Miscellaneous]**

- (26) Do not contact the authors directly.