

For Our ALL Reviewers,

All communications regarding the manuscript are privileged during review process.

Any conflict of interest, suspicion of duplicate publication, fabrication of data or plagiarism must be reported to the Editorial Office ([cr\(at\)j-circ\(dot\)or\(dot\)jp](mailto:cr(at)j-circ(dot)or(dot)jp)) immediately.

Without prior approval from the editorial office, editors and reviewers handling a manuscript submitted to Circulation Reports are expressly prohibited from:

- Copying manuscripts
- Sharing manuscripts with others
- Discussing their personal evaluations or recommendations
- Contacting authors directly
- Denying authors' integrity in their review comments
- Conveying politically incorrect message in their review comments

(Please see the page 2~3)

< Peer Review Processes >

1. General:

Circulation Reports uses a single blind peer-review process, where the reviewers' identities remain anonymous to the authors. Every manuscript submitted to the journal will be peer reviewed.

2. Initial Submission:

Peer review process for initial submission is as follows:

- (1) Manuscripts submitted to Circulation Reports go through technical evaluation by the Editorial Office. Manuscripts that are not in accordance with the journal's policy and/or Instructions to Authors will be returned to the contact author for necessary modifications.
- (2) After the completion of the technical evaluation, the Editor-in-Chief reviews the manuscript to determine whether it meets essential criteria and readership of Circulation Reports to warrant further consideration for peer review.
- (3) If the paper satisfies the journal's screening criteria, the Editor-in-Chief assigns an Associate Editor who is an expert in the paper's research area from the journal's Associate Editors list.
- (4) The Associate Editor evaluates eligibility for publication and sends the manuscript to peer reviewer(s). All original manuscripts are usually evaluated by 2 reviewers who are experts in the paper's research area. Invited reviewers are required to report immediately any potential personal, professional or financial conflicts of interest with authors or related to a manuscript's theme and/or topic when receiving a review invitation. In such cases, the Associate Editor invites another reviewer.
- (5) Reviewers who agree to review the manuscript are asked to complete a score sheet and submit it to the Associate Editor in 2 weeks. Once all reviews are complete, reviewers are required to destroy manuscript copies.
- (6) The Associate Editor will then review and submit a recommendation based on the reviewer(s)' score sheet(s) to the Editor-in-Chief within 5 days.
- (7) Based on the opinions of the Associate Editor and the reviewer(s), the Editor-in-Chief makes a final decision and sends a decision letter to all authors of the manuscript via email. Final decisions include: Accept, Minor Revision, Moderate, Major Revision, and Reject. The Editor-in-Chief is the only person who can officially accept a paper for publication.
- (8) Following the formal acceptance of manuscript for publication, the paper will then proceed to English-language editing, production for online publishing, proofing, and to the online publication in sequence.

3. Revisions:

A decision letter provides questions that were raised during the review process, and/or manuscript status information. It may also recommend revision (Minor Revision, Moderate or Major Revision) when applicable. Authors are required to respond to each and every review comment in a response letter and their manuscript accordingly within 3 months from receipt of the decision letter. In revised manuscript files, all texts/areas updated for that resubmission should be highlighted in yellow.

Peer-review process for revisions is as follows:

- (1) Revised manuscripts undergo a technical evaluation by the Editorial Office. Revised manuscripts must include a detailed point-by-point response to the reviewers' and editors' comments and any revision in the manuscript must be highlighted in yellow.
- (2) Once the technical evaluation is completed, the paper proceeds to peer-review. Reviewer(s), who are usually the same as for the initial review, evaluate whether or not all their suggestions and/or questions have been adequately addressed in the revised manuscript as well as the authors' response letter. They are asked to complete a score sheet and submit it to the Associate Editor in 2 weeks.
- (3) The Associate Editor will then submit a recommendation determined by reference to the reviewer(s)' score sheet(s) in 5 days. Further peer or statistical review may be added at this time.
- (4) Based on the opinions of the Associate Editor and reviewer(s), the final decision is made by the Editor-in-Chief.