

Reviewers Guide

1. Unpublished manuscripts are protected documents. Please keep them safe from all forms of exploitation. Reviewers are not permitted to cite or refer to a manuscript or the work it describes before it has been published, and they are not permitted to use the information it contains for the advancement of their own research.
2. A reviewer should have a positive, unbiased attitude toward the manuscript under consideration.
3. If you believe you cannot judge an article objectively, please return the manuscript to the editor promptly and explain why.
4. Reviews should be completed within two to three weeks. Please notify the editor if you are unable to complete the review within the time frame indicated.
5. The reviewer should not discuss a paper with its author/s.
6. Please do not make any particular statements concerning the acceptance of a work in your form to the author, but instead advise the editor on the accompanying sheet.
7. Please evaluate the following areas of the text in your review, when applicable (see Grid):
 - Importance of the question or subject studied
 - Originality
 - Appropriateness of the experimental or methodological design
 - Appropriateness of the experimental techniques (including statistics)
 - Soundness of conclusions and interpretations
 - Relevance of the discussion
 - Clarity of writing and adequate presentation
8. Criticism should be provided objectively in comments intended for the authors, and harsh remarks should be avoided.
8. Suggested modifications should be written as such and not as acceptance conditions. To ensure that the observations are sent to the authors in a complete and orderly manner, we ask that you fill out the grid (download it [here](#)). We would prefer it if your suggestions were in color or highlighted so that the author could easily identify them and facilitate subsequent evaluation.
10. Your comments, arguments, and suggestions on the manuscript will be most helpful to the editor if they are well documented.
11. You are not requested to correct grammar mistakes, but any help in this regard will be appreciated.
12. The editor gratefully accepts reviewer recommendations, but because editing decisions are typically based on multiple sources of evaluation, a reviewer should not expect the editor to honor every recommendation.

The Editors require an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the study, not just a recommendation for acceptance or rejection.

Recommendations

1. **Accept submission:** acceptable with minimal or no review. Make comments on the aspects that could be improved or need changes.
2. **Publishable with modifications:** acceptable after some specific revisions. Make comments about the aspects that can be improved or that need modifications.
3. **Forward to review:** when the manuscript does not have a logical organization, but the topic deserves its publication, make comments clearly and explain why you are requesting them.
4. **Forward to another Publication:** when the content does not fit with the mission of the journal.
5. **Unpublishable:** explain why the article should be rejected, use language that is courteous and precise, yet critical and concise. Your comments will be transmitted (anonymously) to the authors.
6. **See comments:** contact the Editor to comment on particulars of the manuscript.

Helping the editorial team

1. The Journal wants to give authors a prompt decision, so it is significantly helpful if the Reviewers do their tasks quickly. Please respond within three weeks of receiving the invitation.
2. It is critical that the review period is short, especially if a work is rejected.
3. It is very helpful if you number your main areas of criticism or suggestions for improvement.

In order to upload your observations to the journal page, download the [Tutorial for Reviewers](#). (click here)