

Guidelines for reviewers

The peer evaluation procedure will be managed through the journal's digital platform. It will be carried out under a double-blind modality, the authors will not know the identity of the reviewers, and the reviewers will evaluate the contributions without knowing their authors. Those who are required to evaluate contributions have the duty of confidentiality or the obligation to maintain secrecy and not disclose the document that they have been entrusted to arbitrate. They therefore undertake to maintain total confidentiality regarding the data, results or any other finding of which they have become aware as a consequence of their work as evaluators, refraining from making use of the arguments, data or any other discovery contained in the articles until to be published.

In the event that the reviewer desists from carrying out the review, he or she must communicate this decision to the Editorial Committee and ideally make suggestions regarding other possible qualified reviewers for the proposed document.

Upon accepting the arbitration of the proposed document, the reviewer must rate a series of items that we present and order in the evaluation format that exists for this purpose on the journal's digital platform.

The result of the reviewer's evaluation will consist of the responses to the aforementioned evaluation format (editable online or downloadable from the journal's website), and a copy of the reviewed document where all the comments, observations and corrections considered pertinent have been recorded. Both elements, responses to the form and the document with observations, will be managed on the magazine's digital platform, as a last resort they can be sent by email to the address fondoeditorial@unsm.edu.pe

Responsibilities of the referees

1. Accept the review of texts adjusted to their area of specialty, in order to carry out an appropriate evaluation.
2. Declare from the beginning of the process if they have any conflict of interest. If he or she suspects the identity of the author(s) he or she must notify the journal if this knowledge raises a possible conflict of interest.
3. Reject the review immediately if it is not possible to deliver it within the agreed deadline.
4. Issue the evaluation based on the originality, the contribution of the article to the topic, the methodology used, the relevance and timeliness of the bibliography used; the style, coherence and quality in the structure and writing of the text.
5. Inform the journal, immediately, if during the evaluation he or she finds or discovers that does not have the necessary experience to evaluate all aspects of the text.
6. Their critiques will be objective, specific and constructive.
7. Clearly define the approval, rejection or conditioning of the text.
8. Issue their evaluation within the agreed period.
9. Respect confidentiality during and after the evaluation process.
10. Do not use content from the revised or revised text.
11. Do not involve other people in the review we request.
12. Inform the journal if they detect similarity of the text with another that they have reviewed or if they identify any type of plagiarism.
13. We do not allowed to transfer the responsibility of making an opinion to any other person, assistant or collaborator.