

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Potential reviewers of articles will receive an email from the journal inviting them to participate as reviewers of an article. In that email they will be informed about the article to be reviewed and the information to participate or not in the review.

It is important for the management of the journal articles that the reviewers respond in any sense to the editor as soon as possible, accepting or not accepting to do the review. To do this, they should access the RECYT platform following the instructions in the email they receive and accept or not to do the review.

Once you have accessed the platform, in the "Request" tab (Fig. 1) you must accept or not to do the review. You can see the summary and other data of the article in "View all submission details". If they accept, they should confirm that there is no conflict of interest (Fig. 2). It is important to perform the review within the deadline indicated in the message (Fig. 1).

Fig. 1.

The screenshot shows the 'Request for Review' section of the RECYT platform. At the top, there is a navigation bar with four tabs: '1. Request' (active), '2. Guidelines', '3. Download & Review', and '4. Completion'. Below the navigation bar, the main content area is titled 'Request for Review' and contains the following information:

- A message: "You have been selected as a potential reviewer of the following submission. Below is an overview of the submission, as well as the timeline for this review. We hope that you are able to participate."
- Article Title:** Título de un trabajo que envía Alberto para probar los posibles cambios en la nueva versión de la plataforma RECYT
- Abstract:** asfdsaf
- Review Type:** Blind
- A link: [View All Submission Details](#)
- Review Schedule:** A table with three columns showing dates and their corresponding labels: 2022-08-02 (Editor's Request), 2022-08-03 (Response Due Date), and 2022-08-16 (Review Due Date).

2022-08-02	2022-08-03	2022-08-16
Editor's Request	Response Due Date	Review Due Date

Fig. 2.

Yes, I agree to have my data collected and stored according to the [privacy statement](#).

[Accept Review, Continue to Step #2](#) [Decline Review Request](#)

Then read the "Guidelines" (Tab 2) (Fig. 3) and in the "Download and review" (Tab 3), you will be able to see all the files contributed by the authors (Fig. 4). In the same place, the reviewer can make comments for the authors to read or, also, can write comments for only the editors to see (do not confuse the corresponding boxes).

If they deem it convenient, they can upload a file (Fig. 4) with suggestions or a PDF with comments for the authors, in the box "Upload" > "upload file".

When uploading the files, once the file has been selected, you must click in the following windows: [Continue](#) > [Continue](#) > [Complete](#) (no further action is required).

Fig. 3



1. Request 2. Guidelines 3. Download & Review 4. Completion

Reviewer Guidelines

1. Reviewers maintain their anonymity before the authors of the papers they review. If a reviewer does not wish to maintain the anonymity of his or her review to the authors, he or she should put or sign his or her name to the comments he or she makes to the authors.
2. Listed below are several questions for the reviewer to consider when making the evaluation of the paper (it is not necessary to answer all questions in the review report):
 - Is it an original work?
 - Is the scientific structure of the manuscript correct?
 - Do you think the title of the manuscript is correct?
 - Does the abstract accurately reflect the content of the manuscript?
 - Do you think the choice of keywords is correct?
 - Is the literary style of the manuscript simple and clear?

Fig. 4.

1. Request 2. Guidelines 3. Download & Review 4. Completion

Review Files			Q Search
	341500-1 Manuscrito en Word (incluye figuras en baja resolución) <10 Mb, Manuscrito de prueba para Geogaceta.docx	August 2, 2022	Manuscrito en Word (incluye figuras en baja resolución) <10 Mb
	341501-1 Manuscrito en PDF (incluye figuras en baja resolución) < 10 Mb, Manuscrito_Geo2021.pdf	August 2, 2022	Manuscrito en PDF (incluye figuras en baja resolución) < 10 Mb

At the bottom of the page you must give your recommendation for acceptance or not (Fig. 5).

Accept Submission

- The manuscript can be published as is.

Revisions Required

- The manuscript must be modified before acceptance.

Resubmit for Review

- It cannot be accepted as is, because of its structure, focus, etc., but it could be redone and resubmitted for review again, as it is interesting because of the data or the topic.

Resubmit Elsewhere

- The topic or approach does not correspond to the aims and scope fo Geogaceta.

Decline Submission

- It cannot be accepted because it is not a research paper or it is not rigorous, poorly written, confusing, etc.

See Comments

- In this case the reviewer does not have a sure criterion or wants to add a specific comment that may determine its acceptance or not.

Fig. 5.

Upload
Upload files you would like the editor and/or author to consult, including revised versions of the original review file(s).

Reviewer Files [Search](#) [Upload File](#)

No Files

Review Discussions [Add discussion](#)

Name	From	Last Reply	Replies	Closed
No Items				

Recommendation
Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

Choose One

[Submit Review](#) [Save for Later](#) [Go Back](#)

Communication between Editor and reviewer or vice versa.

If it is necessary to send any additional comments at any other time, you can use the "Review discussions" box at the bottom (Fig. 5). Here you can **"Add a discussion"** and then a window opens to create a message that will be sent to the people you specify, who can reply in the same message. In this way a conversation can be established with successive messages.

Important note: At the end of each year, in the volume of Geogaceta published in December, the list of reviewers who have participated in the two volumes of Geogaceta in that year will be published. Only the full name of the reviewer and the institution to which he/she belongs will be indicated. However, if a reviewer does not wish to appear on the list, he/she should inform the Editor before December of the year in question.

GOOD PRACTICE GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS

- They must inform the Editor, where appropriate, if there is any conflict of interest: a close professional or personal relationship with the authors, or if there are profound scientific discrepancies in the subject of the work to be reviewed that may affect their impartiality, i.e., any type of situation that may influence the evaluation of the article.
- They must consider the work to be reviewed as a confidential document until publication.
- They must carry out the review in an objective manner, considering the manuscript as a whole.
- They must warn the Editor of any indication of plagiarism, invented, falsified or manipulated data.
- They should make constructive and well-argued criticisms.
- They should check that the works cited in the manuscript to be evaluated are relevant to the subject matter.
- The recommendation of bibliographical references from the reviewer's own work must be very well justified.
- They must submit the required report on the manuscript in question on the date agreed with the Editor. If the reviewer is unable to do so, he/she must inform the Editor as soon as possible.