

GUIDE FOR REFEREES

The purpose of this document is to help referees elaborate their reports. It should not be understood as a constraint for this task. Referees may expand on these general guidelines and add any comments that they deem relevant in order to improve the formal layout and content of manuscripts that have received a positive evaluation.

A detailed copy of the instructions for authors can be found at:

http://www.revistadyna.com/doc/eng/norm_extend.pdf

The editors pay particular attention to the following aspects:

1. **ORIGINALITY AND INNOVATION** of the paper
2. **USEFULNESS AND INTEREST** for readers
3. **CLARITY** of exposition
4. **CONCLUSIONS DERIVED** from the research (for research papers)

Each of these criteria should be rated on a scale on 1 to 5, where 5 is the highest rating and 1 is the poorest one. Comments should be included to justify each rating.

Referees are asked to maintain a responsible, impartial, confidential and positive attitude in evaluating manuscripts. They should also instruct authors on how to strengthen their papers. Unfavourable reports should explain the weaknesses of the contributions and offer some feedback on how the paper could be improved in case the author wishes to publish it elsewhere.

The ideal review should answer the following questions:

1. Who will be interested in reading the article? Why?
2. What are the major claims and how significant are they?
3. Could this paper be considered as one of the 10 most important articles published this year in its field?
4. How can this article be compared to others in its field?
5. How original are its claims or conclusions? Are there other articles that undermine their originality?
6. Are the conclusions well-argued and well founded? If not, what evidence is lacking?
7. Are there other methods or experiments that would strengthen the work? How much time and effort would the author need to complete them?
8. Are the claims adequately discussed in the context of earlier literature?
9. If the work is rejected, is it sufficiently promising to encourage the author to introduce modifications and re-submit for a fresh review?
10. If the work is rejected but sufficiently promising, what specific modifications should the author implement?

Both authors' and referees' anonymity will be preserved at all times during the review process.

- If the manuscript is deemed unacceptable, referees are asked to indicate the reasons for its unacceptability using the document: `revision_articulo_autor.rtf`

Two types of negative reports are possible:

1. Definitive rejection. The paper is rejected for reasons having to do with obvious lack of novelty, insufficient conceptual originality, erroneous conclusions etc.
2. Rejection with a recommendation to resubmit. The work is rejected, but authors are advised on how to improve the manuscript so that it can be resubmitted for a fresh review.
 - If the manuscript has to be revised or modified, referees should indicate what modifications should be implemented.
 - If the manuscript is accepted, referees are asked to highlight briefly its strong points

Referees are asked to provide a reasoned recommendation regarding publication using the form revision_articulo_editor.rtf. Referees should take into account that different referees of the same manuscript may have different technical abilities or viewpoints and that the editors may have to make a final decision regarding publication based on competing reviews. It is therefore paramount that referees indicate clearly the reasons for their recommendations.

Referees should maintain a respectful attitude towards the authors. Potentially offensive comments must be avoided. DYNA reserves the right to modify referees' reports if these contain offensive language or if confidential information about the referee is disclosed.

Referees should inform the editors of any conflict of interest in relation to the work that is to be assessed, whether this is a personal, academic, research-related, economic or financial conflict of interest.

In order to speed up the review process, referees are asked to return their reports for the author and for the editors within 15 days of receiving the manuscript.

In DYNA's experience, peer-review is an essential part of the publication process. Referees' reports offer an independent assessment of the manuscript and provide authors with feedback which, together with the editor's advice, often contributes to improving the structure and logic of the papers we publish.