



# *CUADERNOS GEOGRÁFICOS*

Peer Review  
Guide

First Edition. April, 2013

e-ISSN 2340-0129

ISSN 0210-5462

D. LEGAL: GR./392/1971

# Guide for external assessment

The main objective of this guide is to ensure that the peer-review process undertaken by *Cuadernos Geográficos*:

- » Guarantees an independent review and the passing-on of constructive comments for the authors presented in a respectful manner.
- » Ensures that the manuscripts present a comprehensible, objective and balanced view of their respective themes.
- » Ensures that the data presented is up-to-date and scientifically available and verifiable.
- » Confirms that the conclusions or arguments resulting from the research are intelligible and relevant for the discipline.

## Instructions about confidentiality and ethical behaviour

### Confidentiality

All manuscripts are confidential information and reviewers are therefore requested to refrain from showing them to or discussing them with other people, unless it is to ask for their advice on some specific aspect, in this case also maintaining confidentiality.

### Ethical behaviour

*Cuadernos Geográficos* expects that the reviewers taking part in its editorial process shall act as follows:

- » If a reviewer considers that there is another person who is better prepared to assess the relevance and importance of the article, he or she must inform the editorial team.
- » If the reviewer believes that it will be difficult for him or her to make an objective assessment of the article, he or she must inform the editorial team immediately.
- » If the reviewer has had a past or present relationship with any institutions or people related to the manuscript which could give rise to a conflict of interest, they must mention this on the Review Report Form.

### Deadline for review

Once the reviewer has accepted the task of assessing a manuscript, he or she must issue a report within one month.

## Structure and style of the review reports

Reviewers will issue their reports by completing the Review Report Form, following these guidelines at all times:

- » The peer review process has two main purposes, namely to advise the editorial team as to whether the manuscript should be published and to inform them about the improvements that could be made to it.
- » The reviewer must be aware that his or her job is to provide expert advice to *Cuadernos Geográficos* with regard to the work done by another fellow scientist, and not to make judgements on it or take decisions. The tone used in these reports must therefore be very respectful towards all the people and institutions concerned.
- » All comments and criticisms must be objective and must not be based merely on differences of opinion or unsupported personal views.
- » Criticisms must always be levelled at the arguments and at the consistency of the information or data presented and must never be directed against the authors.

## Information about the different aspects that must be evaluated

Reviewers will evaluate general and specific aspects of the manuscript in order to find out whether the research it describes:

1. Advances knowledge and is relevant for the field.
2. Has a suitable level of argumentation and content structure and the quality of writing required in scientific communications.
3. Is of interest for the Journal's target audience.

### Evaluation of general aspects

- » The degree of originality of the article.
- » Its importance for the progress of the discipline and when applicable, any other social, cultural or economic implications it may have.

### Evaluation of specific aspects

Reviewers will evaluate the specific aspects grouped together in the following sections:

#### *Quality of Writing*

Reviewers must evaluate the clarity and precision with which the manuscript has been written both in the body of text and in the headings, abstracts and keywords which must capture the main theme of the research in a clear, unambiguous way.

### *Length and structure*

Reviewers must assess whether the article is structured into logical sections in order to convey the information efficiently and whether any of these sections should be lengthened, shortened or deleted.

### *Methodology and clarity*

In this section, reviewers must assess whether the right analytical criteria and methods have been chosen and whether the research process has been described with the necessary clarity to enable the work to be repeated by another qualified researcher.

### *Results and conclusions*

Reviewers must assess whether the most important arguments and results are clearly identified within the manuscript and whether the conclusions arise from the analysis of these arguments and results.

### *Citations and references*

In this section the reviewers must assess whether all the citations and references used in the text are relevant and up-to-date.

### *Coincidences*

Reviewers must indicate if they know of any other research work published or to be published with identical or very similar content to that of the manuscript they are evaluating.