



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@unamad.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.

Starting with volume 4, the ARIVA expresses its gratitude to the specialists who have collaborated with their reports in the external evaluation of the articles, making their names and affiliation visible. If you do not want your data to be public, you can request its withdrawal by contacting the email fondoeditorial@unamad.edu.pe.

Evaluation form for reviewers

This evaluation form must be completed from the journal's platform, logging in as a reviewer with your user name and password, which will be notified to you by e-mail.

Evaluate the following criteria indicating the degree of acceptance according to the scale: Agree, Partially agree, Disagree.

Criteria	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree						
Is the title brief and does it appropriately describe the contents?									
Is the summary sufficiently informative with respect to the main aspects?									
Do keywords allow proper retrieval of information in databases and on the Internet?									
Is the first part an up-to-date and interesting introduction to the object of study?									
Is the Materials and methods section correct and can the study be replicated or reinterpreted based on the information it contains?									
Is the quality and organization of tables and figures satisfactory?									
Was the evaluation of the data properly performed using statistical methods?									
Are the results reasonable?									
Is the discussion correct and circumscribed to the information presented?									
Are the conclusions warranted, considering the methods and results?									
Are all references up to date and relevant to be cited in the document?									
Are the document organization and grammar satisfactory?									
Is the length of the manuscript appropriate?									
Was an ethical line followed in the research?									
Suspicious of plagiarism or fraud If you suspect that the reviewed work has parts that are copies of other works (plagiarism), or if it seems to you that the results are not true (fraud) please contact the publishers and provide as much background and detail as possible.									
Comments to authors Enter here any other comments you consider relevant. Here you can indicate if errors of interpretation, inaccurate or ambiguous statements, if certain parts of the document should be expanded or condensed, etc. condense certain parts of the document, etc. Your comments on how to improve the document will be greatly appreciated.									
Recommendation <table border="1" data-bbox="143 1691 1072 1798"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Accept without modification</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accept with modifications</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reject</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Accept without modification		Accept with modifications		Reject	
Accept without modification									
Accept with modifications									
Reject									