



Guidelines for Reviewers

The peer review process will be managed through the journal's digital platform. It will be conducted using a double-blind review method; authors will not know the identity of the reviewers, and reviewers will evaluate the contributions without knowing their authors. Those selected to review contributions have a duty of confidentiality, or obligation to maintain secrecy, and are not to disclose the document they have been entrusted to review. They therefore commit to maintaining complete confidentiality regarding the data, results, or any other findings they become aware of as a result of their work as reviewers, refraining from using the arguments, data, or any other discoveries contained in the articles until they are published.

If a reviewer declines to conduct the review, they must inform the Editorial Committee of this decision and ideally suggest other qualified reviewers for the proposed document.

Upon accepting the review of the proposed document, the reviewer must rate a series of items presented and ordered in the evaluation form available for this purpose on the journal's digital platform.

The result of your evaluation will consist of your responses to the aforementioned evaluation form (editable online or downloadable from the journal's website) and a copy of the reviewed document containing all comments, observations, and corrections you deem relevant. Both items—responses to the form and the document with your comments—will be submitted through the journal's digital platform. As a last resort, they may be sent by email to fondoeditorial@unamad.edu.pe.

Responsibilities of the evaluators

1. Will accept the review of texts that fit within their area of expertise, in order to carry out an appropriate evaluation.
2. You will declare from the beginning of the process if there is a conflict of interest. If you suspect the identity of the author(s), you must notify the journal if this knowledge raises a potential conflict of interest.
3. It will reject the review immediately if it is not possible to deliver it within the agreed timeframe.
4. The evaluation will be based on the originality, the contribution of the article to the topic, the methodology used, the relevance and currency of the bibliography used; the style, coherence and quality in the structure and writing of the text.
5. You will inform the journal immediately if, during the evaluation, you find or discover that you do not have the necessary experience to evaluate all aspects of the text.
6. Your criticisms will be objective, specific, and constructive.
7. It will clearly define the approval, rejection, or conditioning of the text.
8. Will issue its assessment within the agreed timeframe.
9. Will respect confidentiality during and after the evaluation process.
10. You will not use content from the revised or revised text.
11. You will not involve other people in the review that was requested of you..



12. Inform the journal if you detect any similarity between the text and another text you have reviewed, or if you identify any type of plagiarism.
13. Transferring the responsibility for making a report to any other person, assistant, or collaborator is not permitted.

Beginning with volume 4, the journal GENTRYANA expresses its gratitude to the specialists who contributed their reports to the external evaluation of articles, making their names and affiliations visible. If you do not wish your information to be made public, you may request its removal by contacting fondoeditorial@unamad.edu.pe.

Evaluation form for reviewers

This evaluation form must be completed through the journal's platform. Log in as a reviewer using the username and password that will be sent to your email address.

Please evaluate the following criteria, indicating your level of agreement on the following scale: Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree.

Criteria	in accordance	Partial agreement	Disagree
Is the title brief and appropriately describes the contents?			
Is the summary informative enough regarding the main aspects?			
Do keywords allow the proper retrieval of information in databases and the Internet?			
Is the first part an updated 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 the tables and figures satisfactory?			
Was the data evaluation carried out appropriately with statistical methods?			
Are the results reasonable?			
Is the discussion correct and limited to the information presented?			
Are the conclusions warranted, considering the methods and results?			
Are all references up to date and relevant to being cited in the document?			
Is the document organization and grammar satisfactory?			
Is the length of the manuscript appropriate?			
Was an ethical line followed in the research?			



Suspected plagiarism or fraud

If you suspect that the reviewed work contains parts that are copies of other works (plagiarism), or if. If you think the results are not true (fraud), please contact the editors and Provide as much background and details on the matter as possible.

Comments to the authors

Incorporate any other observations here that you consider relevant. Here you can indicate if there are errors of interpretation, inaccurate or ambiguous statements, whether they should expand or condense certain parts of the document, etc. Your comments on how to improve the document will be greatly appreciated.

Recommendation

Accept without modifications	
Accept with modifications	
Decline	