Guidelines for reviewers of *The Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology (REED)*

Peer review is one of the fundamental mechanisms to guarantee the scientific quality of a journal. *The Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology (REED)* asks for the assessment of at least two expert reviewers for all original research articles. Occasionally, more reviewers may be requested due to technical reasons (statistics, methodologies, basic science, etc.) or when a discrepancy exists between the opinions of the two reviewers.

Reviewers play a crucial role in maintaining and raising the scientific level of the studies published in *REED*. The reviewers help to select the manuscripts for publication, improve their clarity, transparency, accuracy and the usefulness of the study for the scientific community.

The review process in *REED* is anonymous (double-blinded); the reviewers do not know the identity of the authors or their affiliation and *vice-versa*. If the reviewers identify the authors and their institution by the content of the study, they should avoid contacting the authors and inform the Editor of any conflict of interest.

**Responsibilities of the reviewer to the Editor**

1. Provide a written report of the criteria of originality (lack of duplication, redundancy, plagiarism of the results), regarding the scientific validity and relevance of the study.
2. Assess whether the language of the manuscript is clear and precise and whether the study is suitable given the scope and purposes of *REED*.
3. Identify the shortcomings (scientific language, presentation of the results) of the study and, when necessary, suggest that the authors implement changes which improve the quality of the manuscript.
4. Maintain complete confidentiality throughout the assessment process: avoid sharing information with third parties. The study is exclusively the property of the authors.
5. Give fair and constructive comments to the authors while avoiding any pejorative comments or those that could be considered as sarcastic, mordacious or hurtful, including personal or ad hominem criticism of the authors.
6. Reply to the editors within the established time frame. If deadlines cannot be met (15 days), the invitation should be declined and another reviewer should be reviewed.
7. Communicate the existence of any conflict of interest which may affect the objectivity and impartiality of the assessment. Reviewers must avoid obtaining any scientific, personal or financial benefit from the reserved information.
8. Recommend that the Editor choose one of the following options:
   • Accept in its present form.
   • Accept after minor changes.
   • Accept after more substantial changes (the manuscript will be re-sent to the reviewer after correction).
   • Reject.

**Responsibilities of the reviewer to the authors**

1. Provide a written report that outlines, in a reasoned way, the merit and scientific value of the study together with the scientific basis for the reviewers’ opinions. The reviewers’ anonymous comments will be read by the authors.
2. Indicate if the language used is precise and clear and if the study is interesting given the scope of *REED*.
3. Maintain confidentiality and be aware that the study is privileged information which may be known only by the reviewer. The reviewer must not make use of the information described or share it with colleagues or third parties.
4. Reply to the editors within the established time frame (15 days after acceptance). Delaying the assessment compromises the review process and is damaging to the authors and the reputation of the journal.
5. Avoid all personal or pejorative comments.
6. Inform about the possible corrections and points for improvement in the manuscript.

**Confidential comments to the Editor**

1. The reviewer will clearly and concisely justify one of the following recommendations to the Editor:
   • Accept in its present form.
• Accept after minor changes.
• Accept after major changes (the manuscript will be re-sent to the Editor).
• Reject.
2. Furthermore, the reviewer will complete the questionnaire provided by the journal when accepting to review a manuscript. This covers the following points: general quality, specific characteristics, evaluation of figures, evaluation of tables, evaluation of the manuscript and level of priority.
3. Comments to the Editor should be divided into major and minor comments. The list of comments should be numbered and begin with the major comments.
4. The reviewer will propose to the Editor the possible improvements to the study and the relevance of the bibliographic references and if any relevant quotation from REED has been omitted.

Confidential comments to authors
1. The comments should begin with a very brief summary of the manuscript which should very clearly transmit how the reviewer sees the study.
2. The decision of whether to accept or reject the study is the sole responsibility of the Editor. The recommendation regarding the possible publication or rejection of the article will not be sent to the authors.
3. The comments should be divided into major and minor comments. The reviewer must indicate the main reasons for rejection or the improvements which should be incorporated into the study.
4. All comments must be constructive and should refer to specific sections of the manuscript. All observations should be numbered (1, 2, 3, etc.) in order to facilitate the authors’ ordered responses and the evaluation by the Editor and the Editorial Board.
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