HUARTE DE SAN JUAN
Geografía e Historia / Geografia eta Historia
Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Humanas, Sociales y de la Educación de la Universidad Pública de Navarra
Nafarroako Unibertsitate Publikoko Giza, Gizarte eta Hezkuntza Zientzien Fakultatearen aldizkaria

JOURNAL REVIEWER GUIDELINES

Huarte de San Juan. Geografía e Historia values the work done by peer reviewers in the academic community, who provide an essential service to the process of publication excellence. The peer review process is an essential step to the development of research across all subject areas. The following pages will provide you information and resources to help you as reviewer of this journal.

1. Ethics and Responsibility

This journal is committed to upholding the integrity of the work we publish. *HSJ* takes issues of copyright infringement, plagiarism or other breaches of best practice in publication very seriously. We seek to protect the rights of our authors and we will investigate claims of plagiarism or misuse of published articles. The Editorial Team checks the submitted articles with duplication-checking software to protect the reputation of our journal against malpractices.

All the manuscripts received must pass an anonymous evaluation process by experts (double blind system). If a reviewer come to discover the identity of the author through any means (such as reading a preprint or seeing a paper presented at a conference), they should contact the journal editor immediately.

HSJ recommends that if reviewers suspect any of the following problems with any article that they are reviewing that they contact the journal editor to discuss the situation without delay. Reviewers should keep all information about such matters confidential and not discuss them with colleagues other than the journal editor.

- If they suspect that the paper has been either published or submitted to another journal.
- If they suspect that the paper is duplicating the work of others.
- If they suspect that there might be problems with the ethics of the research conducted.
- If they suspect that there might be an undeclared author's conflict of interest in the paper (editors might have more information about this than you do so it is best to check).

2. Conflicts of interest

HSJ recommends that reviewers should think carefully about their own potential conflicts of interest relating to the paper before undertaking the review. For example:

- May be a close colleague of the authors.
- May be involved in a directly competing effort in the same research area.
- May be involved in a project that would benefit from the authors' work if it is accepted by the journal.
- May have helped the authors with their work.

If any of the above apply to our reviewers, or if for any other reason they feel uncomfortable reviewing an anonymous manuscript, they should inform the Journal Editor so that we decide if a different reviewer is needed. It is OK for the referee to decline to review a paper if they have a potential conflict of interest, and it is important they declare any such conflict at this early stage to avoid any later accusations of bias.

3. Deadlines for send the review

Once accepted the commitment to evaluate a manuscript, the reviewer must send his report within a maximum period of four weeks. The reviewer should ask to the Journal Editor if need additional time to finish the report for any reason.

4. How to write the review

The reviewers should base their decision on the quality of the manuscript. *HSJ* provides a peer review form (available in English or Spanish). The referees must give advice to authors and suggesting revisions, being objective, specific and constructive. In particularly, this journal requires that the reviewers must:

- Be clear about what the manuscript needs to be added or revised.
- Give clear and detailed comments to the Journal Editor.
- Give constructive comments to the author to help him with any revisions.
- Make suggestions about additional literature or references that the author might read to improve his manuscript.
- Be as specific and detailed as the referee can.
- Be honest and don't suggest that author include citations to the reviewer's work merely to increase their citation count or to enhance the visibility of his own work. All the suggestions must be clear and based on valid academic or scientific reasons.