ISSN 1028-9933

**ARBITRATION GUIDELINES**

Dear reviewer:

To carry out your task, we ask you to judge and assess in detail each of the sections of the work assigned to you, following the guidelines indicated below. When you conclude your evaluation, you must make a statement communicating whether in your opinion the manuscript should be accepted for publication in its current form, if you think that it should not be accepted for publication or if you believe that it could be accepted as long as certain indications are met.

Your evaluation will remain anonymous and will only be handled by the Editorial Committee.

* If you suggest to publish it as is, without any modification, you should simply state it that way.
* If you think it should be rejected, you should write a paragraph outlining the reasons in the box titled at the end.
* If, finally, you consider that it must have a conditional acceptance, then you must write an impersonal written text to facilitate the sending of a response to the author, which must have a series of precise, numbered indications (1, 2, 3 ...) successively so that each and every one of the aspects that the author must complete in a new version are listed for a new evaluation. Such a sequence of indications must be added to the table that you will find below under the heading Assessment for the author.

Although you are free to write anything on the text box, you will also find some observations and questions that can serve as a reminder or guide for your comments. **You do not have to answer each of the questions but, as explained before, use them as a guide to make decisions and help to create your list of requirements if that is the case.**

To form your opinion, you must assess the following points. These are sections that could make the publication of the work inadmissible and suggest rejecting the manuscript.

1. Is it clearly and unequivocally stated the objective of the work or the questions the author wants to answer?
2. Is it an article of good scientific quality, without errors or ambiguities, and does it contain enough new results or applications or theoretical developments of interest to readers?
3. Does it draw novel conclusions that deserve to be published to be known by the scientific community?
4. Are personal reflections, comparisons, and opinions based on adequate ethical and ideological principles?
5. Research questions or objectives, study design, results, and conclusions should be mutually consistent. Is this the case in this study?

In order to improve the text if necessary, the answers to the following group of additional questions should be taken into account:

1. Do the title and abstract adequately reflect the subject and content of the text?
2. Are the title and abstract free of abbreviations and clearly include the general objective of the work? Does the article adhere to the rule of not extending beyond 6000 words (including title, abstract, keywords and references)?
3. Are the keywords included and appropriate?
4. The problem must be clearly stated and its formulation must not include any methodological element (allusions to the sample, questionnaires or design). Does this work meet this requirement?
5. Is the article clear, concise, sufficiently explanatory?
6. If applicable, does it adequately define the population and the sample? Does it explain the sampling method? Is the statistical treatment, if any, adequate?
7. Is the instrument for data collection and instructions to its use included if one has been used?
8. Are the tables and graphs clear and relevant? Are the titles adequate? Are some of the tables and/or graphs unnecessary? Is it avoided to repeat in the text all the data presented in the tables?
9. Does it include information that is not relevant?
10. Are the conclusions of the work adequately stated (based on the discussion, integrated with the hypothesis or questions raised and without repeating percentages or results)?
11. Are the references handled correctly according to the Vancouver recommendations (are they updated and duly limited)?

**NOTE:** If you wish, in case of conditional acceptance, in addition to the document with the numbered change requirements (which is essential), you can attach a version with annotations of the manuscript in its current version as complementary information for the author.
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**Recommendations:**

**Accepted to be published without restrictions.
Not accepted.
Accepted if complies recommendations.**

