

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVIEWERS

OBJECTIVES OF THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

First of all, *Neurosciences and History* would like to thank its reviewers for their hard work, dedication, and expertise in reviewing manuscripts. Without their assistance, we would not be able to maintain the level of quality which both our readers and the authors who entrust us with their manuscripts expect from our journal.

The peer review process is a critical stage in the publication of an academic article, and one of the keystones of the scientific process. It should not be seen as a process by which third parties pass judgment on research, but rather as a means of obtaining constructive feedback about that research, provided by the author's peers, meaning his or her equals. Peer review has two essential objectives:

- It acts as a filter by ensuring that research was conducted properly before the project is published.
- It improves the quality of research. Rigorous review by other experts is instrumental in perfecting key points and correcting unwanted lapsus.

The aim of *Neurosciences and History* is to cover a field that does not fall into the scope of other neuroscience journals. Its main focus is researching the history of neuroscience, with particular emphasis on new and interdisciplinary historiographical perspectives. The journal's target audience includes experts in neuroscience and the history of medicine, historians, humanists, and scientists from all fields with an interest in history. Its context within the fields of both medicine and the humanities makes our journal unique, and this should be taken into account during the review process. Recall that each of the fields named above follows its own specific scientific method, and the approach to discussing a certain topic may differ from one field to another.

BEFORE ACCEPTING A REVIEW

1. Does the manuscript you have been asked to review match your area of expertise?

- The editor requesting a review may have only superficial knowledge of your work and experience. Accept the review only if you consider yourself to be an expert in the area in question.

2. Do you have time to complete the review?

- Reviewing manuscripts is a time-consuming process. Time needed to complete reviews may vary depending on the specific topic and its associated characteristics. However, the average time is approximately five hours. Do you have enough time to deliver the review before the deadline? If time is a problem, please let the editor know immediately. If possible, suggest a different deadline for the review.

3. Do you have any potential conflicts of interest?

- A conflict of interest does not automatically exclude you from reviewing a manuscript, but if one is present, please notify the editor so that she may make the appropriate decision. Examples of conflicts of interest might be if you work in the same department or institution as one of the authors, if you have already worked on the manuscript with the author, or if you are professionally or financially connected to the article. Please ensure the editor is aware of any such situations when replying to the request for a review.

REVIEW PROCESS

- The review must be confidential. The manuscript you receive should not be seen by third parties. If you wish to request the opinion of a colleague or expert, please notify the editor first. Most editors are pleased to receive additional comments, but everyone involved in the review process must maintain strict confidentiality.
- Although manuscripts are submitted anonymously, the author or his/her research team can sometimes be identified from the content of the manuscript. Under no circumstances may you contact the author.
- Likewise, reviewers' identities are concealed from the authors.
- In your review, please consider the following:

- *Originality:*

Is the manuscript novel and interesting enough to warrant publication? Does it meet the standards established by *Neurosciences and History*? Is the research topic important? How important is it compared to related articles that have already been published?

- *Structure:*

Is the manuscript clearly structured? Do its sections follow the journal standards established by *Neurosciences and History*? Consider the following aspects:

- *Title.* Does it describe the article's contents clearly?
- *Abstract.* Does it reflect the content of the manuscript? Please revise the abstract and provide suggestions for improving it. Recall that the abstract acts as a manuscript's "filing card" in literature databases. Based on an abstract's quality and contents, readers choose to obtain full text articles and may go on to cite them.
- *Keywords.* Are they appropriate? Do they identify the manuscript properly? Keep in mind that the keywords are used to identify and locate manuscripts that may then be cited in later publications.
- *Introduction.* Does it establish the topic of research clearly? Is the author's purpose described correctly? Generally speaking, the introduction should summarise the most relevant research on the topic in question in order to provide context for the article. Where necessary, it should also indicate any previously published results that have been questioned or need to be expanded. The hypothesis and research objectives must be stated.

- *Material and methods.* Is the study design described? Is the data collection method clearly explained? Are all procedures clearly outlined? Is the information provided sufficient to repeat the research project? Are procedures presented in a coherent and logical way? Have references been identified properly?
- *Results.* The author should describe the findings and discoveries resulting from the research. This information should be presented in a logical and coherent order. The review should state whether or not analysis was carried out correctly. For example, was the statistical analysis performed properly? This section should not include any interpretations of the results.
- *Discussion:* Are statements in this section based on the results obtained? Does the author indicate whether or not the findings support the research hypothesis? Do results support or contradict previous findings? Does the author explain how findings expand on or complete our previous knowledge base?
- *Language:* Are the grammatical structures and vocabulary employed in the manuscript correct? Are there any grammatical errors? Is the text easy to read and understand?
- *Figures and tables:* Do figures and tables complete the information provided in the text? Do they follow the journal standards established by *Neurosciences and History*?

- *Prior research / references*

- If the manuscript is part of a prior line of research, is it properly framed within that line of research?
- Does the references section include the relevant prior publications having to do with the manuscript?
- Are any relevant references omitted?
- Do references follow the publishing standards used by *Neurosciences and History*?

- *Ethical considerations:*

- *Plagiarism:* Is the research original, or does it copy from other projects? If the latter is true, please alert the editor and cite the previous study with as many details as possible.
- *Fraud:* uncovering fraudulent research is extremely difficult, but if you suspect that the research project has been falsified, or that the results and conclusions have been manipulated, please alert the editor.
- *Other ethical considerations:* Where applicable, has the confidentiality of the individuals involved in the research been maintained? Does the research comply with international ethical standards? The editor should also be informed of any such concerns.

CONTACTING THE EDITOR

After reviewing the manuscript, we fill in the manuscript report. A standard form for this report has been attached for your convenience. Please return it to the following address: archivo@sen.org.es. You must fill in all of the sections, especially the one containing the final recommendation:

1. Reject.
2. Accept with major modifications.
3. Accept with minor modifications.
4. Accept.

You should be aware that the final decision rests with the editors, who will first consider reports from at least two reviewers. According to *Neurosciences and History* policy, reviewers will be notified of final decisions on the manuscripts they evaluate.

Remarks for authors will be passed on to the authors. They must be courteous and constructive and written with a view to improving the manuscript and its content. They must not discredit authors or their work. In this section, indicate important deficiencies and, where possible, strategies for remedying them. Since the final decision rests with the editor, we ask you not to give your recommendation as to whether or not the text should be published.

Remarks for the editor are confidential and will not be forwarded to authors. They should be courteous and constructive and include the key points of the review. Highlight any relevant deficiencies so that the editor will receive a reasoned explanation of the conclusions expressed in the review. The final recommendation should be based on whether publishing the manuscript would be appropriate and recommendable.