

MANUSCRIPT REVIEWER REPORT

Review of manuscripts submitted to Editorial CSIC for publication is the best guarantee that appropriate levels of quality will be maintained, and is the usual practice in academic and scientific media.

Editorial CSIC and the editorial staff who manage its collections send anonymous manuscripts for review to experts who are preferably not affiliated with the authors' institution(s) or with members of the Editorial Board. Anonymity of the reviewers is assured during this process.

In order to avoid any possible conflict of interest, before proceeding to review this manuscript please confirm you are not affected by any of the following situations, in relation with the author(s):

- Family relationship
- Manifest personal friendship or animosity
- Belonging to the same research group
- Serving presently or having served as PhD degree advisor or co-advisor within the previous 10 years
- Obtaining a PhD degree with an author as advisor or co-advisor within the previous 10 years
- Collaborating presently or within the previous 5 years in publications or patents
- Collaborating in other economic or scientific-technological activities
- Having a contractual relationship or sharing national or international research funding from public or private entities or any other type of entity within the previous 3 years

In Section 7 of this form you may add any comments on this issue, if needed.

We ask reviewers to specifically evaluate these points:

- Scientific importance of the topic
- Novelty or innovative potential of the focus
- Conceptual and methodological rigor
- Congruence with current scientific thinking
- Internal coherence of the text
- Organization and clarity of the writing
- Timeliness and pertinence of the references cited
- Soundness and relevance of the book's conclusions

The reviewers' opinions will be conveyed anonymously to the author(s).

Editorial CSIC / CSIC Press fully appreciates your collaboration.

REPORT

COLLECTION: *To be completed by the collection editors or Editorial CSIC.*

TITLE:

I. OVERALL JUDGMENT

In your opinion the manuscript should be: *Please mark your choice with an X.*

Accepted as it is

Accepted with slight modifications

Accepted if significant modifications or restructuring are made

Rejected

2. COMMENTS ON THE CONTENT (Please provide reasons for your answers.)

2.1 Is the topic of scientific importance? (timeliness, novelty, etc.)

1. High 2. Average 3. Low 4. Very low

Add comments and, where appropriate, illustrative examples

2.2 Are the methods appropriate and rigorous?

1. High 2. Average 3. Low 4. Very low

Add comments and, where appropriate, illustrative examples.

2.3 Are the references current and pertinent?

1. High 2. Average 3. Low 4. Very low

Add comments and, where appropriate, illustrative examples.

2.4 Are the conclusions consistent and relevant?

1. High 2. Average 3. Low 4. Very low

Add comments and, where appropriate, illustrative examples.

2.5 Should any parts of the manuscript be omitted? If so, please explain what can be omitted and why.

Add comments and, where appropriate, illustrative examples.

3. COMMENTS ON THE PRESENTATION (Please complete your answers with relevant and pertinent information that will be helpful to the author, the publisher, and the quality assessment agencies)

3.1 Coherence of the text; organization and clarity of the writing.

1. High 2. Average 3. Low 4. Very low

Add comments and, where appropriate, illustrative examples.

3.2 Is the manuscript structured appropriately?

1. High 2. Average 3. Low 4. Very low

Add comments and, where appropriate, illustrative examples.

3.3 Are the explanations and argumentation appropriate for the intended objectives?

Add comments and, where appropriate, illustrative examples.

4. IF YOU FEEL THE AUTHOR(S) SHOULD MAKE CORRECTIONS, PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM

Add comments and, where appropriate, illustrative examples.

5. IF YOU WISH, YOU CAN PROVIDE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS NOT COVERED IN THIS FORM.

Add comments.

THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW WILL BE USED EXCLUSIVELY BY EDITORIAL CSIC AND THE EDITORIAL STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR ITS COLLECTIONS.

6. IF YOU WISH, YOU CAN PROVIDE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS YOU CONSIDER PERTINENT. THESE COMMENTS WILL NOT BE PASSED ON TO THE AUTHOR(S).

Add comments.

7. CONFLICT OF INTEREST. PLEASE ADD HERE ANY RELEVANT ISSUE YOU CONSIDER MAY HAVE INFLUENCED YOUR REVIEW.

Add comments.

8. CAN YOU SUGGEST OTHER POSSIBLE EXPERT REVIEWERS FOR THIS TOPIC? PLEASE PROVIDE THEIR NAMES AND EMAIL.

Add comments.

9. DO YOU ACCEPT THE INCLUSION OF YOUR NAME IN A PUBLIC RELEASE OF PERSONS WHO HAVE COLLABORATED IN THIS SENSE WITH CSIC?

10. DO YOU AGREE TO HAVE ANY PARAGRAPH OR SENTENCE EXTRACTED FROM THIS REPORT, BY WAY OF A QUOTATION, IF THE WORK IS FINALLY PUBLISHED, IN ORDER TO PRESENT IT AND MAKE IT KNOWN?

11. IF NECESSARY, WOULD YOU REVIEW THE TEXT AGAIN, ONCE THE REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED?

REVIEWER INFORMATION

*Signature

*Name:

*Date:

*Institutional affiliation:

*Please complete all fields. The names, contact addresses and other personal details provided in this form will be used only for the purposes stated herein and will not be made available to any other person or used for any other purpose.

Please send your completed, signed and scanned form to the contact person who requested the review at the address shown on his/her request.