

Quick Guide for Peer Review in REED

The Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology
Revista Española de Enfermedades
Digestivas(REED)

Can I Carry Out the Review?

- Is the manuscript related to your area of expertise? YES
- Do you have any conflict of interest? NO
- Can you meet the deadline? YES



Accept the review only if these criteria are met.

- You should only accept the review if your answers match the above.
- If you think you might need more time, ask about the possibility of extending the deadline before accepting.

Respond Promptly to the Review Invitation

- Failing to respond slows the review process and negatively impacts the journal and the author.
 - Whether you can review or not, **RESPOND QUICKLY** to the invitation.
 - Declining? Provide alternative reviewer contacts.
 - Short on time? Consider delegating to a supervised collaborator.
-
- If you decline the invitation, providing contact details of potential reviewers in your area of expertise is appreciated.
 - If the reason for declining is lack of time, consider passing the task to a collaborator under your supervision.



Manuscript Review: 1st Reading (1)

General Impression

- Reviewing a manuscript typically takes about 4 hours. Organize your time to meet the submission deadline.
- After the first read, you should be able to summarize the key question of the work and its conclusions.
- Identify the dependent and independent variables of the study, as well as whether necessary covariates have been collected to control for potential biases.



Manuscript Review: 1st Reading (2)

Originality



- **Assess the novelty of the study's findings:**
 - Does the study present an advancement or confirm existing knowledge?
- Are the results entirely original?
- Evaluate the potential impact of the findings on digestive diseases.

Manuscript Review: 1st Reading (3)

Suitability for REED

- Evaluate if the manuscript aligns with REED's areas of interest:
 - Diagnosis and treatment of digestive diseases
 - Diagnostic and therapeutic digestive endoscopy
 - Diagnostic and therapeutic abdominal ultrasound
 - Translational studies on digestive diseases
 - Studies and management of liver diseases and Inflammatory Bowel Disease
 - Evaluation of functional digestive disorders, diseases of the biliary tract and pancreas
 - Diagnosis and treatment of gastric, oesophageal and colonic pathologies

Manuscript Review: 1st Reading (4)

Data Robustness and Conclusion Support



- Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question?
 - Are inclusion and exclusion criteria described?
 - Are the variables clearly defined and measured?
-
- Have confounding and interaction variables been controlled?
 - Are the technical and statistical aspects adequately described?
 - Do the results sufficiently support the conclusions?

Manuscript Review: 1st reading (5)

Clarity

- Is the manuscript easy to read?
 - Highlight unclear or confusing sentences.
 - Do the authors correctly interpret the previously published literature?
 - Have the authors overlooked any key references?
-
- Do the figures clearly represent each important message of the study? Are they self-explanatory?
 - Is there a Table 1 with a description of the study groups?

Manuscript Review: 2nd Reading (1)

Report Preparation



- If, after the first read, you believe the manuscript is:
 - Sufficiently original
 - Correctly designed
 - Methodologically and technically sound
 - Clearly presented
 - With results that support the conclusions
 - Then proceed with a second reading to suggest major and minor revisions and prepare your report.
- If these criteria are not met, you can skip the second reading and prepare the report highlighting the major issues.

Report Preparation(1)

What to do?



- Summarize the main premise and implications of the manuscript in a couple of introductory sentences.
 - Highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the study.
 - Write your comments clearly and in an organized manner, preferably as a numbered list.
 - Separate major and minor issues, specifying whether any suggested revisions are desirable but not essential.
- Use the confidential comments section only for sensitive or contentious information. Review your report carefully before submitting it.

What not to do (2)

What not to do



- Criticizing without providing concrete suggestions for improvement.
 - Giving your overall recommendation about acceptance or rejection.
-
- Using offensive language or making personal comments.
 - Listing numerous personal references for authors to cite.
 - Marking every typographical, spelling, or formatting error.
 - Being entirely negative; all manuscripts have some merit.

Report Preparation (3)

Final Comment




- **Providing negative feedback without suggesting improvements is unhelpful and does not fulfill the purpose of peer review: improving the quality of scientific manuscripts.**
- **From the editor's perspective, a superficial report can be worse than no report at all, as it fails to support the overall decision.**
- **If the manuscript is rejected, this could lead to appeals**

Handling Ethical Concerns in Manuscripts



- **Provide guidance on identifying potential ethical violations (e.g., plagiarism, data fabrication).**
- **Suggest steps to report these issues to the journal.**

Benefits of Peer Review for Reviewers (I)

- Highlight professional development, exposure to new research, and the opportunity to contribute to the scientific community. 
- Earn continuing education credits recognized both in Spain and Across the European Union (EU)
- Institutional Support by Key Spanish medical organizations, including General Council of Official Medical Colleges (CGCOM)
- The Federation of Scientific-Medical Associations (FACME).
- The National Conference of Deans of Faculties of Medical Schools (CNDFM).

Benefits of Peer Review for Reviewers (II)

- **The National Council of Specialties in Health Sciences (CNECS).**
- **European Collaboration: SEAFORMEC works with UEMS-EACCME (European Union of Medical Specialists - European Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education):**
 - **Enables reviewers to earn ECMEC (European Continuing Medical Education Credits).**
 - **Ensures international recognition of these credits**
- **Recognition of review merit through the Web of Science™, by Clarivate™, through Publons**



Thank you for your role as a reviewer, which is essential for the continuous improvement of the Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology (REED).

**Revista Española de Enfermedades Digestivas
(REED)**