

Title:
Guidelines for reviewers of the Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology (REED)

Authors:
Javier A. Cienfuegos, Enrique Pérez-Cuadrado Martínez

DOI: 10.17235/reed.2018.5708/2018

Link: [PubMed \(Epub ahead of print\)](#)

Please cite this article as:

A. Cienfuegos Javier, Pérez-Cuadrado Martínez Enrique. Guidelines for reviewers of the Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology (REED). Rev Esp Enferm Dig 2018. doi: 10.17235/reed.2018.5708/2018.

Enero 2017 • Volumen 109 • Número 1 • Páginas 1-86

CODE: REED09 ISSN: 1009-0108

Revista Española de Enfermedades Digestivas
THE SPANISH JOURNAL OF GASTROENTEROLOGY

Acceso al texto completo en: www.reed.es o www.sped.es

Factor de impacto 100 (ISI) JCR: 1.455 (2016)
SCR: 0.34 (2016)

ORGANO OFICIAL DE:
SOCIEDAD ESPAÑOLA DE PATOLOGÍA DIGESTIVA, SOCIEDAD ESPAÑOLA DE ENDOSCOPIA DIGESTIVA Y ASOCIACIÓN ESPAÑOLA DE ECOGRAFÍA DIGESTIVA

SEPO

Editorial Colitis diverticular bleeding. Have we identified the risk factors for massive bleeding yet? J. W. Bercian Valencia	Lesión de Bowdler: diagnóstico por gastroscopia R. Barrio Guea, N. N. Barrio Irujo, M. Paz Nova y J. E. Dominguez Muñoz	65
Trabajos Originales Risk factors for severity and recurrence of colonic diverticular bleeding N. Argente, P. Cabero, A. Arduas, M. Escobar and N. Guzmán	Notas Clínicas Celiac crisis in adults: a case report and review of the literature focusing in the prevention of relapsing syndrome M. de Alaveda-Nemón, V. L. Barrio-Cabral and S. L. Lopera	67
Microsporidian and inflammatory bowel disease: the other Diogenes J. Barrio, A. Argente, V. L. Barrio-Cabral, J. Castro, M. Acari-Ramos, M. Hernández-Serra, C. García, M. de la Cruz, D. Barrio and A. López-García	Herangopercistoma patiens. Una localización infrecuente de tumor intestinal I. Alonso Abad, J. M. García-Cerbal, L. Aguirre-Duñabe, A. M. Quintana Berro y A. Colla-Morero	69
Influence of sustained blood response on the regression of fibrosis and portal hypertension in cirrhotic (HCV) patients treated with antiviral therapy A. Barrio, J. Cabero, M. J. López-Alca, I. L. Fariña, M. T. Arán, A. Galván, F. Castiella, E. Fabregat and J. Crespo	Hemólisis por eritropoiesis suprarrenal intracerebral C. Pérez-Carpas, A. Escobedo-Sánchez, M. A. Paredes-Capó, J. Arangul-Antich y C. García-Delgado	70
Malnutrition risk questionnaire combined with body composition measurement in malnutrition screening in inflammatory bowel disease A. A. Cortés, A. Muñoz, Z. Pili, I. Pall and P. Malvar	Endoscopia: removal of intubated large nasogastric tubes: a case report M. Oquendo and J. Sainza-Munagorri	73
A survey-based analysis on endoscopic quality indicators compliance among Spanish endoscopists I. Fernández-Cruz, F. Argente, P. Alonso, J. Sainza and S. Soriano	Mesenteric schistosomiasis: an unusual cause of abdominal mass A. Tapia-Palacio, M. R. Ramos-Vázquez, J. C. Cordero-Ramos, J. Cordero-Lafont and L. Carballo-Pérez	76
Revisión Endoscopic resection of colonic polyps in patients on antiplatelet therapy: an evidence-based guideline for clinicians G. Piana, M. Sostero-Salín, C. Salinas, F. Day and M. J. Cuatrecasas	Cartas al Editor Necrotic enterocolitis: not just an infant's disease M. de Barrio, J. Barrio-Fernández and M. N. Barrio-Rodríguez	79
Indicadores en Patología Digestiva Neutrophil de la artéria mesenterica superior: una causa infrecuente de obstrucción intestinal J. Barrio, J. Argente, P. Alonso, M. J. C. García-Pérez	Prevention of small bowel perforation by endoscopic polyp removal: associated with the use of Bariatric, patologic infestation and polyp removal V. Pardo-Vega, D. M. Aguirre y L. A. Alonso	80
Neumotórax agudo intracavitario A. F. Barrio-Muñoz y R. Barrio-Zelga	Perforación múltiple de divertículos de intestino delgado en paciente con síndrome de Ulceras Duodenales R. Barrio-Cruz, A. Barrio-Cruz y E. Muñoz López	83
Síndrome de Miller a cinco años de diagnóstico C. Ochoa-Sandoval, C. C. Hernández-Serra, J. Pineda-Rodríguez y M. González-Fernández	Altopercia anular como manifestación paraneoplásica de un adenoma actínico gástrico J. Barrio-Cruz, F. Barrio-Fernández y J. de la Fuente-Aguado	83
Endoscopic removal of trichobezoars in a schizophrenic patient J. L. Barrio-Hernández, M. E. Torres-Castro and M. Torres-Rodríguez	Revisores 2016	85
All that glitters is not gold. A different cause for an "obscure colitis" A. Pineda, M. Sainza, J. Villanueva and G. Navarro		

ARAN

www.reed.es

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

ED 5708 inglés

Guidelines for reviewers of the *Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology (REED)*

Javier A. Cienfuegos^{1,2,3} and Enrique Pérez-Cuadrado⁴

¹Department of General Surgery. Clínica Universidad de Navarra. School of Medicine. University of Navarra. Pamplona, Spain. ²Institute of Health Research of Navarra (IdisNA). Pamplona, Spain. ³CIBER Physiopathology of Obesity and Nutrition (CIBERObn). Instituto de Salud Carlos III. Pamplona, Spain. ⁴Gastroenterology Department. Hospital Morales Meseguer. University of de Murcia. Murcia, Spain

Correspondence: Javier A. Cienfuegos. Department of General Surgery. Clínica Universidad de Navarra. University of Navarra. Av. Pío XII, 36. 31008 Pamplona, Spain
e-mail: fjacion@unav.es

Nº ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6767-0573>

EDITORIAL

Peer review is one of the fundamental mechanisms to guarantee the scientific quality of a journal. The *Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology (REED)* asks for the assessment of at least two expert reviewers for all original research articles. Occasionally, more reviewers may be requested due to technical reasons (statistics, methodologies, basic science, etc.) or when a discrepancy exists between the opinions of the two reviewers. Reviewers play a crucial role in maintaining and raising the scientific level of the studies published in *REED*. The reviewers help to select the manuscripts for publication, improve their clarity, transparency, accuracy and the usefulness of the study for the scientific community.

The review process in *REED* is anonymous (double-blinded); the reviewers do not know the identity of the authors or their affiliation and vice-versa. If the reviewers identify the authors and their institution by the content of the study, they should avoid contacting the authors and inform the Editor of any conflict of interest.

Responsibilities of the reviewer to the Editor

1. Provide a written report of the criteria of originality (lack of duplication, redundancy, plagiarism of the results), regarding the scientific validity and relevance of the study.
2. Assess whether the language of the manuscript is clear and precise and whether the study is suitable given the scope and purposes of *REED*.
3. Identify the shortcomings (scientific language, presentation of the results) of the study and, when necessary, suggest that the authors implement changes which improve the quality of the manuscript.
4. Maintain complete confidentiality throughout the assessment process: avoid sharing information with third parties. The study is exclusively the property of the authors.
5. Give fair and constructive comments to the authors while avoiding any pejorative comments or those that could be considered as sarcastic, mordacious or hurtful, including personal or *ad hominem* criticism of the authors.
6. Reply to the editors within the established time frame. If deadlines cannot be met (15 days), the invitation should be declined and another reviewer should be reviewed.
7. Communicate the existence of any conflict of interest which may affect the objectivity and impartiality of the assessment. Reviewers must avoid obtaining any scientific, personal or financial benefit from the reserved information.
8. Recommend that the Editor choose one of the following options:
 - Accept in its present form.
 - Accept after minor changes.
 - Accept after more substantial changes (the manuscript will be re-sent to the reviewer after correction).
 - Reject.

Responsibilities of the reviewer to the authors

1. Provide a written report that outlines, in a reasoned way, the merit and scientific value of the study together with the scientific basis for the reviewers' opinions. The reviewers' anonymous comments will be read by the authors.
2. Indicate if the language used is precise and clear and if the study is interesting given the scope of *REED*.

3. Maintain confidentiality and be aware that the study is privileged information which may be known only by the reviewer. The reviewer must not make use of the information described or share it with colleagues or third parties.
4. Reply to the editors within the established time frame (15 days after acceptance). Delaying the assessment compromises the review process and is damaging to the authors and the reputation of the journal.
5. Avoid all personal or pejorative comments.
6. Inform about the possible corrections and points for improvement in the manuscript.

Confidential comments to the Editor

1. The reviewer will clearly and concisely justify one of the following recommendations to the Editor:
 - Accept in its present form.
 - Accept after minor changes.
 - Accept after major changes (the manuscript will be re-sent to the Editor).
 - Reject.
2. Furthermore, the reviewer will complete the questionnaire provided by the journal when accepting to review a manuscript. This covers the following points: general quality, specific characteristics, evaluation of figures, evaluation of tables, evaluation of the manuscript and level of priority.
3. Comments to the Editor should be divided into major and minor comments. The list of comments should be numbered and begin with the major comments.
4. The reviewer will propose to the Editor the possible improvements to the study and the relevance of the bibliographic references and if any relevant quotation from *REED* has been omitted.

Confidential comments to authors

1. The comments should begin with a very brief summary of the manuscript which should very clearly transmit how the reviewer sees the study.

2. The decision of whether to accept or reject the study is the sole responsibility of the Editor. *The recommendation regarding the possible publication or rejection of the article will not be sent to the authors.*
3. The comments should be divided into major and minor comments. The reviewer must indicate the main reasons for rejection or the improvements which should be incorporated into the study.
4. All comments must be constructive and should refer to specific sections of the manuscript. All observations should be numbered (1, 2, 3, etc.) in order to facilitate the authors' ordered responses and the evaluation by the Editor and the Editorial Board.

REFERENCES

1. Dinis-Ribeiro M, Vakil N, Ponchon T. The Editors' guide for peer review of papers submitted to Endoscopy. *Endoscopy* 2012;45(1):48-50. DOI: 10.1055/s-0032-1326005
2. Hoppin FG. How I review an original scientific article. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2002;166(8):1019-23. DOI: 10.1164/rccm.200204-324OE
3. Neill US. How to write an effective referee report. *J Clin Invest* 2009;119(5):1058-60. DOI: 10.1172/JCI39424
4. Provenzale JM, Stanley RJ. A systematic guide to reviewing a manuscript. *J Nucl Med Technol* 2006;34(2):92-9.
5. Spigt M, Arts ICW. How to review a manuscript. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2010;63(12):1385-90. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.09.001
6. ICMJE. Recommendations. Responsibilities in the submission and peer-review process. Cited Apr 25th 2017. Available from: <http://icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/responsibilities-in-the-submission-and-peer-peview-process.html>
7. Reviewer roles and responsibilities - Council of Science Editors. Cited Apr 25th 2017. Available from: <https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/white-paper-on-publication-ethics/2-3-reviewer-roles-and-responsibilities/>
8. Editor roles and responsibilities. Cited Apr 25th 2017. Available from: <https://www.councilscienceeditors.org/resource-library/editorial-policies/white-paper-on-publication-ethics/2-1-editor-roles-and-responsibilities/>

Accepted Article