

REVIEWER GUIDELINES – SANUM. SCIENTIFIC-HEALTH JOURNAL

1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Peer review is a cornerstone of scientific publishing and a key mechanism to ensure the quality, rigor, and originality of the papers published in SANUM. The process is external, independent, confidential, and follows a **double-blind model**.

2. OBJECTIVES OF PEER REVIEW

- Assess the originality, scientific quality, and relevance of the manuscript.
- Suggest improvements to increase clarity, validity, and value of the work.
- Detect possible methodological errors or ethical concerns.
- Contribute to the editorial decision of acceptance, revision, or rejection.

3. EDITORIAL PROCESS AND TIMELINES

1. Initial check by the **Technical Secretariat**: verification of formal requirements.
2. Preliminary review by the **Scientific Committee**: assessment of relevance and editorial fit.
3. Invitation to external **reviewers**: **1 week** to accept or decline the invitation.
4. **Peer review**: submission of the evaluation report within **4 weeks** from acceptance.
5. **First editorial decision**: usually communicated within **4–6 weeks** after receipt of the manuscript. The manuscript will subsequently be published in the next issue of the journal.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Reviewers are expected to assess:

- **Originality and scientific relevance.**

- **Methodology:** design, replicability, statistical analysis, bias control.
- **Results:** clarity, coherence, and credibility.
- **Discussion and conclusions:** sound interpretation, limitations, and contributions.
- **Ethics:** informed consent, ethical approval, absence of plagiarism and conflicts of interest.
- **References:** recency, relevance, and compliance with Vancouver style.
- **Presentation:** IMRAD structure, clear writing, appropriate length.

5. CONFIDENTIALITY AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

- Manuscripts are strictly confidential until publication.
- Reviewers must not share them with third parties or use them for personal benefit.
- Any **conflict of interest** (financial, institutional, personal, or academic) must be declared; reviewers should decline the review if applicable.

6. USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE BY REVIEWERS

Uploading manuscripts to generative AI tools is strictly prohibited. AI may only be used for minor support tasks (e.g., grammar check) and must be **explicitly declared to the editor**.

7. STRUCTURE OF THE REVIEW REPORT

- Short summary of the manuscript.
- Constructive comments for authors (numbered and specific).
- Confidential comments to the editor (if any).
- Final recommendation:
 - Accept without changes.
 - Accept with minor changes.
 - Revise with major changes (requires reevaluation).
 - Reject, with a reasoned justification.

8. ETHICS OF PEER REVIEW

- Report suspected plagiarism, fraud, or data manipulation.
- Safeguard the dignity, confidentiality, and rights of participants.
- Maintain a respectful, objective, and constructive tone at all times.

9. REVIEWER RECOGNITION

SANUM acknowledges the contribution of reviewers by issuing certificates and publishing annual acknowledgements, while preserving the confidentiality of the review process.

10. EDITORIAL CONTACT

Any issues related to peer review should be addressed to:

 secretaria@revistacientificasanum.com

Kindly refer to the Reviewer Evaluation Guide available on the journal's website
