

au *arquitectura y urbanismo*

On the work of the referees

The process of publishing articles in the journal *Arquitectura y Urbanismo* looks at different revision levels. The assurance of the quality of this process relies deeply on the work of the reviewers or referees, who have the responsibility of reading the papers submitted by publishers and cast their critical comments and recommendations.

Items received are initially evaluated by the editorial board to ensure compliance with the minimum requirements. Preliminary criteria for acceptance are as follows:

- Works must be original and unpublished and have not been published in any other medium.
- They must correspond to the topics of the journal.
- Should stand out for its originality, newness and relevance.
- Its content should have the level of quality required in this type of scientific publications.
- The document must be properly structured, leaving expressed the following components: Introduction; Materials and methods; results; discussion; conclusions and references.
- The facts must be exposed with quality, rigor and good writing.
- The sources that serve as references must be current, reliable and recognized within the scientific community.
- Item must strictly follow the rules of writing.

In case you pass this preliminary test, the items are sent to two reviewers who must evaluate the article confidentially and anonymously, which is known as peer review. This means that the document received by the arbitrators does not have the names of the authors, or any data that reveal your identity. Neither the referees know the identity of the other reviewer.

The referee must give their opinions on the basis of a model containing the following:

On the content:

- Scientific quality of the content of the material, with evidence of contributions to the subject treated
- Originality of approach
- Relevance and importance of the subject treated
- Newsness and reliability of the sources

On the shape:

- The Logic of the structure under which the material is organized, making it clear: background, objectives, methods, results and conclusions
- Quality of writing and the style employed
- Relevance and quality of tables, graphs and photos

CONCLUSIONS

Not accept

Accept:

- As it is
- With content modifications
- With such modifications

Received the criteria of the two referees, the editorial board reconciles both reports and contacted the author to give the results in order to make corrections. From that time the author has a month to readjust your article.

In the majority of cases the editors make the final decision confronting the material returned by the author and perfected, with reports from the referees, but may be the case of another round of review required.

Referees are active renowned professionals in each of the subjects of the journal and are assessed annually to be ratified or not in their duties in accordance with their participation in the review process. Each issue specialists who acted as reviewers, which are added to the scientific advisory board of the journal appear.

Ethical obligations of arbitrators:

1. Throughout the process of reviewing the principle of confidentiality will be observe by the referees to review the work, and the confidentiality of their names to the authors of the manuscript will be maintained.

2. If a reviewer does not feel qualified or have not enough time to review the work, he must return the manuscript immediately to the direction of the journal.

3. The reviewer should objectively judge the quality of the manuscript on its own merits and should respect the intellectual independence of the authors. Personal review is inappropriate. Will express their views and opinions in an objective, accurate, clear and convincing, especially the negative judgments, so that editors and authors may understand the basis of their observations.

4. Can't be no conflict of interest between authors and reviewers of the manuscript. If a manuscript submitted for review represents a potential conflict of interest or the reviewer has a personal opinion on it should return the manuscript promptly without conducting the review.

5. The reviewer should note any substantial similarity between the manuscript review and any other published or, if aware, manuscript submitted to any other publication.

6. All the contents of a submitted manuscript is confidential and property of the authors, will not be used in any way by the reviewer, or be exposed otherwise except with the consent of the author and proper attribution.

7. If a reviewer has convincing evidence that a manuscript includes plagiarized content or falsifying research data or known to have been published, shall immediately notify the direction of the journal, which will take appropriate measures.