Reviewers' Responsibilities

The peer review process is a cornerstone of academic publishing, ensuring the quality and integrity of the research published in "Costruzioni Metalliche." Reviewers play a crucial role in this process, and the journal expects them to uphold high standards of ethical conduct and professionalism.

This Reviewers' Responsibilities document is designed to support a fair, transparent, and high-quality peer review process at "Costruzioni Metalliche." By adhering to these principles, reviewers contribute significantly to the journal's integrity and to advancing the field.

Below are the responsibilities expected of reviewers:

1. Confidentiality

- **Respect for Manuscript Confidentiality**: Reviewers must treat all manuscripts they receive as confidential documents. They should not share the content of the manuscript or discuss it with others, except with express permission from the editor.
- **No Use of Unpublished Information**: Any information or ideas obtained during the review process must not be used for personal advantage or shared publicly until the article is published.
- **Maintaining Anonymity**: In single-blind reviews, reviewers should ensure that their identities remain anonymous to the authors. They should avoid actions or comments that could inadvertently reveal their identity.

2. Objectivity and Professional Conduct

- **Impartial Evaluation**: Reviews should be conducted impartially and free from any personal biases. Comments should be objective, constructive, and focused on improving the manuscript's quality.
- **Respectful Feedback**: Reviewers should avoid personal criticisms of the authors. Feedback should be professional, respectful, and aimed at providing useful suggestions or clarifications.
- **Avoiding Conflicts of Interest**: Reviewers must decline the review if they have any conflict of interest with the manuscript's content or its authors, such as financial interests, personal relationships, or competitive affiliations.

3. Timeliness

- **Prompt Response to Invitations**: Reviewers should promptly respond to review invitations and indicate their availability or any conflicts. If they are unable to complete the review, they should inform the editor as soon as possible.
- **Timely Completion of Reviews**: Reviewers are expected to complete reviews within the timeframe agreed upon with the journal. If unforeseen circumstances arise, reviewers should request an extension or suggest alternative reviewers.

4. Thoroughness and Constructive Feedback

- **Detailed Evaluation of the Manuscript**: Reviewers should thoroughly read the manuscript and provide a detailed, point-by-point review covering aspects like methodology, data accuracy, validity of conclusions, and relevance to the journal's scope.

- **Suggestions for Improvement**: Reviewers are encouraged to provide constructive feedback that helps authors improve their manuscript, suggesting specific revisions where appropriate.
- **Identification of Gaps or Errors**: Reviewers should point out any significant issues with the research, such as methodological flaws, unsupported claims, or overlooked references, and recommend improvements.

5. Ethical Compliance and Integrity

- **Identification of Ethical Concerns**: Reviewers should report any potential ethical issues they notice in the manuscript, such as suspected plagiarism, data manipulation, or conflicts of interest. If ethical concerns arise, they should alert the editor without discussing it publicly.
- **Acknowledgment of Source Material**: Reviewers should alert the editor to any significant overlap with other published work if it appears that the manuscript may not be entirely original.
- **Commitment to Re-review**: If the authors revise the manuscript, reviewers may be asked to evaluate the revised version. Reviewers should approach this request with the same level of diligence and commitment.

6. Communication with Editors

- **Seeking Clarification**: If reviewers encounter any unclear points or need guidance during the review process, they should feel comfortable reaching out to the editor.
- **Reporting Challenges in the Review Process**: Reviewers should inform the editor if they encounter difficulties in assessing the manuscript's content due to a lack of expertise or if they feel unable to provide a thorough review for any reason.