

Instructions for reviewers

Peer review is one of the most important steps in scientific communication. It is the prevailing method for ensuring the quality of academic publications in areas such as science, technology, and medicine. It consists of a critical evaluation of research results, devoid of bias of any nature, and should provide constructive opinions. Peer review aims to improve the manuscript and may include judgment of the impact and interest of the manuscript in its area of interest.

1) The first round of peer review should be done carefully and thoroughly, highlighting all aspects to be considered for review by the authors, errors to be corrected, and suggestions for the authors to improve the quality of the manuscript. The journal expects the reviewer evaluation by 3 weeks (**21 days**) after accepting to review the manuscript. Read Supplementary data and all available material.

The second or subsequent rounds are to verify whether the authors met the reviewers' recommendations and to point out misconceptions or necessary improvements in the modifications made by the authors in response to the previous round. The reviewing time is 2 weeks (**15 days**) for the second and subsequent rounds.

2) The reviewer must declare any personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political, religious, or other conflict of interest. If the reviewer's research topic is closely related to the manuscript to be reviewed, this may constitute a conflict of interest.

3) The reviewer should be cautious when suggesting additional work, especially experimental work. When essential to the quality of the manuscript, his/her request should be justified.

4) It is considered polite to respond as soon as possible, either positively or negatively, to an invitation to review a manuscript.

5) The reviewer should only accept the invitation if, after reading the "instructions for the reviewer", he or she believes to be capable of reviewing the manuscript from a scientific and ethical point of view and meeting the deadline established by the journal.

6) If the reviewer cannot meet the deadline during the review, he or she should request an extension from the Editor-in-Chief.

7) If the reviewer does not wish/is willing to review the manuscript for any reason, the indication of alternative reviewers (full name and e-mail address) is grateful.

8) Eclética Química adopts double-blind peer review, but open review is offered and encouraged according to the reviewers' choice (see review form template). The template allows confidential comments to the editor, comments to the authors, and the review form evaluation by reviewers. If the reviewers' comments are considered impolite, the editor can edit them.

9) The journal respects the author's and reviewers' choices.

10) Contact with the authors is allowed when authorized by the Editor-in-Chief.

11) The confidentiality of the authors and the manuscript must be respected. Depending on the choice made by the authors and reviewers, their identities can be revealed, and the reviewers' comments and authors' responses may be published.

12) Reviewers are expected not to use the information from the manuscript for their benefit, or that of others, or to harm anyone.

13) Involving third parties in the peer review process is not permitted without authorization from the editor. If authorized, the collaborator's name must be informed to recognize his/her work.

14) If the reviewer suspects the manuscript involves unethical conduct, improper authorship, or any suspicion about the integrity of the material, he/she must immediately communicate this to the editor, confidentially. It is not appropriate to investigate; this is the journal's responsibility.

15) Suggesting references from the reviewer himself or collaborators constitutes unethical practice.