Instructions for Reviewers

As a reviewer of the manuscript, your input is a crucial part of the peer-review process. The purpose of this guide is to provide you with a general description of your role as a reviewer in ScholarOne Manuscripts, and to provide you with practical guidelines for conducting your review as part of the journal's editorial policies.

The review process
The steps in the review process are as follows:

→ Receiving an invitation to review
→ Replying to an invitation (either accept or decline)
→ When accepting, revise the manuscript
→ Complete online review
→ Send feedback

• **Receiving an invitation for review:** As a reviewer, you will be notified by email of an invitation to review the manuscript.

• **Replying to an invitation:** The e-mail can include hyperlinked response options (acceptance or decline). Selecting an appropriate hyperlink sends an automated response to the journal and updates the system accordingly. If you select the "Agree" hyperlink, you will send an additional email containing a link to your review center. Click on the link to start your review. If you log in to your Review Center, instead, you will see under "notices" that you have a new invitation.

Select the "View invitation" to choose the appropriate response in the "Action" column. When you choose "Agree & Begin Review", you will be taken directly to the submission and scoring sheet.

If the "Decline - Suggest Alternate Reviewer" option is selected, it will take you to a confirmation screen. Clicking on the "I Confirm" option will take you to a new screen. Once you have submitted your evaluation, you will receive a thanks notice on the screen.

Other options, such as "Decline" or "Unavailable," also prompt you to confirm your response. Once your response has been registered, you will see "thank you."

• **Log in to your review center**

"
- *Access*

Typically, a ScholarOne address is provided to you, either in the invitation or in the invitation-response email sent by the journal; the link within the email is selected. You can also enter the web address https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/infectio

- *Login with ORCID*

The journal site can be accessed using the ORCID login. To do this, we selected Login with the ORCID ID button at the bottom of the login box. You will then log in to ORCID ID or register an ORCID account. If you have used this login process before or have already linked your ORCID ID to your ScholarOne profile, you will automatically log into the platform. If this is the first time you are linking your ORCID and ScholarOne accounts, you will be asked to authorize the publisher or journal to obtain your ORCID ID and read the login information, such as your name and address. You will then link your ORCID account to the ScholarOne website. You can see the option to create a new account or log in with your existing site credentials. If you already have an account on the ScholarOne site, you will need to provide your login credentials only once. You can then use ScholarOne or ORCID credentials to log into the site.

- *Account setup and maintenance*

Your account of the journal's ScholarOne Manuscripts site can be created in two ways.
1. The Journal can create your account and send you e-mail instructions on how to log in.
2. Account information may be included in the invitation for a review. If you do not receive your account details, please refer to the instructions on obtaining your password.

To keep your account information up to date, click on your name and select the section that you need to update.

Forgot your password?
If you forget your password, then select the Reset Password option. Enter your email address and select the "Send Reset Link" button. The system sends an email with details of how to reset the password.

Change language
The default language, English, can be changed to another language. To do this, we found the language option located in the header at the top of the screen. Currently, the languages available are English, Spanish, French, Chinese, and Japanese.

- *Overview of the reviewers' center*

Home Page

The homepage contains top-level navigation based on roles. You will see only the roles for which you have granted permission. The home page contains many convenient navigation functions as well as site-specific information and images.

Header: Quick links to access the following functions:

- Your username: click to edit your account
- Instructions and forms: journal-specific instructions for users and any journal-specific forms required for the peer review process; administrators view screens for page editing.
- Help - links you to various help functions
- Log off

Journal logo: You will find the infectious journal logo at the top of the page.

Top-level menu: Access function-specific centers and functions through this menu. Users only see the centers to which they have access. Some centers, such as the Administrator and Editor, were grouped under a heading with a drop-down list. This menu is displayed wherever you are working in the system, to allow you to move easily between functions.

Left menu: Access options for help links and documentation.

- **Manuscript revision**

▪ *Access the review center: Select the "Review" function in the top menu.*

▪ *Access to the manuscript for review: The reviewer panel will show you the number of articles to review. You can select the "Action" column, and you will find "Continue Review," "View Abstract," "View Proof," or "Contact the Journal."*

When you select "Continue Review," you access both the PDF test on the left side of the screen and the score sheet on the right. This type of navigation allows you to scroll through the PDF test and have a score sheet next to the area of the document you are reviewing.

There are four additional tables to assist in reviewing and scoring the manuscript.

- Files: List of all individual files to which you have access.
- Details: provides details and version history of the submission and the author's name (unless it is a blind review) as well as a quick link to the abstract.
- Instructions: See the instructions specified in the journal.
- Search tool: allows you to search for submission items in search engines such as Web of Science or PubMed. The search engines to which you have access are determined by the publisher or the journal.

- **Submitting your review**

Once you have finalized your evaluation, please provide your comments to the authors and send them to us.

- *Recognition option in **PUBLONS***

Our journal recommends that reviewers register with **PUBLONS**: [https://publons.com/wos-op/account/unified-auth/.](https://publons.com/wos-op/account/unified-auth/) These records allow you to obtain acknowledgements that many institutions consider as part of your academic work. If you wish to do so, simply select "Yes" to obtain recognition or click on the link for more information about PUBLONS.

- *Associated ORCID ID*

The score sheet can be configured to request the reviewer's ORCID. This can be set as mandatory or optional for the reviewer to respond. If the reviewer is logged in with their ORCID, the ORCID ID will be associated with the reviewer's account. Otherwise, it will only be displayed where the review form appears.

- *Attach files*

The user can click on the drop zone or import files from the computer. A maximum of ten files can be uploaded at a time. Before uploading the files, they must meet the standard criteria and answer the required question regarding who the file is intended for. This is usually the Author and Publisher or simply the publisher. Once answered, the upload process begins. As soon as you submit your review, you will receive a notification on the screen.

- *Contact with the Journal*

You may have questions about the articles you are reviewing and need to speak to someone on the journal team. Selecting the "Contact Journal" link opens a new window for you to create an email address for the person you wish to contact.

- *Other notifications*

Other notifications you may receive during the review process include a reminder of the next review deadline and whether the review is overdue.

- **See the author's response**

For the reviewed manuscripts, you will be able to see the author's response in the "Details" Tab. If configured, you will be able to see the decision letter sent to the author. Click on the "Author's response" link to access the response information.

- **Suggestions for review**

The review form is automatically saved every 30 seconds. When this occurs, a small message window appears on the bottom right side of the form. It fades after one second. Reviewers have the option of saving manually using the "Save as Draft" button. Also, you can print using the "Save & Print" button. When using the browser controls or the "Save & Print' button, the right side of the page, including the ID, title, and form, will be printed. We recommend that if you cut and paste your comments, you use a plain text editor, such as WordPad or Notepad. Be sure not to include your name in any comments you made to the author, as many sites conduct a blind review process.

- **View completed reviews**

After you submit your review, you can access your full review in the "Score Submitted" section of the dashboard. Select "View Submitted Review" in the "Action" column. A new window will show you the completed review.

- **Publons credit for completed revisions**

Publons allow academics to track, verify, and display their peer reviews and scholarly contributions in journals. *ScholarOne* allows users to search for credit from completed historical reviews. Access historical reviews through "Reviews Pending the Publons Credit queue". To receive credit, select the checkbox next to the appropriate manuscript and then "Get Publons Credit." A success message will confirm the data transfer to Publons.

For more information on using ScholarOne, see: https://clarivate.com/webofsciencegroup/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/dlm_uploads/2019/10/ScholarOne-Manuscripts-Reviewer-Guide.pdf

Guidance on how to perform your assessment

1. *Before you start*

When you start to write the review, be sure to familiarize themselves with the journal's specific guidelines, which can be found in the journal's author guidelines available on the homepage. (https://www.revistainfectio.org/P_OJS/index.php/infectio/index).

Before accepting or declining an invitation to review the manuscript, consider the following points:

- If the manuscript matches your area of expertise. Accept only if you believe you can provide a high-quality review.

- The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest, please Inform the editor if you respond affirmatively.

- If you have time to complete the review. Reviewing can be a lot of work, so make sure you meet the deadline before committing to it. If any additional time is required, please inform the editorial team.

- More information about peer reviews and the peer review process is needed. In this case, we recommend consulting several webpages dedicated to providing recommendations to article reviewers. The following websites can be consulted:

  -https://www.escueladerevisores.com/

   -https://researcheracademy.elsevier.com/navigating-peer-review

  https://clarivate.com/web-of-science-academy/

- Finally, we recommend responding to the invitation as soon as you can, even if it is to decline it, as a delay in your decision slows down the review process, which means waiting more for the author. If you declined the invitation, we would appreciate it if you could provide suggestions for potential reviewers.

2. *How to perform the review*

Please note that all information is confidential and should not be disclosed or discussed with other researchers or staff members.

Once you have read the material, your evaluation should begin with a sentence that summarizes the main objective and results of the study, which demonstrates that, as a reviewer, you have read the material and understood what was presented therein. Subsequently, a general comment on the quality of writing, language, and content can be made. Comments should be made in polite terms without direct allusions to the supposed or known qualities of the authors of the work. Criteria should be formulated in objective terms and point out where there is a lack of clarity, information, or contradiction in the statements.

The following are some aspects that should be considered in their evaluation according to the types of papers submitted to the journal:

Original research article (presentation of primary data or a systematic review)

- The introduction should include the background, justification, and previous work related to the research problem as well as the gaps in knowledge that the work intends to fill. The objective of this study was at the end of the introduction.

- In the Materials and Methods section, a clear, precise, and complete presentation of the methods used, the criteria for the interpretation of the results, the use of materials and reagents, and their identification, which allow their application by other researchers, should be evaluated.

- Therefore, experiments involving patient or animal data should be conducted. Were bioethical standards met, was the institutional ethics committee approval record number included, and, if so, which? Please also note **Infectio**'s ethical statements.

  https://www.revistainfectio.org/P_OJS/index.php/infectio/declaraciones_eticas

  Systematic reviews, which our journal considers as original work, must comply with PRISMA recommendations. https://www.prisma-statement.org/. The criteria, search terms, and databases consulted were also included.
- In the analysis of the results section, it should be noted that the results were sufficient and that their presentation was adequate. If applicable, comment on whether the statistics are robust and fit for the purpose and whether the sampling controls and mechanisms are sufficient and well described.

- In the analysis of the Discussion section, specific comments on the author's interpretation of his results and the scope of the conclusions are presented.

- Finally, a general qualitative synthesis of the work should be conducted, and then a distinction can be made between specific major and minor observations. This detailed numbering is very important because it allows the authors to make modifications and clarifications to each of the reviewers' points, which should be included in the letter of response to the evaluation.

Review article

- The importance of the topic and scope of the review should be discussed and the originality of the review should be evaluated.

- It is important to evaluate whether, in the case of narrative reviews, the methodology applied for the search and selection of literature used in the review was described (verifying that the search terms and databases explored are included).

- Consider the author's presentation of the most relevant advances in the field of study; in addition, evaluate whether the references presented are relevant to the topic, and whether they include historical literature and more recent studies.

- Comment on the wording, organization, and presentation of tables and figures in the manuscript.

- Comments on the author's interpretation of the results.

Clinical Practice Guidelines

- Evaluate whether the recommendations to develop a *de novo* guideline or an adaptation of existing guidelines were carried out, and whether this was described in a complete and detailed manner, especially the process for validation of recommendations (criteria GRADE).

Clinical cases
- Please note that **Infectio** only accepts cases for which there are no previous descriptions in the scientific literature, when they are clinical forms of already well-known infections. In the case of new organisms, microbiological confirmation with DNA sequencing of the new species should be included.

3. *Submit your evaluation*

Once you have finished reviewing our manuscript, please submit your evaluation. The journal has a specific format (questionnaire) for structuring your comments. When making a recommendation, consider the categories that the editor is likely to use to classify the item.

- Reject (explain your reasoning in your report)
- Accept without review
- Revision: Major or minor and indicate to the editor if he/she would agree to revise the new version of the article with the requested changes. If you recommend a revision, you must provide the author with a clear explanation of why the revision is necessary.

Note that there will be an opportunity to address separate comments from both the editor and the author. Please submit your report once you are ready for publication.

4. *Final decision*

After the reviewer's evaluation, the editor decides whether to accept or reject the article, considering all observations. The editor may request another opinion or ask the author for a new review before making a final decision.

5. *Subsequent revisions*

As a reviewer, you may receive an invitation to review the manuscript again after modifications. Please do not confuse this invitation with the request for a review of the original version.

When authors revise their papers, they are asked to include a list of changes and comments from the reviewers. The revised version can be evaluated by the editor if only minor revisions are requested, or it can be returned to the original reviewers if they are available to confirm whether the revisions are satisfactory or require additional changes.