



RIDNAIC PEER REVIEW DUTIES AND OBLIGATIONS

Peer reviewers are the backbone and fundamental element for quality in any International Scientific Journal. The duties and obligations of the peer reviewers associated with findings from scientific publications or emerging technologies worthy of publication for RIDNAIC are described below.

1. **Clarity:** Peer reviewers must evaluate the clarity in which the technical article is presented for the understanding of the reader that mastered the subject.
2. **The level of specificity:** Peer reviewers must evaluate that each section of the technical paper provides the reasonable level of specificity required to effectively comprehend the sequence and interrelationship of each section of the paper.
3. **Peer reviewer qualifications:** If the peer reviewer understands that is not qualified to evaluate the specific electronic technical paper that was initially assigned to him, he/she must notify the RIDNAIC Editor in a timely manner and shall proceed to delete the afore-mentioned electronic file.
4. **Criticism:** Avoid any personal criticism of the authors and their professional academic and research experience.
5. **Plagiarism:** Notify immediately of any suspicion of plagiarism. The suspicion should be cross-check with the primary source.
6. **Confidentiality:** The electronic document of the technical article that has been assigned to you is confidential, therefore it should not be discussed with any other colleague, including graduate students or colleagues in your office or work environment.
7. **Fundamental changes:** Any fundamental change recommended by the peer reviewer associated with a theory or hypothesis must be accompanied by the pertinent citation of the primary source that has previously been published in that specific area.
8. **Ethical Standards:** The ethical standards that control the peer review process are equivalent to those adopted by the code of ethics of the National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE), the American Geophysical Union (AGU) and the code of ethics and professional conduct of their respective professional affiliations.
9. **Potential conflict of interest:** If there is a potential conflict of interest from the reviewer with the authors or the process, or if the reviewer has any personal reservation regarding the research line or development, he/she must notify the Editor and choose not to evaluate the technical article. The electronic file of the technical article submitted to the reviewer must also be discarded.
10. **Tables, figures and images:** The reviewer must evaluate the technical content of the tables, figures and images, including the clarity of the message that the author intends to convey to the reader that mastered the subject.
11. **Technical references:** The technical references must follow the standards established by American Psychological Association (APA).