

Instruction, BioMed, IMF

---

# Guidelines for Reviewers of Ticino Medical Tribune

## **Index**

<b>1. Confidentiality</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Conflict of interest</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Impartiality and objectivity</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Detection of errors and misconduct</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5. Deadlines and timeliness</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>6. Technical and scientific aspects</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>7. Communication with the editor</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>8. Continuous review</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>9. Compliance with ethical standards</b>	<b>4</b>

## Introduction

The following reviewer guidelines have been developed in accordance with the ethical standards of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) to ensure a transparent, fair, and rigorous review process for manuscripts submitted to the journal. The role of the reviewer is crucial in maintaining the integrity and quality of published research.

### 1. Confidentiality

Manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents.

It is not permitted to share or discuss the content of the manuscript with others, except when explicitly authorized by the journal editor.

Reviewers must not use the information contained in the manuscripts for personal or professional purposes

### 2. Conflict of interest

Reviewers must promptly declare any potential conflict of interest that could influence their judgment (e.g., financial ties, collaborations, or personal relationships with the authors).

If a conflict of interest is identified, the reviewer must decline the review assignment.

### 3. Impartiality and objectivity

Reviewers must provide a fair, objective, and constructive evaluation.

Personal criticism of the authors is not acceptable.

The evaluation must be based on scientific arguments and supported by evidence.

### 4. Detection of errors and misconduct

Reviewers must immediately report to the editor any suspected similarities between the manuscript and other published works or suspicions of plagiarism.

They must also notify any methodological errors, incorrect analyses, or other forms of scientific misconduct.

### 5. Deadlines and timeliness

Reviewers should accept assignments only if they can complete the review within the required time frame.

In case of unexpected delays, the reviewer must inform the editor as soon as possible.

### 6. Technical and scientific aspects

Reviewers should evaluate:

- The validity of the methodology used.
- The clarity and completeness of data presentation.
- The originality and contribution of the work to the research field.
- The adequacy of citations and bibliographic references.

## 7. **Communication with the editor**

Reviewers must communicate any issues encountered during the review process to the editor or provide suggestions for improving the manuscript.

Comments for authors should be clear, polite, and constructive.

## 8. **Continuous review**

If the manuscript undergoes subsequent revisions, the reviewer may be asked to evaluate it again.

In such cases, the reviewer must verify that the authors have adequately addressed the previous comments and requests.

## 9. **Compliance with ethical standards**

Reviewers commit to adhering to the ethical principles of COPE and to acting with integrity throughout the entire review process.

December 18, 2024

### **Contact**

Istituto di medicina di famiglia  
Università della Svizzera italiana  
Via Buffi 13  
6900 Lugano  
Svizzera

tmt@usi.ch  
www.usi.ch

© Università della Svizzera italiana