



---

## REVIEW GUIDE

We would like to thank you for agreeing to perform a peer review for the Spanish Journal of International Law. In order to make the review process quicker and easier for you, please see below some short guidelines on the various items included in the review form.

Regarding *item 3* (structure and line of reasoning), please refrain from modifying the author's sequence of ideas unless it is inconsistent.

Regarding *item 4* (references in footnotes), please remember that the author is free to base his/her assertions and conclusions with any scholarly doctrine. However, you may make suggestions on other sources that should had been looked up; the author may or may not take these suggestions into consideration. A reference will be considered *incorrect* if it is unnecessary (for instance, it supports obvious arguments), or if it does not belong in the text where it is included. A reference will be considered *insufficient* if it is significantly lacking (i.e. the author replicates the work of others without quoting them).

Regarding *item 5* (exposition and clarity), we advise you not to alter the writing style, since it must be a personal choice of the author, unless the style seriously undermines clarity and/or in case of grammatical errors or spelling mistakes.

Regarding *letter a)* of *item 7*, (relevance of the work for the scientific community), please refrain from disregarding the manuscript solely on the basis that the reasoning or conclusions differ from yours. If you consider that the work "lacks relevance," you are suggesting that it is purely descriptive and/or that it lacks an analysis and assessment that contribute to the knowledge and understanding of the subject.



---

Finally, regarding *letter b)* of *item 7*, (the work makes a scientific/scholarly-technical contribution), we request you not to disregard a manuscript solely on the basis that its claims or conclusions differ from yours. A work will be considered to make progress if the work overall, or some parts thereof, provide well-supported and interesting innovative contributions to the subject.

In sum, please note that reviewing a manuscript does not entail re-writing it to resemble your style or to include your own opinion. We are requesting you to honestly give a constructive view on a set of objective items that will help us to decide whether or not to publish the manuscript in our Journal. Your opinions and suggestions may be anonymously submitted to the author in order for him/her to modify his/her work if he/she sees fit.

You may request a document certifying that you have been a peer reviewer for this issue of the REDI.

REDI's Editor-in-Chief thanks you for your valuable cooperation.