

Acta Toxicológica Argentina is a “peer-reviewed” scientific journal; This means that all original articles, special articles, short communications, clinical case presentations and others that the editors consider relevant are sent to at least two independent referees, recognized in the relevant area. The identity of authors and reviewers is kept confidential.

The review processes take an average of 60 days.

The reviewers chosen for their experience in the various thematic areas covered by the journal will issue their opinion on the manuscripts to the Redaction Committee who will ultimately determine the steps to follow with the manuscripts and who will be the only means of communication between the authors and the Journal.

Peer review of manuscripts sent to the journal is a tool to ensure that the chosen publications have high technical-scientific quality. Acting as a reviewer of a scientific journal is a great responsibility and requires significant effort for those who undertake such a task and, at the same time, indicates that the reviewer is recognized as a prominent actor in the topics in which they are asked for their input.

For this reason, they are given formal recognition and thanks for their collaboration, efforts and time they give to the review process for the journal.

Each manuscript is sent to two referees, requiring them to report their opinion within 30-60 days of submitting the manuscript. If there is any delay in delivery, we request that you notify us in advance. If review of the work is not possible, the suggestion of a colleague who could act as a reviewer on the specific topic is requested.

The authors do not know who carries out the arbitration.

Along with the original manuscript, a form is sent as a guide in order to guide the review process, contemplating aspects to consider in the review process. Reviewers are required to make a general comment on the manuscript and specific comments with detailed criticisms or suggestions of the points to be clarified in the manuscript.

The criticisms made must be objective, technically based and precise and, above all, they must be constructive since a good review in our journal has a teaching function, which we try to carry out regardless of whether the manuscript is accepted or not. In cases where the referee rejects a manuscript, he must clearly express the reasons that motivated that decision.

Likewise, it is well seen that the reviewers tell the editors their opinion about the work in terms of quality and its acceptance or not.

It is important to note that the final decision regarding whether or not to accept the manuscript rests with the editors.