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**Referee Responsibilities
1. REFEREE RESPONSIBILITIES**
The referee responsibilities of the International Crimes and History (ICH) are as follows.
**1.1. Conflicting interests**
1. Reviewers must declare all potential competing or conflicting interests.
2. You should not agree to review manuscripts if the referee currently works at the same institution as any of the authors, or has recently (e.g. within the last 3 years) been an advisor or close collaborator or co-grantee of the authors.
3. The referee should not agree to review a manuscript that is not intended for submission, but has been submitted for comment only. In addition, the referee should not agree to review manuscripts on a very similar topic that he/she is in the process of writing or is under review in another journal.
**1.2. Timeliness**
If a reviewer is unable to complete a review, he or she should notify the reviewer within a reasonable time frame. If the referee does not feel competent to evaluate the manuscript submitted for review, and if he/she feels that he/she cannot complete a review within the proposed or mutually agreed timeframe, he/she should not accept the review.
The reviewer should notify the journal immediately if his or her circumstances change, or if he or she is unable to honor the agreement, or if for other reasons he or she requires more time for review.
If the referee is unable to review for some reason, it is helpful if they make suggestions for alternative referees, based purely on their expertise and without the influence of their personal opinion and without the intention that the manuscript will receive a particular result (positive or negative).
**1.3. First Steps**
The referee should read the manuscript thoroughly, including additional data files and supplementary materials (e.g., review instructions, required ethics and policy statements), and then contact the journal to request them if he/she is unsure of clarity or if there are missing items he/she needs.
The reviewer should not contact the authors directly without the journal's permission. It is important that the reviewer understands the scope of the review before starting the review.
**1.4. Confidentiality**
The referee must respect the confidentiality of the review process, and the referee must refrain from using information obtained in the process of reviewing the manuscript for his/her own or others' benefit or to the disadvantage or discredit of others.
The referee should not involve anyone else (including someone in his/her early research years as a consultant) in the review process without informing the journal. The names of individuals who assisted the referee in reviewing the manuscript should be recorded and associated with the journal and should be recognized for their efforts.
**1.5. Bias and Competing Interests**
The referee must remain impartial to ideas about the origins of an article or commercial considerations, regardless of nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors.
If the referee becomes aware of competing interests that may interfere with providing a fair and impartial review, they should inform the journal and seek advice.
While awaiting a response, the reviewer should refrain from looking at the article and related material in case the request for review is withdrawn. Similarly, he/she should notify the journal immediately if he/she realizes that he/she does not have the necessary expertise to assess the relevant aspects of an article so as not to delay the review process unduly.
In the case of double-blind review, the reviewer should inform the journal if he/she suspects the identity of the author and if he/she believes that this information could create any potential competition or conflict of interest.
**1.6. Suspicion of Ethical Violations**
The referee should inform the journal if he or she encounters any irregularities related to research and publication ethics. For example, the referee may have concerns that inappropriate behavior occurred during both the research, writing and submission of the manuscript. As another example, they may notice that the manuscript is in simultaneous submission to another journal or that there is a significant similarity to a published article. In the case of these or other ethical concerns, the reviewer should contact the editor directly and not attempt to investigate on their own. It is appropriate to cooperate safely with the journal and not to investigate personally unless the journal requests further information or advice.
**1.7. Transfer of Peer Reviews Between Journals**
Publishers may have editorial policies regarding the transfer of peer reviews to other journals in the publisher's portfolio (sometimes referred to as portable or cascading peer review).
Reviewers may be asked to give permission for their reviews to be transferred (if in accordance with journal policy).
If a manuscript is rejected by one journal and submitted to another journal and the referee is asked to review the same manuscript, the referee should re-evaluate, recognizing that the two submissions may be different and the journal may have different evaluation criteria and acceptance requirements.
For the sake of transparency and efficiency, it may be appropriate for the referee to use his/her original review (with permission from the original journal) for the new journal, explaining to the journal that "he/she has already reviewed the manuscript and has not made any changes".
**1.8. Report Preparation
1.8.1 Format**
The reviewer should follow the journals' instructions for writing and submitting reviews.
If a specific format or scoring is required, they should use the tools provided by the journal.
Reviewers are expected to be objective and constructive in their assessment, giving feedback to help the author improve their manuscript. For example, reviewers should be authentic in their criticism and provide supporting evidence with appropriate references to assist the editors in their evaluation and to verify general statements.
Reviewers are expected to be professional and refrain from hostile, inflammatory, insulting personal comments and making unfounded accusations.
**1.8.2. Appropriate Feedback**
The reviewer should keep in mind that it is the editor's responsibility to ensure that the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript are assessed fairly, honestly and impartially.
The journal should allow the referee to send confidential comments to the editor. These comments should also be in comments that can be read by the authors. The journal may also ask for a recommendation of acceptance/revision/rejection; any recommendation should be consistent with the comments given in the review.
If the reviewer did not review the entire manuscript, he/she should indicate which aspects of the manuscript he/she evaluated.
The referee should make sure that his/her comments and suggestions to the editor are consistent with the report to the authors; most feedback should be put in the report for the authors to see.
The reviewer's confidential comments to the editor should not contain slander or false accusations, and should be made with the knowledge that the authors will not be able to see the comments.
**1.8.3. Language and Style**
The referee should keep in mind that the article is the author's own article and therefore should not try to rewrite the article in their own preferred style. However, they may suggest changes that improve clarity.
In addition, when the reviewer becomes aware of language problems caused by authors writing in a language that is not their native language or in a language in which they are not proficient, they should express this in an appropriate and respectful manner through their feedback.
**1.8.4. Suggestions for Further Work**
The referee should prepare the referee report himself/herself, unless the referee has received permission from the journal to involve someone else in the review process. The referee should refrain from unfair negative comments and unfair criticism of any competitor in the manuscript.
The referee should refrain from including citation suggestions made by authors to increase the citation count or to increase the visibility of a colleague's (or an employee's) work; suggestions should be based on valid academic or technological reasons.
Reviewers should not prolong the review process by deliberately delaying the review report or requesting unnecessary additional information from the journal or the author.
**1.9. Referee Evaluations**
The referees will inform their final decision by filling out the referee form in the evaluation process.