



## ***Historia Agraria de América Latina (HAAL)***

### **Good Practice Guidelines**

1. The Editors, the members of the Editorial Advisory Board, and the Editorial Production Team will observe absolute confidentiality with regards to authors and reviewers' both personal and professional information, as well as regarding every step of the evaluation of manuscripts submitted to the Journal.
2. The evaluation and revision of manuscripts submitted to HAAR will be conducted in a rigorous and professional manner. Authors will be responsible for compliance with the requirement of submitting only original works that have not been published previously, are not under evaluation by, or will not be submitted to, another journal while under consideration at HAAL. To this effect, authors should fill out and sign a Statement of Originality and Consent, and send it along with their submission. Consequently, authors will solely be responsible for any property rights conflict regarding their manuscripts' textual and graphic contents.
3. Authors should clearly and precisely indicate the sources they used in their submission, and they should also acknowledge the use of any ideas, arguments, methods, approaches, and evidence borrowed or taken from another scholar's work.
4. The manuscripts submitted to HAAL will be first evaluated by the Editors, who can reject or send them to external peer review. The external reviewers will be two specialists, who will evaluate the manuscript within the assigned time frame, working independently and under a 'double-blinded' process, will write a report assessing the manuscript. Likewise, the reviewers should inform the editors if they identified the manuscript's author or have any conflict of interest, in which case they will decline the invitation to evaluate. Reviewers should also report to the editors any circumstances that compromise the manuscript's originality, such as plagiarism and self-plagiarism. In addition to those done by external reviewers, evaluations can be also done by members of the editorial board.
5. In case of significant discrepancies between the two reviewers' evaluations, or in case that either be of insufficient quality to support a decision on a manuscript, the editors will ask for a third evaluation. The editors will make a decision on a manuscript based on the reviewers' reports. The decision can be one of the following options:
  - (a) Unconditional acceptance, with minor revisions
  - (b) Acceptance, pending major revision and substantial changes
  - (c) Revise and resubmit
  - (d) Rejection, no publication.

6. Manuscripts that have been accepted ‘pending major revision and substantial changes’ should be revised by the author according to the reviewers’ comments and suggestions from the editors. The author should submit the revised version within four weeks after receiving the reviewers’ reports. In response to the reviewers, the author should also submit a note explaining the main changes introduced in the new version. The revised version will be sent to the same reviewers for a second round of evaluations. However, if advisable to ensure the quality, fairness and confidentiality of the evaluation, the editors may send the revised version to a different reviewer.

7. HAAL will assign one of the editors the supervision of the evaluation of each manuscript. This editor will interact with the author, the reviewers, and the other editors, and will answer any questions regarding the evaluation process. Any interest conflict will be settled by the editors, whose decisions will be final. The editor in charge of the manuscript will inform the author of the editors’ decisions.