

Peer review

General description

Type: double-blind review

All of the articles published in this journal are first submitted to a double-blind review by members of the scientific editorial board, recognized experts in the field.

Blind review guarantee

To guarantee the anonymity of authors, as set out in the guidelines for authors (publication rules), the article must be submitted without the personal details (name and surname(s), email address, academic affiliation, postal address and brief CV). This type of information must be attached in a separate file.

Phases of the article review process

Phase 1: submission of the original.

Phase 2: assessment by the journal's editorial team of the text received; a decision is taken as to whether the work will go on to the expert review phase or if it will be rejected, either for structure or content.

Phase 3: blind review of the original by two external reviewers, experts in the subject area of the article. Reviewers are asked to consider the following factors: the suitability of the work to the journal's subject area, the presentation and writing of the text, the originality and interest of the subject tackled, the description of the main subject of the research, the explanation of the theoretical-conceptual framework, the suitability of the methodology used, the explanation and analysis of the results and conclusions, the relevance of the bibliographical references and the appropriateness of the tables and figures.

Approximate duration: between one and six weeks. During this process, the identity of the authors under review and the reviewers doing the reviews are kept hidden. The journal has a database of reviewers who are methodological experts in the various subject areas covered; every year the list of experts that have been consulted is published. The journal offers instructions and forms to reviewers to assess the quality and relevance of the articles.

Phase 4: the result of the review is sent to the journal managers. The reviewers send the result of the review and a proposed ruling to the journal's editorial team, which then takes the reports into consideration and has to take a decision and decide whether to send the work to a third reviewer.

Phase 5: communication of the result of the review to the authors, which must be done between three and seven weeks after the date the original is received. The editorial decision must be given to the authors with reasons and justifications. Types of decision:

- **Accepted:** an article is approved if the result of the two reviews is positive and the editorial team feels that the authors do not need to be asked to make any changes.
- **Not accepted:** an article is refused if the result of one or both reviews is negative.
- **Major modifications need to be made:** the result of the review calls for modifications of the content or structure, which the author must apply, resubmitting the article for review. Making the proposed changes does not imply acceptance of the article.
- **Minor modifications need to be made:** the result of the review calls for modifications of a structural nature that do not affect the content. The author has to apply them and the article is not resubmitted to a new review process.

If the author suggests a possible reviewer for their article, the journal reserves the right to take this recommendation into consideration or not.