



Guidelines for Reviewers

Definition of Peer Reviewer

Psicogente considers peer reviewers to be skilled professionals specialized in the subject area of each article submitted to *Psicogente*. Their aptitude will depend on the following criteria, among others:

- Holding a master's, doctoral, or postdoctoral degree;
- Having published scientific papers with research or studies in the field of social and human sciences and in disciplines related to psychology and its various areas; and
- Not having the same institutional affiliations as the article's authors.

If these criteria are met, you can become part of *Psicogente's* group of reviewers; furthermore, the following factors should be considered.

Type of Review

Psicogente employs double-blind review, wherein neither the peer reviewer nor the author is informed of the name and affiliation of the other. This type of review helps reduce bias in evaluation.

Role and Responsibilities of the Peer Reviewer

Peer reviewers are responsible for ensuring that the article's content adheres to the standards of quality defined by the scientific community, follows the scientific method, and makes a correct review of the study's supporting background. Further, they ensure that the methodologies used are valid and current in the relevant field; examine whether the language is clear, accurate, and unambiguous; and verify whether the analyses, interpretation of findings, literature review, and testing/rejection of hypotheses were rigorous. In summary, the peer reviewer is responsible for evaluating the quality of the form and content, originality, relevance, contribution, and potential ethics violations of the article submitted to the journal.

Ethics Responsibilities

As a reviewer, you should always consider the following:

- As part of their responsibilities, reviewers are responsible for maintaining the strictest level of confidentiality of all information provided to them when they accept to perform the review.
- It is the reviewer's duty to report the existence of any conflict of interest with the article received for publication, in which case, they should declare this and turn down the offer to review.
- An objective and respectful assessment of the article's quality should be provided, along with clear and accurate remarks regarding the text; the editor should be informed of any discrepancies in the text that may violate ethical norms of research, as well as any instances of plagiarism. Finally, their assessment must be delivered in a timely manner to *Psicogente*.
- Peer reviewers are responsible for judging the scientific quality of articles in terms of their content by examining the relevance, pertinence, and originality of the works submitted to *Psicogente*, as their opinion is a fundamental criterion for its acceptance or rejection.

Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when the peer reviewer is unable to assess the article objectively or impartially. This situation can arise in any of the following situations:

1. If the reviewer has a personal, familial, professional, or commercial relationship with the author;
2. If they work, have worked, or published works with the author;
3. If they plan to work with the author in a similar research project or proposal in the future; and
4. If they are currently working or have previously published on a similar subject.

Peer reviewers must report any conflict of interest to the editor, either after the invitation to review or during the evaluation process.

Evaluation Processes and Timescales

If an article complies with the journal's policies, the editorial team begins the search for peer reviewers. Evaluation times may vary; on average, four to six weeks are required to complete the process, including one week to select reviewers and another week to ask for their availability. The evaluation period takes three to four weeks. The invitation letter includes the title, abstract, and expected deadline for submission to *Psicogente*. If a peer reviewer declines the invitation, they will be asked to recommend a colleague who may be available to evaluate the work; if

the peer reviewer accepts the invitation, the manuscript will be sent to them, without the author's identification data to ensure double-blind evaluation. During evaluation, the reviewer may include specific comments to facilitate the evaluation process; they will be asked to opt for author/user as their username/initials if they wish to add comments while retaining anonymity. The evaluation guidelines and form setting out the criteria to be used to evaluate the article should be reviewed and filled out carefully. Further, the evaluation form must be filled with care and include the reviewer's personal details and signature. The entire process is conducted through the OJS. If, for exceptional reasons beyond the reviewer's control, they are unable to follow the stated deadline for submitting their decision, the editor expects to hear from the reviewer prior to the delivery time to agree on a new deadline. The criteria for evaluating the article in question must be documented carefully by providing responses to the points below:

1. The relationship between the article and the journal (relevance)
2. Formal aspects of the article
3. The article's content and general aspects.

These will be rated according to a scale ranging from "Very good" to "Good," "Fair," "Little," and "Poor"—the lowest grade.

The general assessment criterion enables the reviewer to provide a quantitative assessment of their expert opinion; the highest score is four (4), with one (1) being the lowest. This should be taken together with the qualitative assessment: accepting the article as is, accepting the article with some suggestions, accepting the article after a comprehensive review, or rejecting the article. Finally, a space for brief comments or suggestions for authors shall be provided (50 words as a minimum).

As a reviewer, you will have an approximate deadline of 15 days to return the assessment via email. This deadline may be extended based on your specific issues or on request. On average, the peer review process takes 6–12 weeks.

Certificate

After the review process, *Psicogente* will send a certificate in appreciation for your work as a token of gratitude for your cooperation and for sharing your time and experience in this process of scientific dissemination; you are free to share the certificate as you wish. To receive this certificate, the reviewer must be duly registered on the OJS platform. The name of the reviewer will be published in the journal to thank them for their involvement as an evaluator.

Evaluation Form

Psicogente considers it important that authors and reviewers familiarize themselves with the article evaluation process and the criteria used to assess manuscripts.

The key part of our editorial process is the review process, which allows us to identify articles that meet the quality standards for publication. The review model of the journal follows the double-blind methodology, that is, neither the author nor the peer reviewer knows the other's identity. *Psicogente* accepts research and review articles.

Research Articles: An original, unpublished work that presents the results of a concluded research project in a detailed and organized manner; it includes the following sections: abstract, introduction, method, results, discussion, and conclusion (IMRaD).

Review Articles: An original, unpublished work that is the result of a study in which the most recent and relevant works in the research field in question are compiled, organized, and analyzed in a systematic manner; the review article also presents the evolution of a topic by providing a broad overview of current trends, disputes, and discussion.

The following should be noted:

1. The reviewer must use the evaluation form to assess the manuscripts received.
2. The material sent and the evaluation result subsequently disclosed should remain confidential. This information can neither be shared nor used outside this process.
3. Confidentiality and anonymity should be preserved.
4. The existence of any type of conflict of interest that may prevent unbiased evaluation must be declared.
5. Reviewers should reject the assignment if the subject of the article is not in line with their academic profile or thematic expertise.
6. The quality of the article must be objectively reviewed.
7. Please be clear and technical and justify your feedback. *Psicogente* and the authors appreciate any comment that would contribute to improving the article.
8. Please be objective and neutral in your reviews and provide support for your opinions and constructive comments. *Psicogente* requires peer reviewers to avoid making disrespectful, personal, and unnecessary comments.
9. Refrain from making demands to authors that may exceed the research limits and objectives.
10. Inform the editor of the existence of any similarity between the article and any other work that has been previously published or is under review.
11. The article should be checked for plagiarism and self-plagiarism.
12. Inform the editor of any suspicion or doubt with regard to data manipulation, data veracity, or bias in research.
13. Check the data sources used in the article and suggest modifications, if necessary.
14. Submit the evaluations requested on time and inform the editor in advance in case of expected delays.

Conflicts of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when the peer reviewer is unable to assess the article objectively or impartially. This situation can arise in any of the following situations:

1. If the reviewer has a personal, familial, professional or commercial relationship with the author;
2. If they work, have worked, or have published works with the author;
3. If they plan to work with the author in a similar research project or proposal in the future; and
4. If they are currently working or have previously published on a similar subject.

Peer reviewers must report any conflict of interest to the editor, either after receiving the invitation to review or during the evaluation process.

[Evaluation Form](#)