

Evaluation process

Revista Ean

Revista Ean applies the **DOUBLE BLIND REVIEW PROCESS** in the manuscript evaluation process, meaning that both authors and reviewers remain anonymous to each other throughout the evaluation.

All manuscripts received are subjected to a rigorous evaluation process in order to guarantee the quality and scientific rigor of the publication. Therefore, the reviewers should take into account the following general selection criteria:

Thematic relevance: Assess the coherence between the manuscript's content and the journal's research lines, including those contemplated in special issues. This criterion is related to the formulation of the problem, the proposed objectives, the scope of the study, among others.

Scientific quality: Evaluate the methodological rigor, consistency of the analysis, and strength of the argumentation of the manuscript. The articulation between the theoretical framework, research design, analysis of results and conclusions is considered.

Originality: Examine the manuscript's novel contributions to the field, either through an innovative approach, important findings or the proposal of new conceptual or methodological perspectives.

Clarity in the argumentation: Evaluate the logical flow of the text, the clarity of writing, and coherence in the development of ideas and the clarity of the writing, factors that facilitate the comprehension of the content by the readers.

Compliance with editorial parameters: Review the manuscript's adherence to the journal's submission guidelines established by the journal, including formal aspects such as format, length, structure and citation.

Reviewers are committed to submit their evaluations objectively and constructively, within the established deadlines, thus contributing to the academic strengthening of the publication. To know in detail the commitments acquired in this role, it is recommended to consult the journal's ethic code, access it in the following link [*Ethic code and good editorial practices.*](#)

Evaluation process:

Once the thematic focus of each edition has been defined and the editorial calendar has been established by the journal's editorial committee, the respective calls for papers are published.

After the closing of each call for papers, the editorial committee meets to verify the initial requirements of the manuscripts received, in relation to their typology, compliance with the established presentation guidelines and the relationship with the thematic focus.

Once this first evaluation filter has been passed, all authors are notified of the corresponding result. Those texts that have passed this first stage go through a review process by external peers, who are selected and assigned according to their knowledge and experience in the field of the text to be evaluated.

The evaluation is conducted using the journal's official review format, which is sent to the peer reviewers together with the text of the article, the general indications for its completion and a notification indicating the deadline for the review. You can consult the format in the following link [*Peer evaluation of articles in an institutional scientific journal.*](#)

The evaluation format is structured around two main dimensions: formal structure and content quality. Each dimension is subdivided into multiple criteria, each rated on a numerical scale from 1 to 10—where 1 is the lowest score and 10 the highest—accompanied by a written justification. The total score, obtained from the sum of all ratings, forms the basis for the overall evaluation and final recommendation regarding the article's publication, as follows:

RATING	EVALUATION	CONCEPT
100 - 90	EXCELLENT	Publishable and requires no adjustments
89 - 80	VERY GOOD	Publishable with minimal adjustments
79 - 70	GOOD	Publishable with medium level adjustments
69 - 60	ACCEPTABLE	Publishable with significant adjustments
59 - 0	NOT ACCEPTABLE	Not publishable.

Based on the concept issued by the reviewer, each author is informed, including the feedback with the observations and suggestions derived from the evaluation process, as well as the request for adjustments, if required. In the latter case, a specific deadline is set for the delivery of the adjusted version, which will be subsequently verified by the same reviewers. In the event of any controversy, the editor, together with the editorial committee, will make the final decision and issue the corresponding verdict.

Estimated time for evaluation:

To ensure a rigorous and timely evaluation process, the following average timeframes are estimated for each phase:

First stage - Editorial Committee: This phase takes place at the end of the call for papers period, once all the articles submitted to the editorial process have been compiled. Since the meetings are scheduled by coordinating the agendas of the committee members according to their availability, the average response time is approximately 3 months.

Second stage - External peers: Considering the response times to the invitations addressed to external peers and their availability to carry out the corresponding readings, it is estimated that the average time for the issuance of the verdict in this phase is approximately 3 months.