Indications for External Reviewers of «Sophia»

The **Board of External Reviewers of «Sophia»** is an independent collegiate body whose purpose is to guarantee the excellence of this scientific publication, because the blind evaluation - based exclusively on the quality of the contents of the manuscripts and carried out by experts of recognized International prestige in the field - is, without a doubt, the best guarantee for the advancement of science and to preserve in this header an original and valuable scientific production.

To this end, the **Board of External Reviewers** is made up of several scholars and international scientists specialized in **Education**, essential to select the articles of the greatest impact and interest for the international scientific community. This in turn allows that all the articles selected to publish in «**Sophia**» have an academic endorsement and objectifiable reports on the originals.

Of course, all reviews in «**Sophia**» use the internationally standardized system of double-blind peer evaluation that guarantees the anonymity of manuscripts and reviewers. As a measure of transparency, the complete lists of reviewers are published on the official website of the journal http://Sophia.ups.edu.ec/)

1. Criteria for acceptance/rejection of manuscript evaluation

The editorial team of «**Sophia**» selects those that are considered more qualified in the subject of the manuscript from the list of reviewers of the Board of Reviewers. While the publication requires the maximum collaboration of reviewers to expedite the evaluations and reports on each original, acceptance of the review must be linked to:

a. **Expertise**. Acceptance necessarily entails the possession of competences in the specific theme of the article to be evaluated.
b. **Availability**. Reviewing an original takes time and involves careful reflection on many aspects.
c. **Conflict of interests**. In case of identification of the authorship of the manuscript (despite their anonymity), excessive academic or family closeness to their authors, membership in the same University, Department, Research Group, Thematic Network, Research Projects, joint publications with authors ... or any other type of connection or conflict / professional proximity; The reviewer must reject the publisher's invitation for review.
d. **Commitment of confidentiality.** Reception of a manuscript for evaluation requires the Reviewer to express a commitment of confidentiality, so that it cannot be divulged to a third party throughout the process.

Sophia 24: 2018.

ISSN impreso:1390-3861 / ISSN electrónico: 1390-8626, pp. 360-364.

In the event that the reviewer cannot carry out the activity for some of these reasons or other justifiable reasons, he/she must notify the publisher by the same route that he/she has received the invitation, specifying the reasons for rejection.

2. General criteria for the evaluation of manuscripts

a) Topic

In addition to being valuable and relevant to the scientific community, the topic that is presented in the original must be limited and specialized in time and space, without excessive localism.

b) Redaction

The critical assessment in the review report must be objectively written, providing content, quotes or references of interest to support its judgment.

c) Originality

As a fundamental criterion of quality, an article must be original, unpublished and suitable. In this sense, reviewers should answer these three questions in the evaluation:

- Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to justify publication?
- Does it contribute anything to the knowledge canon?
- Is the research question relevant?

A quick literature search using repositories such as Web of Knowledge, Scopus and Google Scholar to see if the research has been previously covered, may be helpful.

d) Structure

Manuscripts that refer to «Sophia» must follow the IMRDC structure, except those that are literature reviews or specific studies. In this sense, the originals must contain summary, introduction, methodology, results, discussion and conclusion.

- The **title, abstract, and keywords** should accurately describe the content of the article.
- The **review of the literature** should summarize the state of the question of the most recent and adequate research for the presented work. It will be especially evaluated with criteria of suitability and that the references are to works of high impact - especially in

ISSN impreso:1390-3861 / ISSN electrónico: 1390-8626, pp. 360-364.

WoS, Scopus, Scielo, etc. It should also include the general explanation of the study, its central objective and the followed methodological design.

- In case of research, in the **materials and methods**, the author must specify how the data, the process and the instruments used to respond to the hypothesis, the validation system, and all the information necessary to replicate the study are collected.
- **Results** must be clearly specified in logical sequence. It is important to check if the figures or charts presented are necessary or, if not, redundant with the content of the text.
- In the **discussion**, the data obtained should be interpreted in the light of the literature review. Authors should include here if their article supports or contradicts previous theories. The conclusions will summarize the advances that the research presents in the area of scientific knowledge, the future lines of research and the main difficulties or limitations for carrying out the research.
- **Language**: It will be positively assessed if the language used facilitates reading and is in favor of the clarity, simplicity, precision and transparency of the scientific language. The Reviewer should not proceed to correction, either in Spanish or English, but will inform the Editors of these grammatical or orthographical and typographical errors.
- Finally, a thorough **review of the references** is required in case any relevant work has been omitted. The references must be precise, citing within the logic of the subject at study, its main works as well as the documents that most resemble the work itself, as well as the latest research in the area.

3. Relevant valuation dimensions

For the case of empirical research articles**,** «**Sophia**» uses an evaluation matrix of each original that responds to the editorial criteria and to compliance with the publication guidelines. In this sense, the reviewers must attend to the qualitative-quantitative assessment of each of the aspects proposed in this matrix with criteria of objectivity, reasoning, logic and expertise.

ISSN impreso:1390-3861 / ISSN electrónico: 1390-8626, pp. 360-364.

If the original is a review of the literature (status of the matter) or other type of study (reports, proposals, experiences, among others), the Editorial Board will send to the reviewers a different matrix, including the characteristics of Structure of this type of originals:

REPORTS, STUDIES, PROPOSALS, EXPERIENCES	
Valuable items	**P.**
01. Title and abstract (clarity and structure)	0/5
02. Thematic relevance	0/10
03. Review of the literature	0/10
04. Structure and organization of the article 05. Argumentative capabilities and coherence 06. Scientific redaction	0/10
07. Original contributions 08. Conclusions	0/10
09. Quotations 10. References	0/5
Total	50

RESEARCHES	
Valuable items	**P.**
01. **Title and abstract (clarity and structure)**	0/5
02. Thematic relevance 03. Originality of the work 04. Review of the literature	0/10
05. Structure and organization of the article 06. Argumentative capabilities 07. Redaction	0/10
08. Methodological rigor 09. Research instruments	0/10
10. Research results 11. Advances 12. Discussion 13. Conclusions	0/10
14. Quotations (variety and richness) 15. References	0/5
Total	50

Sophia 24: 2018.

ISSN impreso:1390-3861 / ISSN electrónico: 1390-8626, pp. 360-364.

4. Ethical issues

a. **Plagiarism***:* Although the journal uses plagiarism detection systems, if the reviewer suspects that an original is a substantial copy of another work, he must immediately inform the Editors citing the previous work in as much detail as possible.
b. **Fraud**: If there is real or remote suspicion that the results in an article are false or fraudulent, it is necessary to inform them to the Editors.

5. Evaluation of the originals

After the quantitative-qualitative evaluation of the manuscript under review, the reviewer may make recommendations to improve the quality of the manuscript. However, the manuscript will be graded in three ways:

a. **Rejection** due to detected deficiencies justified and reasoned with quantitative and quantitative assessment. . The report should be longer if a score of less than 40 of the 50 possible points is obtained.
b. **Acceptance without review**
c. **Conditional acceptance** and therefore review (greater or lesser). In the latter case, it is necessary to clearly identify which review is necessary, listing the comments and even specifying paragraphs and pages suggesting modifications.

ISSN impreso:1390-3861 / ISSN electrónico: 1390-8626, pp. 360-364.