



Estudios Eclesiásticos

Revista de investigación e información teológica y canónica

Reviewers Guidelines

This document is a guide to reviewing an article via the *Estudios Eclesiásticos* website.

We are asking for your opinion in order to assess the originality and importance of the proposed article, to improve — if possible — the quality of the article, to ensure that the author is aware of previous outstanding research and to highlight any omissions in the list of references.

Here are some guidelines to keep in mind to help you in your evaluation.

If, as a reviewer, you detect any personal, professional or financial interest or conflict that prevents you from making an objective assessment, please inform the journal editor. Further information is available in [code of ethics](#).

Evaluate the manuscript honestly, objectively and critically, writing your comments as if you were writing to the author — whenever possible — using a constructive tone, so that the editor and the author can clearly understand your reasoning, detailing in which cases it is your own opinion and avoiding derogatory-sounding expressions. Keep an open perspective, avoiding dismissing theories that may conflict with your own views.

It should consider if the author states his or her perspective on the research and if the theoretical framework guides the approach of the study. The methodology employed should be appropriate and used in a consistent manner. Likewise, the literature review should be adequate and the conclusions should be appropriate and achieve their objective.

The arguments put forward should have merit and if they do not, try to pass on guidelines to the author to make the manuscript more reliable.

If you think the author could use other sources to strengthen his or her arguments or if there are more up-to-date sources, reflect this in the report.

Assess whether you think the manuscript will advance research in your field and whether it will have value and impact in the field of theology or canon law.

Inform the editor if you find that the manuscript contains duplicate or redundant results. Of course, report any signs of plagiarism that you detect.

Also, if the review identifies areas in which you are not an expert, please indicate this in the comments so that the editor can take it into consideration.

We remind you that you must maintain the confidentiality of the evaluated text until its publication, refraining from consulting with other colleagues.

In order to increase transparency, the journal *Estudios Eclesiásticos* asks its reviewers to carry out the evaluation through its website, as the entire evaluation process is recorded within the system.

Manuscripts submitted by authors undergo an initial review by a member of the journal's editorial board to decide whether to initiate the formal peer review procedure.

First, the journal editor will send you an email invitation informing you that you have been selected to review one of the manuscripts received by the journal. In this communication you will find instructions on how to access the journal's website as an authorised reviewer.

Dear college

I believe that you would serve as an excellent reviewer of the manuscript «Title of the article», which has been submitted to *Estudios Eclesiásticos*. The submission's abstract is inserted below, and I hope that you will consider undertaking this important task for us.

Please log into the journal web site by YY-MM-DD to indicate whether you will undertake the review or not, as well as to access the submission and to record your review and recommendation. The web site is

<https://revistas.comillas.edu/index.php/estudioseclesiacos>

The review itself is due YY-MM-DD

Submission URL: <https://revistas.comillas.edu/index.php/estudioseclesiacos/xxxx>

If you do not have your username and password for the journal's web site, you can use this link to reset your password (which will then be emailed to you along with your username).

<https://revistas.comillas.edu/index.php/estudioseclesiacos/login/lostPassword>

Thank you for considering this request.

[Estudios Eclesiásticos. Revista de investigación e información teológica y canónica](#)

Dr. Gabino Uribarrí Bilbao | Director
C/ Universidad Comillas, 3. 28049 – Madrid (Spain)
Tel. +34 91 734 39 59 - Ext. 2652
guribarr@comillas.edu

If you wish, you can reset your password (which will then be emailed to you along with your username).

The first step is to inform the editor whether to accept or reject the review request:

Review Schedule

2016-08-30

Editor's Request

2016-09-20

Response Due Date

2016-09-27

Review Due Date

You will find additional information, like important dates. According to the regulations of the journal, you have 4 weeks to complete it. If you need more time, please contact the editor.

If you accept, you will move to review step 2, where you would be able to read reviewer guidelines provided by the journal.

**Review: approach for externalization of expert tacit knowledge**

1. Request 2. Guidelines **3. Download & Review** 4. Completion

Reviewer Guidelines

Please complete the review with a constructive perspective.

[Continue to Step #3](#)

[Go Back](#)

Hit **Continue** to move to step 3. From here you can download a copy of the review files and enter your review comments.

Review Files

[Search](#)



163-1

Author, submission-manuscript.docx

Article Text

In order to facilitate your task and to make the evaluation as objective as possible, we have provided you with a form to fill in. Please, fill in the fields with your rating (5 being the highest score). Please note that fields marked with an asterisk are mandatory. You have one free field for additional comments or suggestions. Please use this field if you are inclined to reject the publication of the article or if you consider that improvements are necessary or highly desirable, as long as required, so that we can inform the author accordingly. The journal jealously preserves the anonymity of its reviewers.

Template for the assessment of original papers - 2023

Purposes of this assessment

- To assess the originality, contributions and importance of the article.
- To improve, if possible, the quality of the article.
- To ensure that the author is aware of previous outstanding research and highlight any relevant omissions in the reference list.
- To assist editors in making the right decision on the publication of the article.
- To report, if detected, any plagiarism or self-plagiarism.

Using the questions under each item as a guide, rate the article, keeping in mind that **1** is the **lowest** rating and **5** the **highest**. In the last item you have space for a free comment, which is very helpful in making the correct decision.

1. Title, abstract and keywords *

How well do they express the object of study? (Rate from 1 to 5)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

There is a section for uploading additional files for consultation by the editor, should this be necessary. We remind you to comment on the article file itself and upload it, either by using the Word comment or by writing in a different colour or highlighting it.

Upload

Upload files you would like the editor and/or author to consult, including revised versions of the original review file(s).

Reviewer Files	Search	Upload File
No Files		



Next, you must then make your recommendation using the dropdown menu.

Recommendation

Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

Choose One

Submit Review

[Go Back](#)

* Denotes required field

Your choices include:

Accept Submission: it is ready to go to Copyediting as is.

Revisions Required: it requires minor changes that can be reviewed and accepted by the editor.

Resubmit for Review: it requires major changes and another round of peer review.

Resubmit Elsewhere: it doesn't seem like a good fit for the focus and scope of this journal.

Decline Submission: it has too many weakness to ever be accepted.

Finally, hit the Submit Review button to complete your task. You'll be asked to confirm.

You will be taken to the final confirmation screen thanking you for your work.

Review: *approach for externalization of expert tacit knowledge*

[1. Request](#)

[2. Guidelines](#)

[3. Download & Review](#)

[4. Completion](#)

Review Submitted

Thank you for completing the review of this submission. Your review has been submitted successfully. We appreciate your contribution to the quality of the work that we publish; the editor may contact you again for more information if needed.