

Reviewers Guidelines

CÁTEDRA
FRANCISCO JOSÉ AYALA
DE CIENCIA, TECNOLOGÍA
Y RELIGIÓN



razón y fe

revista de cultura fundada en 1901



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](#).

Razón y Fe has provided you with a form to assist you in this task to be completed. Please use the field dedicated to comments, as long as you require, in order to inform the editor and the author. If you find it more convenient, you can attach a file with your comments and indications and upload it to the platform. Also, if you prefer, you can make comments on the article file, using another colour or marking it with colour shading. In this case, please anonymize the document. In any case, you must fill in the general form, even if you then analyse the details using one of these means. Regardless of how you submit your review, confidentiality is guaranteed.

Your evaluation will help the editor to make a decision as to whether or not the article should be published in Reason and Faith and will help the author to improve his or her article, so we ask that, once you have read the manuscript, if possible, you take a short period of reflection so that you can analyse it in greater depth from your expert opinion.

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 add value and impact in the field of science-religion dialogue.

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 *Razón y Fe* 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 *Razón y Fe*. 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/razonyfe>

The review itself is due YY-MM-DD

Submission URL: <https://revistas.comillas.edu/index.php/razonyfe/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/razonyfe/login/lostPassword>

Thank you for considering this request.

[Razón y Fe](#)

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.

Review form

Topic relevance (rate from 1 to 5) *

Please explain your answer

Originality and quality of the article (rate from 1 to 5) *

Coherence in the articulation of objectives (rate from 1 to 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	Q 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.

* 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.

The author will be informed of your opinion and your suggestions for improvement, if any.

Thank you for your collaboration with the journal *Razón y Fe*.