Guidelines of the Revista Española de Pedagogía (REP) for the evaluation of articles

1. The principle of "double-blind" is followed, meaning that neither the reviewer knows the name of the article's author nor are the authors informed of the person(s) who reviewed it.

2. Before conducting a more in-depth review of the original, it must be clear whether the work in question is eligible for publication in the journal. Expressly, the following will not be accepted:

    a) Papers that do not address some aspect of education.

    b) Papers that have already been published elsewhere in other languages, in whole or in part.

    c) Papers that lack the specific unity that characterizes an article are mere sections of a future book or chapters of a completed and published thesis, among others.

    d) Essays or those that merely express opinions and are not based on verified research.

    e) Papers that are reduced to another validation of an external test are adopted without personal research.

    f) Papers are known to have been submitted simultaneously to another journal.

If the submitted work meets the characteristics indicated in these points, it will be returned to the Editorial Board.

3. The journal is defined by its research nature, universal vocation, desire to illuminate the different dimensions of educational action and purpose of contributing to more lucid professional practice. All of these factors have significant consequences when selecting manuscripts. Among these, we cite the following.

    a) The results of local research projects organized around surveys usually achieve modest general interest and receive little attention.

    b) Works of little interest will also be rejected due to their limited theoretical ambition, such as being limited, for example, to the history of an irrelevant school or a person whose contribution to pedagogy was insignificant, among others.

4. Evaluating the research nature of a work requires consideration of its uniqueness. It is essential to assess the author's rationale, knowledge of the universal scientific literature on the topic, order, precision, depth in the problem statement, richness of ideas, critical thinking, and maturity of proposals. Depending on the type of research, its design, relevance of the data collected, and analysis will need to be considered.

5. It is also necessary to assess readability and attractiveness. It must be clear, linguistically correct, and adhere to the journal's formal criteria, as detailed in the Instructions for Authors available online. In addition, it is also necessary to assess

   a) Whether the title reflects the content is attractive.

   b) Whether the article includes a presentation of the problem, a development, a discussion, and conclusions, which should be substantially found in the Abstract. It is important to remember that the databases only present this Abstract, so the article will be read to the extent that it is attractive.

6. Of particular interest are those that promote lucid professional practice, are less subject to current trends, are more effective, and are more fulfilling for the pedagogue, teacher, or anyone working in the educational world.

7. Authors must follow Revista Española de Pedagogía's policy on using artificial intelligence (AI) and declare their compliance before submitting papers for review by the journal. They must also comply with equality and equity policies and gender/sex considerations in the submitted research. Failure to comply with these policies may result in the rejection of the article. Reviewers are also expected to consider this policy in their evaluation. Likewise, the reviewers agree with the following:

   a) Not uploading articles to generative AI tools for review.

   b) Do not use generative AI or AI-assisted technologies to aid the review of this article.

   c) Reviewers can refuse to review articles if the AI has been misused. They must inform the REP Editorial Committee of this fact through communication channels established for the review process in the previously submitted application.

   d) Reviewers may use generative AI tools to ensure that the authors' declaration does not violate review terms.

   e) Reviewers must provide unequivocal information about the use of AI in the article under review, either through the review template or comments associated with the review process.

   f) Reviewers must provide information that helps assess the article's compliance with other policies considered in the REP.

8. The evaluation results vary widely. Some works will be approved without any modifications. Others will be rejected outright. However, there will also be those approved with minor improvements or considered interesting only if they introduce changes of specific significance. The report must indicate which of these options the evaluator supports without prejudice to the possibility of expressing a grading for any of them. If the necessary changes are significant and numerous, or if the quality of the original is considered acceptable or poor, it is generally rejected.

9. Please submit your evaluation report before the application date.

Please follow the outline below when submitting your report:

I. Numbered comments from the author (and editor):

General comments:

The study...

Specific comments:

1.

2.

…

Major comments:

1.

2.

…

Minor comments:

1.

2.

…

II.1. Confidential Comments for Editors:

Please indicate your assessment, paying special attention to the following aspects: the study is ethical; the material is original; previous/related work is adequately discussed and cited; the writing is clear; the study methods are appropriate; AI has been used appropriately in compliance with the journal's policy (https://www.revistadepedagogia.org/rep/policies.html); compliance with other editorial policies established in the REP; the data are valid; the conclusions are reasonable and supported by the data; the information is relevant; and the topic is interesting to our readers.

…

…

…

…

II.2. Indicate any potential conflicts of interest that could interfere with your objectivity.

 …

II.3. If there is any part of the manuscript that you cannot review owing to a lack of expertise in the subject matter (e.g., statistics or English), please specify it here. If you have suggestions for external reviewers who can evaluate the relevant sections, please do so here.