

EVALUATION RULES FOR REVIEWERS OF THE JOURNAL ECONOMÍA Y NEGOCIOS UTE

1. General Information

The Council of External Reviewers of ECONOMÍA Y NEGOCIOS UTE is a collegiate body made up of national and foreign experts of great prestige in their areas, which guarantees the quality of the publications in this scientific journal by evaluating the articles under the double-blind scheme. This team is in charge of issuing its criteria on the novelty, rigor, relevance and impact of the articles that are submitted for evaluation.

Manuscript evaluation is carried out by a group of experts from the Council of International Reviewers, which allows the selection of the best articles to be published. On the other hand, the author obtains an objective report of the strengths and weaknesses of the same. The review process is confidential and all those involved undertake to maintain it, as well as to demand it from those who, in one way or another, are consulted on a manuscript or topic. Reviewers will maintain objectivity and accuracy in their comments, which will respect elementary standards of courtesy among colleagues. The entire review process is done through the OJS 3 Platform.

The Council of International Reviewers is made up of academics independent of the Editorial Team, which allows them to evaluate manuscripts with complete confidentiality, autonomy and independence. The team of reviewers of Economía y Negocios UTE is public on our website <https://revistas.ute.edu.ec/index.php/economia-y-negocios/about/editorialTeam>

2. Criteria for Acceptance / Rejection of the Manuscript

The editors of Economía y Negocios UTE request, through an invitation, the collaboration of the Reviewer who they consider is empowered to carry out the evaluation of the manuscript, given their knowledge and expertise on the subject, as well as their interests in the research area. The participation of the Reviewers is essential in the process of sending reports to the authors in terms of deadlines and publication processes. However, acceptance to evaluate a manuscript is related to:

- a) Knowledge and experience in the subject of the article. The Reviewer must have the necessary skills to give their criteria, regarding the content of the manuscript.
- b) Time availability. Reviewing and evaluating a manuscript takes hours of work and analysis.
- c) Conflict of interests. If the Reviewer detects that there are conflicts of interest due to the suspicion of loss of anonymity of the authors, or that there may be closeness to the University or research group, as well as some personal or professional relationship, this incident must be recorded as a justification to refuse to carry it out.
- d) Confidentiality commitment. The receipt of a manuscript under review implies a commitment to its confidentiality, so that the Reviewer is not able to share it with third

parties. Any existing doubts before an additional opinion on the part of another person must be consulted in advance with the Editor.

If for any reason mentioned above, the Reviewer cannot carry out the evaluation process of the manuscript, he (or she) must notify the Editor through the platform, indicating the reasons why he (or she) rejects the invitation.

3. The Review Functions

The task of the external reviewer, as a blind peer, is to objectively and constructively analyze the content of the manuscript to collaborate with the Editors in making a decision: if the work under review contains parameters of high scientific quality and meets all the parameters to be accepted and subsequently published. The reviewers will provide a technical report of the manuscript to the Associate Editors. This report contains the criteria of quality, originality, clarity and relevance of the article.

4. General Criteria for Evaluating Manuscripts

The general criteria that the Reviewer must evaluate in the manuscript are centered on four axes:

- a) **Originality of the manuscript.** Since technology is constantly advancing, our journal seeks originality and novelty in each of the manuscripts received. The Reviewer can make use of tools such as Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science, among other bases of scientific sources, to see the importance and relevance of the research topic. The central theme of the manuscript must be novel and relevant, so that it is attractive to the scientific community; this must be specific to be covered in detail throughout the article. The summary is a very important element of the document, it should describe in a few words the work carried out, highlight the most relevant points of the work and include a brief synthesis of the main conclusions reached, without covering them all. The introduction should contain the current state of the problem (related works or state of the art), including the most relevant similar studies and highlighting their approaches, pros and cons. In addition, in this it is correctly indicated what the investigation consists of, the proposed objectives, antecedents and hypotheses.
- b) **Rigorousness of the manuscript.** The methodology must be precisely described with the procedure carried out during the design, experimentation and testing of the hypothesis. Timely introduces the resources, materials and methods used in each part of the process. The results should explain the work product clearly, where measurement or quantification data can be presented. The discussion interprets the results according to similar studies, that is, it must correlate the results of the study with others carried out and state advantages and contributions avoiding adjectives that praise the results. Regarding the revision of the references, it must be done exhaustively, so that relevant works are not omitted within the document. These references must correspond to research within the subject and current affairs.
- c) **Clarity of the manuscript.** Regarding the language, if the manuscript presents syntactic and (or) semantic grammatical errors in Spanish or English, which make it difficult to read

and understand it, the Reviewer should not proceed to review. In this case, the Editor must be informed so that the article is returned to the author and, where appropriate, be forwarded, complying with the parameters required by the regulations. Regarding the use of tables and figures, the reviewer will determine their relevance in order to clarify the text of the article (number and form).

- d) **Relevance of the manuscript.** The conclusions should specify what results were obtained and if they allowed to meet the objectives, raise perspectives of the study, the application of the results and future work. Finally, at this point, it will be assessed whether the research carried out makes a contribution to the state of the art in an adequate way.

5. Ethical Issues

The Reviewers undertake to confidentially notify the Editors of any suspicion of unethical conduct or fraud in the results of the manuscripts, such as the detection of total or partial plagiarism, citing the original work as far as possible.

6. Manuscript Evaluation Process in OJS 3.0

Reviewers must access the online system of the magazine Economía y Negocios UTE, using their username and password, following the instructions shown in the URL of the journal: <https://bit.ly/44rhR8a>. In case of doubt, it is suggested to follow the detailed instructions by [clicking here](#). It is also recommended to review the [Regulations for Authors](#) available on the website.

7. Evaluation Report

The journal Reviewers, after deeply analyzing the manuscript, contrasting the information provided in it and reviewing the scientific literature that supports the document, will inform the Editors about the relevance of accepting or rejecting it. The evaluation report will consist of completing the external peer review protocol, which quantitatively evaluates four dimensions, following the steps in Table 1.

Table 1

Weights of the evaluated parameters.

Evaluated Parameter	Weight
Originality of the manuscript	20 points
Rigorousness of the manuscript	40 points
Clarity of the manuscript	20 points
Relevance of the manuscript	20 points

In each of these dimensions, the Reviewer will quantitatively assess the parameters to be evaluated. After assigning a rating, it will issue its observations, suggestions and comments that justify the assessment made. In addition, for specific comments, the Reviewer will fill out a comments section for the author, which will contain suggestions that have not been considered in the previous points.

Finally, the Reviewer may suggest, based on the evaluation carried out, if the article submitted for evaluation classifies in one of the categories that appear in Table 2.

Table 2

Decision of the manuscript.

Recommendation	Evaluation
Accept without modifications	91 – 100
Accept with minor modifications	90 – 71
Accept with major modifications	70 – 51
Reject	0 – 50

The comments made must be clear, concise, objective and supported, so that the author and editors can understand the suggestions made and the decision regarding the acceptance or not of the manuscript. Reviewers are encouraged to maintain a formal and friendly language in their comments.

8. Manuscript Evaluation Protocol for External Reviewers

The manuscript evaluation protocol to be evaluated by external peer reviewers refers to the rubric detailed below.

ORIGINALITY OF THE MANUSCRIPT		
Evaluated parameter	Evaluation	Comments and observations
Is the general topic of the research original, current and relevant?	/2	
Is the title novel and does it encompass the research presented in the document?	/2	
Does the summary highlight the most relevant points of the work, does it include a brief synthesis of the main conclusions reached, without covering them all?	/4	
Does the manuscript present the current state of the problem (related works, state of the art or literature review), by including the most relevant similar studies and highlighting their approaches, pros and cons?	/6	
Does the manuscript correctly indicate what the investigation consists of, the proposed objectives, antecedents and hypotheses?	/6	
Total	/20	

RIGOROUSNESS OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Evaluated parameter	Evaluation	Comments and observations
Does the methodology accurately describe the procedure performed during the design, experimentation, and testing of the hypothesis? Does it accurately and timely introduce the resources, materials and methods used in each part of the process?	/10	
Are the results obtained conclusive and are they consistent with the objectives and hypotheses of the article?	/10	
Does the discussion interpret the results obtained, correlating them with other related works? Does it state the advantages of the study and its contributions, as well as the difficulties faced?	/10	
Is the bibliography relevant, up-to-date and sufficient?	/10	
Total	/40	

CLARITY OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Evaluated parameter	Evaluation	Comments and observations
Is the manuscript written in clear language so that it is easy to follow and understand?	/10	
Are the figures and tables of good quality and do they contribute to a better understanding of the subject? Are all figures and tables correctly entered and explained in the text?	/10	
Total	/20	

RELEVANCE OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Evaluated parameter	Evaluation	Comments and observations
Do the conclusions and recommendations specify and specify the results obtained and did they allow the objectives to be met? Do they raise perspectives for the study, and the applicability of the results?	/15	
Does the manuscript contribute to the state of the art in an adequate way?	/5	
Total	/20	

MAIN PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

--

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE AUTHOR (S)

(Any additional recommendation to improve the article, expansion of the revised points, justification of the decisions taken, among others).

--

FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Please place an "X" in the option that applies according to your evaluation

	Accept without modifications (Evaluation between 91 and 100 points)
	Accept with minor modifications (Evaluation between 71 and 90 points)
	Accept with major modifications (Evaluation between 51 and 70 points)
	Reject (Evaluation less than 50 points)