

Peer Review: A Fundamental Pillar of Scientific Publishing

Revisión por pares: pilar fundamental de la publicación científica

Revisão por pares: pilar fundamental da publicação científica

A journal is considered refereed when the content it publishes has been reviewed by peers. This process, which is essential to the quality of scientific publications, involves academics and expert researchers dedicating time to reading, evaluating, and writing recommendations that guide the editor's decisions and allow authors to improve their manuscripts.

In the last three years (2023-2025), *Ciencias Psicológicas* has invited a total of 925 potential reviewers. Almost a third of them (297) agreed to review articles for our journal. Most of these researchers are affiliated with institutions in Ibero-American countries (27 % Brazil, 16 % Argentina, 15 % Mexico, 8 % Colombia, 7 % Spain), although researchers from other regions have also collaborated. The rest responded that they did not have time to perform the task, that they were already committed to other reviews, recommended other colleagues as potential reviewers, or did not respond at all.

The data show how difficult it is to get two or three reviewers to read and evaluate a manuscript within a reasonable time frame, and this complexity comes up again and again in exchanges between editors of scientific journals. So, what can we do to ensure and strengthen the peer review process?

One fairly obvious and evident measure is to ensure real dialogue between authors, reviewers, and editors. Constructive criticism, the exchange of arguments and ideas, and seeing how learning and improvements to the publication are generated cannot be indifferent to any researcher in a given area of study. The role of the editor in this regard is sophisticated, as it involves finding the actors and creating the channels for that dialogue to be truly fruitful.

The task of a reviewer is specialized and requires dedication. It deserves greater recognition. It seems necessary to engage in dialogue with universities and national research agencies so that this task is given greater prominence and weight in the evaluations of academics and researchers. It is true that not all reviewers undertake the task with the same commitment and rigor. In double-blind reviews, it may be necessary for the editor to rate the review in some way, which is certainly a delicate matter. In open reviews, the contributions of each reviewer are evident, and the entire process is transparent.

Another necessary dialogue concerns the open nature of reviews promoted by the open science movement. Although its spirit is commendable, it raises the following questions: Are we prepared to open up the arbitration process? What would be the acceptance rate of reviews if we adopted this practice? Can we demand this type of arbitration without changing anything else?

These dialogues do not involve each journal and each country, but rather the entire scientific publication ecosystem, and they require specific spaces, such as the roundtable discussion to which *Ciencias Psicológicas* was invited at the 7.^o Congresso Brasileiro Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão. We thank Professors Dr. Mary Sandra Carlotto and Dr. Neuza M. F. Guareschi for their invitation.

Finally, and as could not be otherwise in this editorial note, we thank the reviewers who evaluated articles during 2025 for *Ciencias Psicológicas*. Thanks to their generous contribution, we are closing a volume with 42 articles by authors from Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Spain, the United States, Mexico, Peru, Portugal, and Uruguay.