Cuban Journal of Agricultural Science
ISSN: 0864-0408
ISSN: 2079-3480
Ediciones ICA

Argota Pérez, George
Scientific writing and referee professional training
Cuban Journal of Agricultural Science, vol. 57, e22, 2023
Ediciones ICA

Available in: https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=653774963010

How to cite
Complete issue
More information about this article
Journal's webpage in redalyc.org

Scientific Information System Redalyc
Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America and the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal
Project academic non-profit, developed under the open access initiative

Letter to the editor/Carta al editor

Scientific writing and referee professional training

Escritura científica y formación profesional del árbitro

George Argota Pérez

Centro de Investigaciones Avanzadas y Formación Superior en Educación, Salud y Medio Ambiente "AMTAWI". Perú

Email: george.argota@gmail.com

George Argota Pérez: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2560-6749

Several researchers refer the determining function of the scientific writing in the reflexive construction of knowledge (Chun *et al.* 2022). The scientific writing, as being a complex process because its style and impact of the results (Lu *et al.* 2019, Chen *et al.* 2020 and Ante 2022), require clarity and precision in the information, abilities that with frequency are loss when it is not answer to the research question during the writing process (Simón *et al.* 2020). In consequence, in the scientific field, the feasible, the ethical, the interest, the discoveries and the relevance as criteria to be measure, influence on the decisions of accepting or rejected a paper which is subjected to a checking process for their publication. From this perspective, the referee represents one of the attention centers due to the decision they emit in the publishing process, whose responsibility is to keep the quality and integrity of the scientific literature (Grimaldo *et al.* 2018 and Libby *et al.* 2022).

When it is decided to publish a scientific paper and later it is not cite or is a criticism target by the scientific community, it should exits an indicator which allow the participatory observation of whose has the responsibility of the paper evaluation. Among the determining factor of mistakes on the decisions of not cited a scientific article or criticized, is the tendency of the editorial board to give the scientific papers with subject similarity to the same referee or indicate to the correspondence author recommendations of possible referees with the purpose of speed out the checking process. Both decisions can be obstacles for the guarantee of the journals quality.

Is reprehensible if the referees didn't has opinions which are not been involved to the evaluation exigencies impose by the journals. In fact, is probably that a referee gives service to some scientific journals, and the rules for the acceptation and evaluation of papers differs among them. Therefore, the evaluation by external peers faces at present a critic sight respect to its practice, quality and results. In addition, the aspiration for become permanent (Teele and Thelen 2017), as well as the productivity evaluations in which the quantity with respect to the

Diversas investigaciones refieren la función determinante de la escritura científica en la construcción reflexiva del conocimiento (Chun *et al.* 2022). La escritura científica, al ser un proceso complejo por su estilo e impacto de los resultados (Lu *et al.* 2019, Chen *et al.* 2020 y Ante 2022), exige claridad y precisión en la información, habilidades que con frecuencia se pierden cuando no se responde a la pregunta de investigación durante el proceso mismo de la escritura (Simón *et al.* 2020). En consecuencia, en el ámbito científico, lo factible, lo ético, el interés, los hallazgos y la relevancia como criterios a medir, influyen en las decisiones de aceptar o rechazar un manuscrito que se somete al proceso de revisión para su publicación. Desde esta perspectiva, los evaluadores representan uno de los centros de atención por la decisión que emiten en el proceso editorial, cuya responsabilidad es mantener la calidad e integridad de la literatura científica (Grimaldo *et al.* 2018 y Libby *et al.* 2022).

Cuando se decide publicar un manuscrito científico, y luego no se cita o es diana de críticas por la comunidad científica, debería existir un indicador que permita la observación participativa de quienes tuvieron a su cargo la evaluación del documento. Entre las condicionantes de fallas en las decisiones de no citar un artículo científico o criticarlo, se encuentra la tendencia de los comités editoriales a derivar los manuscritos científicos con similitud temática a los mismos evaluadores o indicar al autor de correspondencia recomendaciones de posibles evaluadores con la finalidad de acelerar el proceso de revisión. Ambas decisiones pueden constituir obstáculos para la garantía de la calidad de las revistas.

Es criticable si los evaluadores adolecen de juicios que son ajenos a las exigencias de evaluación que imponen las propias revistas. De hecho, es probable que un evaluador preste servicio a varias revistas científicas, y que difieran entre ellas las reglas para la aceptación y evaluación de los manuscritos. Por consiguiente, la evaluación por pares externos enfrenta en la actualidad una mirada crítica en cuanto a su práctica, calidad y resultados. Además, la aspiración por lograr la titularidad (Teele y Thelen 2017), así como las evaluaciones de productividad en las que predomina la cantidad con

quality predominates (Edwards and Siddhartha 2017 and Bianchi *et al.* 2018), make these pretentious to challenges the sustainability of the publication system in contexts of hypercompetition (Kovanis *et al.* 2016 and Righi and Takács 2017).

Some analysts state that the peer review is inadequate face to the lack of guarantees to publish the researchers which are innovators, reliable and valid (Macdonald 2015 and Sobkowicz 2015). However, the peer review is a decision of the editorial board to subject to questions that, possibly, improved the papers quality. The arguments which have not been sufficiently solid or probative could be reasons to turn down the paper. Even, these opinions are little promising if they arrive to the referee after the time established. Face to this conflict, the worrying will not be the lateness, will be the interruption or the desertion of the paper checking and the later sending to another journal.

Among the reasons of the lateness in the peer review is considered the subjectivity and the direction of the paper (King *et al.* 2018 and Teplitskiy *et al.* 2018). The exhaustive and easy answers to the comments of the referees should be the professional acknowledgement attitude, although the refereeing decision will be not accepted (Cushman 2023).

Join to the altruism that should be in the relations between the referee experts and author, is essential the knowledge of the principles in the referee professional training (table 1). The fulfillment of the principles will make the evaluation process of the papers be satisfactory, the journal quality increase and the scientific knowledge will transfer to the society.

respecto a la calidad (Edwards y Siddhartha 2017 y Bianchi *et al.* 2018), hacen que estas pretensiones desafíen la sostenibilidad del sistema de publicación en contextos de hipercompetencia (Kovanis *et al.* 2016 y Righi y Takács 2017).

Algunos analistas señalan que la revisión por pares resulta inadecuada ante la falta de garantías para que se publiquen aquellas investigaciones que son innovadoras, confiables y válidas (Macdonald 2015 y Sobkowicz 2015). No obstante, la revisión por pares es una decisión del comité editor para someter a cuestionamientos que, eventualmente, mejorarán la calidad de las publicaciones. Los argumentos que no sean suficientemente sólidos o probatorios pueden ser razones para rechazar un manuscrito. Incluso, estos juicios son poco prometedores si llegan al evaluador después de los plazos que se establecen. Ante este conflicto, lo preocupante no sería el retardo, sino la interrupción o el abandono de la revisión del manuscrito y el posterior envío a otra revista.

Entre las razones de la demora en la revisión por pares se considera la subjetividad y sesgo del dictamen (King *et al.* 2018 y Teplitskiy *et al.* 2018). Las respuestas exhaustivas y fáciles a los comentarios de los evaluadores deben ser las posturas de agradecimiento profesional, aunque no se acepte la decisión arbitral (Cushman 2023).

Unido al altruismo que debe coexistir en las relaciones entre los expertos evaluadores y los autores, es fundamental el dominio de los principios en la formación profesional del árbitro (tabla 1). El cumplimiento de los principios hará que el proceso de evaluación de los manuscritos sea satisfactorio, la calidad de la revista aumente y el conocimiento científico se transfiera a la sociedad.

Table 1. Principles of knowledge in the professional training of the scientific referee

Principles	Description
Basics or generals	Ethic in the review and scientific refereeing
	Methodology training of research
	Statistical significance
Advanced or specifics	Valor gnoseológico y epistemológico en la revisión y arbitraje científico
	Criterion of thoroughness in the scientific writing
	Primary criteria in the review of the scientific paper
	Secondary criteria in the review of the scientific paper
	Constructive interpretation of the paraphrase
Complementaries	Professional communication with the authorship
	Permissible mistakes in the review and scientific refereeing: acto y potencia de duda y confusión

The principles of knowledge in the professional training of the scientific referee show a set of knowing abilities which are needed to increase the papers quality in the journals. The knowing of the study design, the general experience of the theme in the paper, the constructive evaluation of the checking and the ethical considerations (table 1) allow that the scientific literature be of relevance and, at the same time, the referee

Los principios de dominio en la formación profesional del árbitro científico muestran un conjunto de habilidades aprendidas que se necesitan para aumentar la calidad de la publicación en las revistas. El conocimiento del diseño de estudio, la experiencia general del tema en el manuscrito, la evaluación constructiva de la revisión y las consideraciones éticas (tabla 1) permiten que la literatura científica sea de relevancia y, al mismo tiempo,

professional acknowledgment by the journal (Ellwanger and Bogo 2020 and Libby *et al.* 2022).

el reconocimiento profesional del revisor por la revista (Ellwanger y Bogo 2020 y Libby *et al.* 2022).

References

Ante, L. 2022. "The relationship between readability and scientific impact: Evidence from emerging technology discourses". Journal of Informetrics, 16(1): 101252, ISSN: 1875-5879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2022.101252.

Bianchi, F., Grimaldo, F., Bravo, G. & Squazzoni, F. 2018. "The peer review game: an agent-based model of scientists facing resource constraints and institutional pressures". Scientometrics, 116(3): 1401-1420, ISSN: 1588-2861. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2825-4.

Cushman, M. 2023. "How I respond to peer reviewer comments". Research and Practice in Thrombosis and Haemostasis, 7(2): 1-3, ISSN: 2475-0379. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpth.2023.100120.

Chen, B., Deng, D., Zhong, Z. & Zhang, C. 2020. "Exploring linguistic characteristics of highly browsed and downloaded academic articles". Scientometrics, 122(3): 1769-1790, ISSN: 1588-2861. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03361-4.

Chun, C.L., Li, C.C., Chin, Y.H., Ching, C.Su. & Ya, L.H. 2022. "Exploring the experience of reflective writing among Taiwanese undergraduate nursing students: A qualitative study". Journal of Professional Nursing, 40: 105-110, ISSN: 1532-8481. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2022.03.007.

Edwards, M.A. & Siddhartha, R. 2017. "Academic research in the 21st century: Maintaining scientific integrity in a climate of perverse incentives and hypercompetition". Environmental Engineering Science, 34(1): 51-61, ISSN: 1092-8758. https://doi.org/10.1089/ees.2016.0223.

Ellwanger, J.E. & Bogo, C.J.A. 2020. "We need to talk about peer-review – experienced reviewers are not endangered species, but they need motivation". Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 125: 201-205, ISSN: 1878-5921. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.02.001.

Grimaldo, F., Marušić, A. & Squazzoni, F. 2018. "Fragments of peer review: A quantitative analysis of the literature (1969–2015)". PLoS One, 13(2): 1-14, ISSN: 1932-6203. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0193148.

King, E.B., Avery, D.R., Helb, M. R. & Cortina, J. M. 2018. "Systematic subjectivity: How subtle biases infect the scholarship review process". Journal of Management, 44(3): 843-853, ISSN: 1557-1211. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317743553.

Kovanis, M., Porcher, R., Ravaud, P. & Trinquart, L. 2016. "The global burden of journal peer review in the biomedical literature: Strong imbalance in the collective enterprise". PLoS One, 11(11): e0166387, ISSN: 1932-6203. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0166387.

Libby, W.M., Sundland, R., Adams, A.M., Faria, I., Feldman, H.A., Gudmundsdottir, H., Marmor, H., Miles, V., Ochoa, V., Ruff, S.M., Tonelli, C., Altieri, M.S., Cannada, L., Dewan, K., Etkin, Y., Marmor, R., Plichta, J.K., Reyna, C., Tatebe., L., Drudi, L.M., Hicks, C.W. 2022. "The art of peer review: Guidelines to become a credible and constructive peer reviewer". Seminars in Vascular Surgery, 35(4): 470-478, ISSN: 1558-4518. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.semvascsurg.2022.10.002.

Lu, C., Bu, Y., Dong, X., Wang, J., Ding, Y., Larivière, V., Sugimoto, C.R., Logan, P. & Zhang, C. 2019. "Analyzing linguistic complexity and scientific impact". Journal of Informetrics, 13(3): 817-829, ISSN: 1875-5879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2019.07.004.

Macdonald, S. 2015. "Emperor's new clothes. The reinvention of peer review as myth". Journal of Management Inquiry, 24(3): 264-279, ISSN: 1552-6542. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492614554773.

Righi, S. & Takács, K. 2017. "The miracle of peer review and development in science: An agent-based model". Scientometrics, 113(1): 587-607, ISSN: 1588-2861. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2244-y.

Simón, E.L., Osei, A.M., Wachirad, B.W. & KwanGetting, J.K. 2020. "Getting accepted – Successful writing for scientific publication: a Research Primer for low- and middle-income countries". African Journal of Emergency Medicine, 10(2): 154-157, ISSN: 2211-4203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.afjem.2020.06.006.

Sobkowicz, P. 2015. "Innovation suppression and clique evolution in peer-review-based, competitive research funding systems: An agent-based model". Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation, 18(2): 13, ISSN: 1460-7425. http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/18/2/13.html.

Teele, D.L. & Thelen, K. 2017. "Gender in the journals: Publication patterns in political science". PS: Political Science & Politics, 50(2): 433-447, ISSN: 1537-5935. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096516002985.

Teplitskiy, M., Acuna, D., Elamrani, R.A., Körding, K. & Evans, J. 2018. "The sociology of scientific validity: How professional networks shape judgement in peer review". Research Policy, 47(9): 1825-1841, ISSN: 1873-7625. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.06.014.

Received: May 15,2023
Accepted: July 5,2023