

SELECTION OF TEXTS FOR PUBLICATION

REVIEW PROCEDURE

The review process of the texts for publication received by *Supervisión21* requires a long and variable period of time that can last between one and three months, depending on the quarterly milestones.

The evaluation in *Supervisión21* takes the form of an academic opinion by blind peers PERK (Publishing Ethics Resource: <https://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk>).

Throughout the editorial process, the article is carefully reviewed to ensure that it is unpublished and that it follows the editorial guidelines of the journal. As a result, authors may be asked to make several adjustments. Authors will be notified by mail and will have one to two weeks to make the necessary changes. As the process is completed in different stages, adjustments may be requested at different times. Additionally, during this process the Editorial Board may request the ORCID code (Open Researcher and contribution: <https://info.orcid.org/es/documentation/features/orcid-registry/>)

The process is as follows:

1. Receipt of the manuscript: once *Supervisión21* receives the manuscript, a confirmation email will be sent to the author. It is recommended to attach a letter certifying that the manuscript is unpublished, signed by the author(s). It is compulsory to attach the file and its anon-

ymous version containing the body of the manuscript according to the template format provided on the journal's website. The omission of these files may be cause of rejection.

2. Analysis of compliance with the formal guidelines of *Supervisión21*: the editorial team checks that the document fulfils the formal requirements and the annexed files. If not included, the author will be notified by email and the process will not start. He/she will be able to make a new submission by attaching all the documents on the platform.

3. Analysis of the thematic relevance and basic conditions of academic writing: subsequently, the editorial team analyses the manuscript to determine whether it complies with the basic parameters of academic writing and whether it fits within the journal's thematic field. If this is not the case, the authors will be informed why the manuscript is not accepted in *Supervisión21*. During this stage, [SIMILITARY CHECK CROSSREF](https://www.crossref.org/services/similarity-check/) <https://www.crossref.org/services/similarity-check/>. Supervision21 is part of the CROSSREF membership [CROSSREF](https://www.crossref.org/).

4. Editorial Board review: if it is, determined that the manuscript fits within the journal's thematic field and fulfils the formal requirements of the journal, the Editorial Board will review the manuscript anonymously and continue the process or withdraw it due to major adjustments. The adjustments suggested by the committee will be annexed to the evaluators' concepts, and their compliance will determine the publication of the article.

5. First blind peer evaluation: Reviewed by the Editorial Board and endorsed for possible publication—even with improvement adjustments—the evaluation process begins in the form of a double-blind academic opinion by external peers. Therefore, the editor asks some

high-level experts in the specific subject of the manuscript and in the methodology used to evaluate it anonymously. The number of experts assessing each article may vary, with a minimum of two expert pairs. It is possible that more may be convened. These experts are external to the Editorial Board. The editor sends each peer reviewer a) the manuscript without any reference to its authors, b) this document of publication standards and c) an evaluation format according to the nature of the article (reflection, scientific and technological research, and review), and assigns a deadline of two weeks to prepare and send the concept.

- In the evaluation form —article evaluation protocol— peers are asked to: a) indicate whether or not the article meets the criteria of form and content; b) make a general assessment of the article, including suggestions, contributions and observations; and c) recommend whether or not to publish it on a scale that includes the possibility of proposing publication with certain modifications or with major changes. Peers are asked about their willingness to evaluate the new version according to their observations, in order to continue the process of publication.

6. Second version of the manuscript is prepared on the basis of the peer reviewers' comments; withdrawal or rejection of manuscript: When the editorial team receives the peer reviewers' reports, they prepare a document with their comments, without any identifying information. Based on the report, the editorial team asks the author for a new version of the manuscript, according to the peer reviewers' comments or if the process requires further adjustments. This document is sent to the authors. When the authors wish to send the

new version and continue the evaluation process, the editor will determine a date of submission according to the extent of the requested adjustments. If the authors do not continue the process, the manuscript is removed from the journal's database. If the authors do not continue the process, the manuscript is removed from the journal's database. Authors will also be informed if the manuscript is totally rejected by the reviewers. The *Supervisión21* policy contributes to the improvement of the article writing process: authors are always aware of the concepts issued by the reviewers, even in the case of withdrawn or rejected manuscripts.

7. Verification of the second version with the adjustments by the peer reviewers: the new version of the article is sent back to each reviewer anonymously with the report and revision of the manuscript that the expert sent to verify whether the suggested adjustments have been made. Afterwards, each expert reviews the article again and indicates whether further adjustments should be made or whether the article is ready for publication.

8. Preparation of the final version: once the editorial team confirms that the peer reviewers agree that the text can be published, the article is sent to the editorial process (layout and style correction). If the peer reviewers, or any of them, consider that further adjustments to the manuscript are necessary, the previous process is restarted until the peer reviewers agree that it can be published. In all instances, the anonymity of authors and reviewers is maintained.

Occasionally, the author(s) send responses to the reviewers' comments to explain or clarify the reasons why certain suggested adjustments are not made to the manuscript. In these cases, a blind dialogue may be

established between the reviewer and the author, mediated by the editorial team, to discuss the adjustments. In all circumstances, the approval or rejection of the article depends on the expert reviewer's opinion.

In the event that the concepts are very dissimilar and controversial, a fourth reviewer will be called in to settle the matter.