

# Recognition for our 2020-2021 reviewers

Vanesa Pereira Prado<sup>1</sup>  0000-0001-7747-6718

Carina Patrón<sup>1</sup>  0000-0002-8662-9437

DOI: 10.22592/ode2021n37e501



The editorial process is the pillar that supports and shapes scientific journals. It is a complex process that involves receiving the manuscript according to the journal's standards, reviewing it, and publishing the final article. Peer review is the expert evaluation of manuscripts by two external referees that contribute to the editorial decision of accepting or rejecting the work. It is essential to select the right reviewers for the editorial team to improve the articles' quality and make the necessary modifications.

The editorial process requires the follow-up of the articles' life cycle. It also involves fluid communication with authors and referees to provide feedback on the relevant evaluations.

Accepting or rejecting a manuscript does not mean that it is of inferior quality. It often means that the work does not follow the scientific journal's guidelines, does not comply with specific ethical requirements, or is not considered original or novel in a widely explored topic.

All the articles are reviewed by two referees from the relevant area. A third referee is convened if the two original referees disagree. Care is taken so that foreign referees are assigned to an article with a Uruguayan author, and vice versa.


During this period, 43 articles were published out of 65 reviewed, resulting in a rejection rate of 33.8% and an acceptance rate of 66.3% (Chart 1). These rates are similar to the range of other journals in the area.<sup>(1,2,3)</sup>

Compared to the 2018-2019 period, the rejection rate was 20% after evaluated 50 articles.<sup>(4)</sup>

## Chart 1: Rejected and accepted articles

---

1 Publications Department. School of Dentistry. Universidad de la República, Uruguay



A total of 138 reviews were conducted by 97 referees from Latin America (Table 1 and 2).

**Table 1: Review distribution by country**


Country	Reviews conducted
Argentina	30
Brazil	9
Chile	23
Ecuador	1
Mexico	5
Panama	1
Peru	1
Dominican Republic	1
Uruguay	67
Total	138

**Table 2: Number of participating referees**

Country	N°
Argentina	22
Brazil	6
Chile	17
Ecuador	1
Mexico	5
Panama	1
Peru	1
Dominican Republic	1
Uruguay	43
Total	97

Chart 2 shows an even gender distribution of reviewers: 58.2% were women and 41.8%, men.

**Chart 2:** Reviewer distribution by gender



In the following table, we acknowledge and thank the referees who have worked on the articles.

**Table 3: Names and countries of reviewers for the 2020-2021 period**

Reviewers	Country	Reviewers	Country
Actis, Adriana	Argentina	Casamayou, Martha	Uruguay
Alcántara, Raúl	Chile	Caviglia, Inés	Uruguay
Álvarez, Licet	Uruguay	Cosetti, Laura	Uruguay
Andrade, Ernesto	Uruguay	Cubillos, Paulina	Chile
Añaña, Nelly	Uruguay	Cuevas Suárez, Carlos	Brazil
Araya, Carlos	Chile	Díaz, Alejandro	Chile
Arriagada, María	Chile	Dreyer, Erik	Chile
Arriagada, Verónica	Chile	Espinosa, Leon	Mexico
Artaza, Lilitana	Argentina	Fernández, Claudia	Argentina
Badanian, Andrea	Uruguay	Fierromonti, Claudia	Chile
Beovide, Verónica	Uruguay	Figueiredo, Marcia Cançado	Brazil
Biondi, Ana	Argentina	Flores, Homero	Chile
Blanco, Verónica	Uruguay	Fontanetti, Pablo	Argentina
Bologna, Ronell	Uruguay	Francia, Alejandro	Uruguay
Bonecker, Marcelo	Brazil	Funosas, Esteban	Argentina
Borgia, Ernesto	Uruguay	Galiana, Beatriz	Argentina
Bueno, Luis	Uruguay	Garay, Fernando	Uruguay
Cabrera, Carlos	Uruguay	Garchitorena, María Inés	Uruguay
Cantero, Cecilia	Chile	García, Andrés	Uruguay

Reviewers	Country
García, Graciela	Uruguay
Gigena, Pablo	Argentina
Gonzalez, Rogelio	Mexico
Grassi, Annabel	Uruguay
Grazioli, Guillermo	Uruguay
Gugelmeier, Virginia	Uruguay
Hermida, Laura	Uruguay
Herrero, Cynthia	Argentina
Inostroza, Carolina	Chile
Jasa, Gainer	Uruguay
Kaplan, Andrea	Argentina
Kreiner, Marcelo	Uruguay
López Jordi, María del Carmen	Uruguay
Mandalunis, Patricia	Argentina
Martinelli, Sylvia	Uruguay
Martins, Manuela	Brazil
Masoli, Carla	Argentina
Mateu, María Eugenia	Argentina
Molgatini, Susana	Argentina
Molina, Gustavo	Argentina
Moran, María	Chile
Moran, María Paz	Chile
Muñoz, Helmuth	Chile
Obelli, Juan José	Argentina
Oliva, Ricardo	Mexico
Oyarce, Carmen	Chile
Palacios, Silvia	Argentina
Pareja, Carmen	Peru
Perez Eka	Panama
Picapedra, Alicia	Uruguay

Reviewers	Country
Picca, Mariana	Argentina
Pisterna, Gabriela	Argentina
Puig, Germán	Uruguay
Raffo, Marisa	Uruguay
Reyes, Ariel	Dominican Republic
Riva, Raúl	Uruguay
Rivas Carlos	Chile
Rodríguez, Ismael	Argentina
Rodríguez, María Fernanda	Uruguay
Romero, René	Uruguay
Russo, Ana Laura	Uruguay
Sacoto, Fernanda	Ecuador
Salveraglio, Inés	Uruguay
Samar, María Elena	Argentina
Sánchez, Celeste	Mexico
Scarrone, Marcelo	Uruguay
Sicco, Estefanía	Uruguay
Silva, Rhonan	Brazil
Silveira, Felipe Martins	Brazil
Szwarc, Esther	Uruguay
Taramaso, Fernando	Uruguay
Valenzuela, Cecilia	Uruguay
Valez, Valeria	Uruguay
Vázquez, Susana	Uruguay
Verdera, Sergio	Uruguay
Villanueva, Francisco	Mexico
Vuoto, Elena	Argentina
Wendler, Michael	Chile
Zepedeo, Martín	Uruguay

## References

1. Acta Odontológica Colombiana. Instrucciones a los autores. Available from: [Sobre la revista | Acta Odontológica Colombiana \(unal.edu.co\)](http://www.unal.edu.co/ActaOdontologicaColombiana)
2. Revista KIRU. Instrucciones a los autores. Available from: <https://www.aulavirtualusmp.pe/ojs/index.php/Rev-Kiru0/about/editorialPolicies>
3. Revista de Odontopediatría Latinoamericana. Instrucciones a los autores. Available from: <https://www.revistaodontopediatria.org/index.php/alop/information/authors>
4. Lopez Jordi MC, Piovesan S, Pereira V, Patrón C, Lima A. Proceso de arbitraje para la calidad de las revistas científicas. *Odontoestomatología* 2019; 21(34). Available from: [http://www.scielo.edu.uy/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S1688-93392019000200074&lng=es&nrm=iso&tlng=es](http://www.scielo.edu.uy/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1688-93392019000200074&lng=es&nrm=iso&tlng=es)