

GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS

This document is intended as an aid to the evaluation of papers and not as a limitation to it. The reviewer may add to these general indications those aspects that he/she considers appropriate in line with one of the foundations of peer-review, that is, to improve the formal presentation and the contents of the work when it merits a favourable report.

IMPORTANT NOTE TO REVIEWERS

DYNA aims to maintain a content structure in its articles that allows it to aspire to the continuous improvement of its impact factor. To this end, the articles submitted should preferably show the research work carried out to achieve a new or improved product or process, indicating the current situation, the theoretical considerations for improvement, the execution of the research, the validation of the results and the conclusions for subsequent application.

Research articles are therefore not considered to be research articles if they are limited to local studies or analyses of a situation, if they are based on surveys that only provide information without applicable deductions, or if they are limited to descriptions of a process (good practice), even if they include improvements made to the process or to the state of the art through the simple application of knowledge.

For this reason it is of great importance that:

- Titles should be clear, brief, free of acronyms and express the essence of the text.
- The summary, also clear and brief, should develop the object (why and what for) of the work, marking behind it the key words.
- The introduction presents the state of the problem addressed.
- The materials and methods should describe the research process followed, with supplementary material such as tables or graphs that are long without losing the coherence of the text.
- The results provide data on what has been achieved in the work and, if necessary, its practical evaluation with a short case study.
- The conclusions compare the initially intended object with the results obtained, offering solutions that are not local but globally applicable.

With these requirements, it will be possible to make a decision on the article so that it can be favourably reviewed and find wide dissemination, serving as a reference for other authors and improving the author's H-index.

A DYNA reviewable article should be a statement of achievements on a proposed objective.

CLEAR DEFINITION OF OBJECTIVES AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE REVIEWER'S WORK

(Why, why, what for and results obtained)

It is very IMPORTANT that the papers to be reviewed always incorporate:

- In the introduction, the reasons or motivations that have led the authors to undertake the work they are about to describe and the practical objectives they have set themselves.
- In the conclusions, the actual results achieved by the development and/or discussion, if possible compared to the objectives and adequately quantified, as well as the effective practical application they will have and their continuity in the near future.

Please check whether this content is included in the text submitted for your reviewer's review, especially for proposals that qualify as research articles, as this is one of the most insistent requests from our readers.

IMPORTANCE OF THE CLARITY OF THE WORK

DYNA is a **multidisciplinary** scientific and technological journal of **Industrial Engineering**. This means that its content must be oriented above all to satisfy these two concepts: on the one hand, **Engineering**, understood as the set of techniques for which this profession has attributions, and on the other, **Industry**, that is, the real application of professional knowledge. In addition, given the wide range of specialities among its readers, it is important to be CLEAR and simple in language and exposition, explaining the less usual terms or concepts.

ASPECTS TO BE REVIEWED

The Editor pays particular attention to the following 4 aspects:

1. **ORIGINALITY / INNOVATION** of the work
2. **UTILITY / INTEREST** for readers
3. **CLARITY** of the text, even for non-experts in the subject matter. It is advisable to keep the main title as short as possible, which can be complemented by a subtitle.
4. Number of **PEOPLE AFFECTED** by the problem/solution addressed in the article
5. **SCIENTIFIC RIGOUR / FOUNDED CONCLUSIONS** (Potential IMPACT Factor) of the work. Especially for research articles containing outstanding originality or innovation.

Each of these criteria must be evaluated on a scale or mark of 1 to 5 points (5: Very much - 4: Quite a lot - 3: Medium - 2: Little - 1: Very little) and justify this mark with comments on each of the 4 aspects evaluated.

6. **TECHNOLOGY MATURITY LEVEL (TRL)**. This defines the state of progress of the technology presented in the work (see section on Technology Maturity Level). This is an informative assessment. A higher level of technology maturity does not necessarily indicate a better quality of the text.

TECHNOLOGY MATURITY LEVEL (TRL)

Articles that could be considered as research or good practice will be classified into one of the 9 levels corresponding to the TRL (*Technology Readiness Level*) concept:

- LEVEL 1 - Basic ideas or principles are presented (this could include compilations of good practices, state of the art or surveys to determine validity or use of technologies).
- LEVEL 2 - Technological concepts and/or applications are formulated (Level 1 but adding some original contribution to the real application of these analysed technologies).
- LEVEL 3 - The functions and/or characteristics of these concepts and/or technological applications provided in theoretical analytical form or by means of simulation are tested.
- LEVEL 4 - The validation of these concepts and/or applications with laboratory tests is described.
- LEVEL 5 - Describes the validation of these concepts and/or applications with tests in their environment of use.
- LEVEL 6 - A model or prototype system is presented that captures the concepts tested as a demonstration in a relevant environment.
- LEVEL 7 - A model or prototype system is presented that captures the concepts tested as a demonstration in a real environment.
- LEVEL 8 - Describes how the designed system is completed and qualified through testing and operational demonstrations.
- LEVEL 9 - The validity of the designed system is confirmed by exposing the successive successful operational performances.

A subsequent step, or LEVEL 10, would be the determination and/or implementation of necessary improvement actions on the technology found, derived from its performance.

Proposals classified in levels 1 and 2, if they do not contain appreciable originality, could, where appropriate, be approved as collaborations.

TYPE OF EVALUABLE PAPERS

Articles may be qualified as:

- **RESEARCH ARTICLES.**

Of the utmost originality and innovation. They include the results of unpublished research, theoretical or experimental, on new technologies or developing existing industrial engineering technologies with their own contributions. The original aspects proposed must be clearly appreciated.

It can be basic or applied, tending towards the latter and if basic, proposing at least the possible practical use of its findings. This is the meaning of the citation in the evaluation form of "research results" as a necessary input.

- **LITERATURE REVIEW ARTICLES**

They describe and/or compile the most recent developments or published works on a given industrial engineering topic, always providing some improvement, complement or original perspective that should also be expressly highlighted.

It is the orderly presentation of the "state of the art" in a given technique. The aim is not to give a theoretical lecture on subjects related to industrial engineering studies, but rather to give a current practical view of the subject and, above all, to highlight what new contributions can be made to it.

- **GOOD PRACTICE COLLABORATION.**

They describe positive experiences in the application of current technologies with outstanding achievements in any field of industrial engineering, with preference given to cases that involve contributions of improvement or original details that should also be expressly highlighted.

It will reflect the "positive experiences" that have been obtained with the real application of techniques or knowledge specific to industrial engineering, giving priority to conclusions that represent some kind of improvement or contribution to what has been presented.

- **COLLABORATION TECHNICAL REPORT.**

On any subject or discipline related to industrial engineering, both originals and reproductions or translations, in full or summarised, that provide training or information to readers. It may develop or summarise its own or published topics, in this case by means of version, translation and relevant authorisations.

THE REVIEWER

The evaluation of articles should be carried out in a **responsible, impartial, confidential** and **positive manner**, with the aim of helping the author to improve it. Likewise, unfavourable reviews or rejections should explain to the author which are the weak points of their work and thus indicate which aspects of their article need to be improved in order to be published elsewhere.

The first step to check the originality of the work is to search the Internet for what has been written on the subject of the article to be reviewed, trying to avoid "reproductions" or "refusions" with similar conclusions.

The Editor expects the reviewer to identify flaws or weaknesses, suggest improvements and assess the level of originality and innovation of the work under review.

An "ideal" reviewer should answer the following questions:

1. Who will be interested in reading the article and why?
2. What is the main achievement of the work and how important is it?
3. Is there really a need or problem that the work is trying to solve?
4. Could this article be considered one of the 25 most important articles published this year in your field?
5. How does this article compare to others in your field?
6. Are your conclusions or statements original, and which other articles compromise this originality?
7. Are the conclusions well argued and reasoned? If not, what other evidence is needed?
8. Are there other methods or tests that could improve the work? How much time and effort would it take?
9. Are the achievements adequately discussed in terms of other published work?

10. If the article is rejected, clearly indicate the reason to the author in the reviewer document: evaluacion.odt. Two different types of rejections are considered:

- Definitive rejection: This is an unappealable rejection for reasons such as a clear lack of novelty, insufficient conceptual progress, erroneous conclusions, ...
- Recoverable rejection: Rejected, but as it looks promising, the author is told that with a notable improvement or major rethinking of the paper it can be resubmitted for a new review cycle. If the paper is rejected but is promising, what specific improvements should the author make?

11. If the article needs to be modified or revised, mention what improvements would need to be made to the article.

12. If the article is accepted, briefly indicate the strengths of the article. The reviewer and author will always receive communications regarding the review anonymously.

The reviewer and author will always receive communications regarding the review anonymously.

The evaluation document should contain the reviewer's justified recommendation on the publication of the article. The reviewer should be aware that other reviewers of the same article may have different technical levels or points of view, and that the Editor may have to make the publication decision based on reports with different recommendations. Therefore, it is helpful for the Editor to explain the reasons for the reviewer's proposed decision.

When completing the "EVALUATION AND COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR" section, we ask the Reviewers to avoid using statements that may unnecessarily upset the author. The recommendations written in this section of the reviewer's document will be transmitted directly to the author.

DYNA reserves the right to modify the evaluation reports in cases where offensive language is used or confidential information of the Reviewer is disclosed.

The reviewer must disclose to the Editor any personal, academic, research, economic or financial conflict of interest in relation to the work to be reviewed.

In order not to extend the article review period too long, please return the review reports to the Author and Editor within 30 days of receipt of the article.

DYNA's experience corroborates that peer review is an essential part of the publication process. It provides an independent assessment of the author's work and often the reviewer's recommendations, together with the editor's advice, improve the structure and logic of the article.

A detailed copy of the Instructions for Authors is available [HERE](#)