

Characterization of the profile and remuneration of business and management peer reviewers accredited by Minciencias, Colombia.

Fabio Orlando Cruz-Páez¹, Lizeth Valeria Parra-Montenegro², Jorge Isaac Lechuga-Cardozo³
^{1,2}*Universidad de Cundinamarca, Bogota - Colombia*, ³*Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, Monterrey - México*
ORCID: [0000-0001-7834-2762](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7834-2762), [0000-0002-6557-1539](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6557-1539), [0000-0002-0999-5468](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0999-5468)

Received: June 16, 2021.

Approved: August 18, 2021.

Abstract— The purpose of the article is to characterize the profile of peer evaluators in the business and management field accredited by the Ministry of Science, Technology, and Innovation (Minciencias), Colombia, and their opinion about the remuneration for the publication of articles, topics of interest and indented scientific journal categories. The methodology used was quantitative, non-experimental design, and descriptive level. A 15-item questionnaire was used for a random sample of 190 evaluator-investigator pairs. It was found that most business and management researchers are junior category and prefer to find out about the calls through social networks for researchers. They also receive economic benefits from their institutions for publication in primarily high-impact indexed journals such as those indexed to Scopus, with general administration as the preferred topic. It is concluded that the Colombian national research system has great challenges in stimulating the researcher performance within higher education institutions and developing more qualified human talent. In order to respond to the quality system of indexed journals, training efforts and retention and development programs must be implemented for researchers who act as peer reviewers in scientific journals.

Keywords: evaluation, motivation, peer reviewer, researcher, scientific journal.

*Corresponding author.

email: focruz@ucundinamarca.edu.co (Fabio Orlando Cruz Páez).

Peer reviewing is a responsibility of the Universidad de Santander.

This article is under CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

How to cite: F. O. Cruz-Páez, L. V. Parra-Montenegro y J. I. Lechuga-Cardozo, "Characterization of the profile and remuneration of business and management peer reviewers accredited by Minciencias, Colombia", Aibi research, management and engineering journal, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 1-9, 2021, doi:[10.15649/2346030X.2515](https://doi.org/10.15649/2346030X.2515)

I. INTRODUCTION

An evaluator of scientific journals also called a reviewer or referee, plays an essential role when judging, suggesting modifications and improvements, or recommending the non-publication of a work submitted to a scientific journal, considering principles of impartiality to avoid bias and subjectivity [1]. In this sense, the evaluator verifies compliance with the relevance, publication standards, theoretical basis, writing, and originality of the results, which [2] call formal, editorial, and scientific merit aspects.

[3] adds that the reviewer plays an important role in the communication and dissemination of science to the extent that he/she exercises a common verification role for the validation and acceptance of scientific articles. These processes are subjected to anonymous or double-blind scrutiny and criticism by peer experts in the field, facilitating the selection, classification, and prioritization of new articles submitted for publication.

On the other hand, the concept of perception in research concerns the approach in which each human being can interpret things. Therefore, the point of view of a person can be valid according to the interpretation and suggestions. Under the experience of applying surveys, this research is aimed at peer reviewers in their research role and the work they perform for indexed journals regarding the preferences they have at the time of publishing scientific productions with the support of databases at a national and international level, such as Scopus, WOS, Publindex, Latindex, MIAR, Dora, AmeliCA, LatinREV, among others.

This article reviews the case of how the profiles of researchers are considered to carry out the evaluation process, as well as the economic and motivational incentive for scientific publication in peer-reviewed journals in Colombia. These theoretical contributions explain the phenomenon of publication and peer review in scientific journals in the discipline of business and management.

This study identifies a weakness in the incentive system of academic journals that harms the motivation and performance of peer reviewers of indexed journals. In this sense, the following question is posed as a problem: What is the profile of business and management researchers accredited by Minciencias, their topics of interest, and categories of indexed scientific journals, and are the current economic incentives appropriate for a peer reviewer who referees in indexed journals?

Thus, the article aims to characterize the profile of the business and management researcher accredited by Minciencias, Colombia, and his opinion about the remuneration for publishing articles, their topics of interest, and the categories of indexed scientific journals.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As variables for the present study, the researcher's profile, the types of economic incentive, and the motivators for scientific publication are established. In this regard, after an exhaustive review of scientific journals indexed in Minciencias in the business and management field, taking into account the parameters of submission and review of manuscripts for possible publication in these journals, these variables are explained below.

a. Profile of peer reviewers

The profile shows the number of research that a researcher generates and also describes concise qualities. The concept of the profile has been used to express the set of traits and characteristics that people have, according to the activity to which they are dedicated, even to refer to the pathologies that he/she may present, which are the particular focus of multiple studies [4]. Likewise, research emerges from a central nucleus that considers objectives, perception, and the realization of experiments to verify theories in response to generalized problems. For example, curiosity is a characteristic of human beings. When this characteristic is used systematically to create or generate knowledge, to advance in its construction, with the help of techniques and procedures and with the support of reason and experimentation, it can be said that research is being done. And whoever performs these activities will be considered a researcher [5].

On the other hand, creating a researcher profile collects the main information about the researcher's professional trajectory, including high-level studies, such as specializations, master's degrees, doctorates, and post-doctorates. The researcher's profile, mainly in Colombia, becomes a competition to generate high-quality profiles to obtain distinctions for publication and arbitration, according to the evaluation criteria of articles in indexed journals. The reality of a researcher as a subjective entity depends on a profile with experience, knowledge, and ideas in the field, leading to prestige in academic and scientific productions from the research's ideation, perception, and judgments [6].

In order to have an assertive and high-impact researcher's profile, it is managed from experience according to the trajectory presented, as seen in the ability to design and specify the questioning in front of research and the problematizing and systematizing questions of the same. Moreover, it generates an own work for the researchers towards the field to be developed and/or strengthened. For [7], working together generates an essential key to the experience acquired in the trajectory of the role as researchers and having an adequate approach to obtain improved results based on their own experience and researchers working along the same lines.

b. Economic incentives for research

The economic incentives of the university sector mainly derive from academic production from research, associated with the teaching career, and with salary incentives [7]. In the 21st century, education has become the main competitive advantage of nations. Human capital displaces physical and financial capital as the true generator of wealth in the future [8]. The human capital of education research in the 21st century shows interest in obtaining financial resources and leverage in the context of research and products that can be obtained for measurement by entities that manage research.

The question arises about absorbing this growing demand, given the limited human and financial talents. Human talent is likely to experience a deficit in the coming years, both in terms of teachers and researchers. In contrast, financial talent will not increase at a comparable rate.

Another question is how to ensure the sustainable funding of universities that face new challenges. For [9], the question is to maintain and strengthen excellence in teaching and research without minimizing the level of quality offered while offering broad, equitable, and democratic access to higher education.

In higher education and research entities, research groups generate for their members capabilities towards innovation with entrepreneurial ideas, adapting to technology for the development of research projects, considering the use of financial resources, and making decisions according to the respective execution [10]. However, creating research groups involves the definition of incentives and economic stimuli for the human capital to carry out relevant actions or execute research projects. Furthermore, according to the financial capital, the investment would maximize profitability by analyzing the financial statements with estimates in international finance to carry out business ideas [4].

c. Motivators for scientific publication

The motivators for publication are especially given to researchers with versatility and focus on topics of their preference or standardized by indexed journals that invite through calls for the reception of scientific and/or academic productions. Researchers apply and expose their academic productions in different ways for the development and effectiveness of their publications. Consequently, academic production and conceptual development are so heterogeneous that lead to reflect ambiguity and lack of universalism, as stated by researchers [11].

To this effect, it is understood that the main key to academic production is the researchers since they generate scientific activity. If there is no progress in such activity, the limitations for research development will generate inconsistencies. There is no researcher or research if no academic production is derived from the scientific activity. Therefore, the productivity of researchers becomes a key variable in discovering the progress or limitations that may exist in the development of research.

The variety of articles published in nationally and internationally recognized indexing databases is increasing, generating a high impact index, and expectations are positive for the publication of academic and scientific productions. Concerning scientific articles, the gap in production in high-impact indexes has been closing compared to those of more regional recognition. The publication of articles in WoS and Scopus has been increasing, responding to a measurement system that stimulates much more to obtain publications in this type of product [12].

III. METHODOLOGY OR PROCEDURES

The approach of the present study is based on a quantitative methodology [13], which involves collecting data for the approval of a hypothesis using numerical measurement and statistical analysis [14]. The approach is quantitative because the survey technique is used by applying a questionnaire to peer evaluators accredited by Minciencias in the business and management field. On the other hand, the research reaches a non-experimental design as defined by [13] as performed without deliberately manipulating variables, studies in which the independent variables are not intentionally varied to see their effect on other variables [15].

The level of the study is descriptive since it seeks to specify the properties, characteristics, and profiles of people, groups, communities, processes, objects, or any other phenomenon that is subjected to analysis. It also shows precisely the angles or dimensions of a phenomenon, event, community, context, or situation [16]. The instrument used consists of a questionnaire structured in Google forms, with closed questions with multiple choice answers composed of 15 items for the variables researcher profile, economic incentive, and motivators for scientific publication. The instrument was validated through a piloting process with peer evaluators accredited by Minciencias, and its reliability was calculated with Cronbach's Alpha, with a confidence level of 95%.

Filter questions are posed as basic information about the respondent, participation in calls for indexing, current experience, preferred indexing at national and/or international level, type of financial contributions, payment for the work performed as peer reviewer according to the indexing, awards or certificates to improve the resume or to receive financial benefits, the preferences towards topics of interest for the publication of articles or also for the evaluation of journals as a peer reviewer, the main category in Colciencias considering whether it is a junior researcher (J), associate researcher (I) or senior researcher (IS) and finally, the main networks that influence as a major impact on the scope of the calls for volumes of a journal.

The population of the study is the peer reviewers - researchers accredited by the Administrative Department of Science, Technology, and Innovation of Minciencias in the business and management field, which sum of 1266 as of May 2020 [6]. Finally, 1264 reviewers were considered because one of the peer reviewers is the director of this research, and the other does not have contact information. A sample of 200 peer reviewers was randomly selected [13], obtaining a response from 190 researchers. Of these, 188 are from the national context, and two are international, categorized as research professors, staff professors, and other positions under the management of their respective roles.

In terms of procedure, the study begins with the formulation and systematization of the problem for the subsequent construction of state of the art and the structuring of the theoretical framework. From there, the questionnaire is designed, then piloted, and finally applied to the selected sample. Next, the data is processed in specialized software. Finally, the results are expressed in tables, and the interpretation of the results is performed to conclude in the light of the objectives outlined [17] [18].

IV. RESULTS ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The researchers were asked about their participation as peer reviewers of journals, with the results shown in Table 1. Seventy-one percent stated that they had participated either in one of the two modalities or only one according to their respective role; however, 29% of the respondents have not participated in calls for indexing as authors or peer reviewers for journals in the last year. Therefore, the respective justification is requested, taking into account whether the answer is an affirmation or denial. The results also show that 50% of the respondents justify and comment on the experience and role they have played with their participation, whether it is currently active or has been left aside for

different circumstances. It was obtained from 95 justified surveys, i.e., 50% of the respondents consistently clarified their respective role and their experience within the same affirmation.

Table 1: Peer reviewer participation in journals.

Option	N°	%
YES	135	71%
NO	55	29%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Among the respondents, 13% justified that they have played both the role of author and peer reviewer in the last year for calls aimed at the publication of scientific productions. In the author role, it should be taken into account that for the possible publication of manuscripts, they must be unpublished and not be submitted to any other call for a possible physical or electronic publication [19] [20]. Of the 95 justified responses, 18% state that they have only been peer reviewers in journals, congresses, or any activity that they call peer reviewer. In contrast, 9% state that they have been peer reviewers of scientific productions for participation in congresses and respective calls. Finally, 73% of the respondents allude to different journals that have participated in the national and international field, the corresponding number of years, and different universities and research places that they have had to the fullest for the performance of their role.

Next, a question was asked about the experience as an evaluator, with the results shown in Table 2. Nine percent express that they have up to one year of experience since they are initiating the work as peer and/or research author, and in the process, they will strengthen their skills to perform the evaluation management towards scientific productions. In this regard, 21% responded to have 2 to 3 years of experience, 19% have 4 to 5 years, and 51% have more than five years of experience and have a considerable amount of production to perform the evaluation or arbitration management under the relevant knowledge in the topic of assessment towards indexed journals. The evaluation is managed by recognized researchers with a high degree of scientific productivity [18]. The peer-review process should be objective in the criticism and constructive in the observations, supporting them and doing it with neutrality and respect for the article and the author [21]. Thus, it should contribute with criticisms and recommendations that improve the manuscript [21].

Table 2: Experience as evaluators.

Option	N°	%
0-1 years	18	9%
2-3 years	39	21%
4-5 years	37	19%
More tan 5 years	96	51%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

When asked about the preference for indexing, the answers in Table 3 were obtained. In this regard, 51% of researchers prefer Scopus mainly because it is internationally recognized, while 34% prefer Publindex, 6% Latindex, 3% WoS, and 6% other indexing. Other indexing options include EBSCO, JRC, Scielo, scientific journals, university, and direct. However, the peer reviewers agreed that not only one indexing is sufficient, where a combination of both WoS and Scopus is considered a more appropriate option for indexing. In other cases, the peer reviewers affirm that none of the options presented followed their indexing preferences. There is also a process of assimilation of which indexing is the most convenient. It is important to note that between 80% and 95% or more of the scientific articles submitted to high-impact national and international journals are generally rejected, and only a small number are published [22].

Table 3: Preferred indexing.

Option	N°	%
Scopus	97	51%
Publindex	64	34%
Latindex	11	6%
LatinREV	1	0%
WOS	5	3%
Amelica	0	0%
Dora	0	0%
MIAR	1	0%
Other	11	6%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Regarding the type of financial incentives used for research, the results are shown in Table 4. The table shows that 33% of researchers consider that the institutional incentives are the appropriate financial contributions since educational entities manage recurrent research in order to postulate articles that are convenient to obtain prestige. Additionally, 31% of the respondents consider that own and institutional incentives are suitable for these financial contributions on certain occasions; 27% affirmed that the contributions are their own for the publication and thus, do not require third parties to submit articles. Finally, only 9% have the perception that there is no generation of contributions by themselves or third parties. This is due to their trajectory of having been the corresponding author of scientific articles. Therefore, it is vital to highlight the importance of priorities in developing science, technology, and innovation with governmental support to allocate financial capital to research [23].

Table 4: Types of financial contributions.

Option	N°	%
Own	52	27%
Institucionals	63	33%
All options	59	31%

Other	16	9%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Also, Table 5 shows the results for a question about payment for the peer reviewer's work. In this regard, 23% of the respondents have never received a payment or affirm that it is not feasible to receive a payment because it would only be for remuneration and not for the learning obtained for the indexing management. On the other hand, 77% mention that they have obtained payment for the work performed as peer evaluators. This is related to the origin of departmentalism, thus incorporating research applied to the university and being remunerated to the collaborators [24].

Table 5: Payment for work performed.

Option	N°	%
Received payment	147	77%
Not received payment	43	23%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

When inquired about payment according to each country's exchange rate, the results shown in Table 6 were found. Of the 147 respondents who answered affirmatively, it is estimated that 62% have been paid in local currency, i.e., Colombian pesos, and 10% have been paid in foreign currency, mainly in dollars, considering that international level indexations are acquired the most due to the management carried out by this target population. Additionally, it was found that 5% consider that payment is variable according to the journals for indexing, whether they pay or not, and 23% consider that payment should not be made for the work done, but that learning is the most convenient for them today or that it does not apply in their case. Finally, it is worth noting that a study carried out regarding payment for publishing articles evidenced a figure of 182 million dollars in 2012 with an annual growth of 134%, which could cover up to 20% of publications until 2020 [25].

Table 6: Payment according to the exchange rate.

Option	N°	%
Local currency	118	62%
Foreign currency	20	10%
Variable	9	5%
No payment	43	23%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

The results shown in Table 7 were found regarding the standardization of the payment received. Regarding the payment made for the peer reviewer, 22% of the respondents consider that it is according to the Current Minimum Legal Monthly Salary (SMMLV), which payment ranges between 25% to 50% depending on the indexed journal. In comparison, 78% have in mind a standardized payment, that is, exact figures according to the journal or corresponding indexing, taking into account that it can be in Colombian pesos, dollars, or any exchange rate. From the total of 190 respondents, 118 answered the question accurately, and the remaining 72 did not answer according to what was asked, mainly with the concept previously expressed, since they do not know if there is a stipulated payment, among other circumstances.

Table 7: Standardized and minimum salary payments.

Option	N°	%
Standardized payment	92	78%
Payment based on the SMMLV	26	22%
Total	118	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

For the indicator referring to the reception of the evaluation evidence, the answers are shown in Table 8. According to the respondents' criteria, 14% mention that the three options: certification, documented proof, or financial award, are important depending on the moment. For example, they explain that the three options are necessary at the moment of evaluating an article. Furthermore, 20% think that the financial award prevails above all as an incentive for carrying out the work, while 22% believe that a certificate is important to be attached to the resumes, taking the CvLAC as an example, and 11% agree that either a certificate or a documented proof is enough. It was also found that 25% of respondents think that both the financial award and the certificate generate more expectations, while 5% believe that the certificate is more important than any of the other aspects presented, and 2% do not consider this type of incentive relevant, and only learning is enough when evaluating scientific productions. Thus, for these respondents, the important thing is to carry out an assertive and objective evaluation for the publication of articles [26].

Table 8. Award, certification, or documented proof.

Option	N°	%
All options	27	14%
Financial award	39	20%
Certification	42	22%
Documented proof or certification	20	11%
Certification and financial award	47	25%
Documented proof	11	6%
Not relevant	4	2%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Table 9 shows the results regarding the H-index. Considering that the H-index allows highlighting the researchers within their discipline, it is found that 23% of the respondents do not know or do not care about it. In comparison, 46% manage to recognize their h-index. Additionally, the i10 index, which is defined as the indicator of the publications that have been cited at least ten times, was enquired. The results show that only 2% know their i10 and do not know their h-index, and 29% have knowledge of the two indexes as peer evaluators and their importance within their field of expertise. These results show the importance of one of the commandments to increase citations and indexes, including scientific journals in databases [26].

Table 9: H-index and i10 index.

Option	N°	%
Not applicable	43	23%
Know your H and i10 indexes	56	46%
Only know your H-index	87	29%
Only know your i10 index	4	2%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Regarding the subject topic for the publication of articles in indexed journals, the answers are shown in Table 10. The responses include options such as economics, which 11% of respondents consider as their topic of interest. Another topic of interest is management, which obtains among 42% of the respondents. Another topic is marketing, where 6% of answers prefer this topic. Finally, 41% of the respondents went for the option of other topics of interest, including other specialized subjects, such as financial education, entrepreneurship, innovation in pedagogical practices, political economy - public policy - social sciences, tourism/administration, finance, accounting - management, among others. Peer reviewers with basic knowledge of terms frequently used in their topic usually structure quality articles for scientific publication in journals [27].

Table 10: Topics of interest for publication of articles.

Option	N°	%
Economics	21	11%
Management	80	42%
Marketing	12	6%
Other	77	41%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Table 11 shows the results of the interest in being a peer reviewer and in refereeing for indexed journals. In this regard, 9% prefer economics, 43% management topics, 6% marketing, and 42% other options, which include accounting, education, law, education, economics, sustainable development, sustainability, technology, operations, statistical methods, computer security, primary health science, among others. The above is inherent in the sense of diversity thanks to the potential of research and the change it promotes in the community [28].

Table 11: Topics of interest for peer-reviewing.

Option	N°	%
Economics	18	11%
Management	82	42%
Marketing	11	6%
Other	79	41%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Regarding the research category, the results obtained are shown in Table 12. Any peer reviewer should be classified in a specific category according to Minciencias hierarchy. Thus, the categories to take into account are Junior Researcher (IJ), where 48% of respondents belong, Associate Researcher (I) with 38% of respondents, and Senior Researcher (IS) with 14% of respondents, which is a small portion of the respondents.

Table 12: Researcher category.

Option	N°	%
Junior Researcher (IJ)	91	48%
Associate Researcher (I)	73	38%
Senior Researcher (IS)	26	14%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Finally, Table 13 shows the results regarding research networks. Currently, technology changes the environment as it advances, and for this reason, defining scope is required to index a certain number of journals. In this sense, 90% of the respondents prefer scientific networks, while 3% and 2% consider Facebook and Twitter, respectively, as a network of greater scope. Finally, 5% of respondents believe that there are more alternatives of greater scope such as university research groups, Researchgate, Google Scholar, emails, all networks, Academia, and academic communities such as CLADEA, Iberoamerican Academy of Management, Academy of International Business, direct email and social networks, direct mail, academic Google and the editorial page of universities. Educational research institutions are thus valuable and necessary for the society that finances them and thus positioning a name and submitting it in the research context [29].

Table 13: Main networks with the most significant impact on the scope of journal calls for papers.

Option	N°	%
Scientific networks	171	90%
Facebook	5	3%
Twitter	3	1%

Other	11	6%
Total	190	100%

Source: Prepared by the authors.

It is important to highlight that the opinion of some respondents is that the options included are essential and that all the networks are influenced because they are of greater reach. The variety would be present due to the volume of journals to be reached, and other opinions are that none of the networks presented are relevant for this process.

V. PROPOSED SOLUTIONS OR IMPROVEMENTS

The research shows that peer reviewers' opinions differ regarding remuneration for the arbitration of manuscripts and preference for indexing scientific journals. Although there are some coincidences, and mainly there is a greater motivation for learning when refereeing articles, it is said that learning in these research fields has more weight than any other remuneration, mainly in cash. In the same way, there are researchers who perform this refereeing job primarily to acquire knowledge and receive payment from indexed journals in the national and/or international context. The aforementioned applies to researchers who like to publish and evaluate different topics being of interest or not. In this sense, opinions are divided as to whether it is better to assess articles for learning and to do it willingly or just to receive something in return, either payment or certifiable documents that are annexed to resumes, especially in the Latin American and Caribbean Curriculum Vitae (CvLAC).

A debate would be generated since there are divided opinions by the peer reviewers, where it is convenient to consider that each one under his experience describes and is concrete in what he does and that in the review and evaluation of articles the accurate and truthful knowledge is noted to be published in such highly recognized journals. From the point of view of the peer reviewers, it is inferred that they are versatile as well as being consistent concerning the arbitration work with different topics, preferred or not. There is also multiculturalism towards evaluative or publication topics, which makes most of the respondents be research or full-time professors of educational institutions at the national or international levels to encourage undergraduate, master's, and Ph.D. students to the creation of articles where they would be represented as scientific or academic productions, whether this is the case or not, so that multiculturalism exists in the face of the variety of topics present, including future research colleagues.

The diversity of topics for the publication and evaluation of articles corresponds either by preference or only by participation in the same; that is why there is a discussion as to whether it is better to make efforts for preference, to do it for knowledge, for learning or to receive some recognition or taking into account records for active participation in events of national and/or international calls.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

With the present study, it has been possible to understand the current status and perceptions of business and management peer reviewers accredited by Minciencias on the indexed journals, based on the opinions of the respondents, regarding their profile and motivational factors and incentives for refereeing jobs. In short, based on the results obtained from the surveys, some general conclusions can be drawn. In the first place, peer reviewers, considering their experience in refereeing articles specifically, generate constructive criticism to improve academic and scientific productions and journals indexed in the national and/or international context. According to [30], this element has allowed journals and publishers to show an image of impartiality and academic justice, which has made it possible to achieve the dizzying multiplication of journals and articles.

This research provides an essential point towards the respondents' perceptions, understanding if there is a knowledge of the remunerated payment for the arbitration of research, scientific, reflection articles, and any academic and/or scientific production according to calls by indexed journals. These journals require to receive their articles of such interest, demanding a bank of qualified peer reviewers to perform evaluation procedures considering the policies established by each journal. The knowledge of the corresponding payment can be based on the exchange rate according to whether the arbitration is conducted nationally or internationally, if the payment is standardized, based on the experience, the topic diversity, among others; and finally, the most used by journals, if the amount is a percentage of a Current Minimum Legal Monthly Salary in Force (SMMLV) for Colombian journals.

On the other hand, according to the results of the questionnaire applied, the peer reviewers' preferences can be divided into two parts: the first is to obtain financial recognition, documented proof, or certifications, which improve resumes and increase their prestige as a peer reviewer and/or author. The most recurrent dynamic to exercise the reviewing job is to obtain a valid document, add it as proof of experience, and learn. The second preference concerns the alternative topics of interest for both the publication and the arbitration of articles.

This research evidences that most of the respondents are research professors and full-time lecturers of different institutional affiliations who permanently emphasize research experience and knowledge. According to [31], the concept of peer learning implies the valuation of knowledge generated in daily practice, which is experiential and embodied and has meaning for those who have produced and used it. Thus, an honest evaluation system brings together individuals and institutions that interdisciplinarily contribute with transparent and high-quality processes [32].

Finally, being aware of the current situation of business and management reviewers classified by Minciencias, it is considered appropriate to give continuity to this study by proposing as future lines of work the development of empirical research that includes the variable perception of recognition that can provide quantitative and statistically relevant data in this field of knowledge [33] [34].

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results obtained from the surveys, some general recommendations can be listed:

- Educational institutions should encourage and stimulate their ranked researchers' academic and research activities with particular attention to those who serve as peer reviewers of scientific journals [35].
- Recognition by the national science and technology system of peer review activity in scientific journals is important in business and management and other disciplines [36].
- Economic incentives are essential since the peer reviewer dedicates time, his resources (energy and internet), and his knowledge to give an expert opinion. Moreover, like any professional, they demand economic recognition of their work, so journals need to incentivize their peers to improve the quality in selecting more suitable and competent peers [5].
- Public recognition plays an important role, and journal editors should issue a certificate or diploma for the reviewing job. When human beings are stimulated and motivated, they perceive positive gratitude, and their self-esteem improves [37].
- Training is essential. It is opportune to generate training spaces for peer reviewers that will allow them to play a better role when making judgments in evaluations. Technification will result in less time and understanding of the filling of formats and an objective assessment of the manuscripts [8].

VIII. REFERENCES

- [1] A. Mora y J. Gonzalo, "Presentación: El papel de evaluador en las revistas científicas". *Revista Española de Financiación y Contabilidad*, n° 140, pp. 623-631, 2008.
- [2] T. Plata, O. Córdoba y P. Trzesniak, "Dictámenes en revistas científicas: lo que necesitan los editores y autores, lo que hacen los evaluadores". *Revista Colombiana de Psicología*, vol. 21, n° 1, pp. 37-55, 2012.
- [3] D. Grainger, "El participar como par evaluador de calidad es una responsabilidad profesional internacional; aquellos que publican con confianza deben también evaluar con competencia". *Revista Ingeniería Biomédica*, vol. 3, n° 5, pp. 66-74, 2009.
- [4] G. Castaño, G. Calderón y R. Posada, "Perfiles y tipologías del investigador en administración en Colombia y su producción científica". *Innovar*, vol. 24, n° 52, pp. 45-57, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.15446/innovar.v24n52.42505>
- [5] L. Gutiérrez, G. Castaño y J. Vivares, "Estímulos y restricciones para la investigación en administración en Colombia". *Innovar*, vol. 23, n° 49, pp. 5-16, 2013.
- [6] E. Pino y M. Sáenz, "La dimensión social de la universidad del siglo XXI: creación del programa de aprendizaje-servicio en la Universidad Técnica de Ambato". *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, vol. 65, n° 1, pp. 1-11, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie651334>
- [7] G. Delgado, P. Patiño, L. Castro, M. Arias, D. Caicedo y D. Ojalora, "Guía para el reconocimiento y medición de grupos de investigación e investigadores". Bogotá: Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación, 2016. https://minciencias.gov.co/sites/default/files/ckeditor_files/guia-reconocimiento-y-medicion-de-grupos-e-Investigadores.pdf
- [8] J. Vanegas, J. Restrepo y M. González, "Negocios y comercio internacional: evidencias de investigación académica para Colombia". *Suma de Negocios*, vol. 6, n° 13, pp. 84-91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sumneg.2015.08.007>
- [9] J. Ávila, I. Romero, E. Saavedra y A. Marengo, "Influencia de la producción de nuevo conocimiento y tesis de postgrado en la categorización de los grupos de investigación en Ciencias Sociales: árbol de decisiones aplicado al modelo científico colombiano". *Revista Española de Documentación Científica*, vol. 41, n° 4, pp. 1-13, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.3989/redc.2018.4.1547>
- [10] R. Hernández, C. Fernández y P. Baptista, "Metodología de la investigación", Mexico: Mcgraw Hill Interamericana, 2014.
- [11] J. Hurtado, "Guía para la comprensión holística de la ciencia", Caracas: Fundación Sypal, 2010.
- [12] A. Bernal, "Metodología de la investigación", Bogotá: Pearson, 2010.
- [13] M. Tamayo, "El proceso de investigación científica", México: Limusa, 2002.
- [14] J. Lechuga, F. Cruz y A. Cazallo, "Grupos de interés en la estrategia de responsabilidad social corporativa de organizaciones", Barranquilla: Ediciones Unisimon, 2018.
- [15] F. Cruz, C. Mera y J. Lechuga, "Evaluación de estrategias de emprendimiento sostenible e innovación implementadas en las unidades productivas del SENA, Centro Industrial y Desarrollo Empresarial de Soacha-Cundinamarca-Colombia". *Tendencias*, vol. 20, n° 1, pp. 183-202, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.22267/rtend.192001.113>
- [16] Universidad Nacional de Colombia, "Guía para autores". *Acta Biológica Colombiana*, 2018.
- [17] Universidad Libre de Colombia, "Directrices para autores", *Revista Entramado*, 2020.
- [18] E. López, S. Tobón y L. Juárez, "Escala para Evaluar Artículos Científicos en Ciencias Sociales y Humanas-EACSH", *Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, vol. 17, n° 4, pp. 111-125, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.15366/reice2019.17.4>
- [19] Universidad Mariana, "Guía para evaluadores", *Revista Criterios*, 2019.
- [20] Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, "Proceso de evaluación por pares", *Revista Magis*, 2018.
- [21] Ó. Guilherme y N. Arrechavaleta, "El financiamiento, la ciencia, la tecnología e innovación y la educación superior". *Revista Cubana Educación Superior*, vol. 3, n° 1, pp. 4-19, 2017.
- [22] V. Manzano, "Hacia un cambio paradigmático para la evaluación de la actividad científica en la Educación Superior". *Revista de la Educación Superior*, vol. 46, n° 183, pp. 1-35, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resu.2017.08.003>
- [23] J. Santana, "Normas para elaborar y evaluar artículos científicos". *Revista Archivo Médico de Camagüey*, vol. 18, n° 1, pp. 1-8, 2014.
- [24] G. Buena, "Evaluación de la calidad de los artículos y de las revistas científicas", *Psicothema*, vol. 15, n° 1, pp. 23-35, 2003.
- [25] M. Bobenrieth, "Normas para revisión de artículos originales en Ciencias de la Salud", *Revista Internacional de Psicología Clínica y de la Salud*, vol. 2, n° 3, pp. 509-523, 2002.
- [26] E. Ortiz, "La evaluación del impacto científico en las investigaciones educativas a través de un estudio de caso". *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, vol. 17, n° 2, pp. 89-100, 2015.
- [27] M. Laufer, "Arbitraje por pares". *Interciencia*, vol. 43, n° 1, pp. 6-8, 2018.
- [28] A. Torres, "Aprendizaje entre pares", 2018.
- [29] V. Manzano, "Hacia un cambio paradigmático para la evaluación de la actividad científica en la Educación Superior". *Revista de la Educación Superior*, vol. 46, n° 183, p. 1-35, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resu.2017.08.003>
- [30] S. Sánchez, "Visibilidad y reconocimiento de la revisión por pares: el caso de la plataforma Publons", *Revistas Científicas de Educación en Red*, 2018.

- [31] I. Zenner, "Pares evaluadores: una constante tribulación para los editores de revistas indexadas". *Rev. U.D.C.A Act. & Div. Cient.*, vol. 17, n° 2, pp. 597-605, 2014.
- [32] J. De Ketele, "La formación didáctica y pedagógica de los profesores universitarios: luces y sombras". *Revista de Educación*, vol. 1, n° 331, pp. 43-169, 2003.
- [33] M. Marquina, "Académicos como pares evaluadores en el sistema argentino de evaluación de universidades: diez años de experiencia". *Revista de la Educación Superior*, vol. 37, n° 148, pp. 7-21, 2008.
- [34] C. Villalba y A. González, "Reflexiones sobre el sistema de arbitraje en revistas jurídicas indexadas en Colombia", *Prolegómenos*, vol. 17, n° 33, pp. 11-14, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.18359/dere.779>
- [35] L. Rodríguez y C. Tejada, "Recomendaciones a los editores para fortalecer la revisión por pares en su revista científica". *Anuario ThinkEP*, vol. 10, n° 1, 222-227, 2016.
- [36] E. Pino, "La dimensión social de la universidad del siglo XXI. Creación del programa de aprendizaje-servicio en la Universidad Técnica de Ambato". *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, vol. 65, n° 1, pp. 1-11, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie651334>
- [37] J. Restrepo, "La revisión por pares (peer review) en las revistas científicas: un proceso que requiere intervención". *Tempus Psicológico*, vol. 3, n° 1, pp. 133-155, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.30554/tempuspsi.3.1.3410.2020>.