EDITORIAL

Educating people is a principle that most States have in order to achieve their objectives. This implies the democratization of knowledge through access to information and to research results, and in that sense, it is required to involve many people to divulge it. One of the enabling tools to achieve that, is to build networks to break down barriers and identify new opportunities, such as open access through megarevistas, that give the opportunity of extensive information without restrictions and at costs quite acceptable for both the publisher and the reader. Although this new trend, which among other advantages is perceived to be more efficient than physical-type serial magazines because in theory they can reduce publishing times helping the work of editors and contributing to curb oligopolies of writers, peer reviewers and thematic, does not solve the underlying problems that arise in the dissemination of scientific knowledge. Some of these problems will be mentioned below:

The transparency of the publishing process that is directly related to the ethics of the editor and the writer is hard to deal with, to the extent that it is a personal decision that even if good practices are promoted, freedom of will prevails. However, it is important to point out several aspects that explain this behavior on both sides. Concerning the writers, the pressure to publish exerted by the institutions they are connected to, forces them to put out a large number of articles, along with the need to increase their personal revenue, as they may enjoy low wages. Likewise, the charging rates per publication end up diminishing the scientific quality of the articles, raise doubts on the transparency of the publications and acts as a discriminatory factor for those that have no resources. Editors, on the other hand, are under periodicity pressure, shortage of peers and economic instability.

Regarding the previous point, many institutions sponsor research, and in return require the publication of several articles product of that research. Because of that commitment, then arises duplicity and excessive self-citation that editors and peer reviewers cannot detect. However, some of the better solutions are the disciplinary peer networks to identify them and avoid the occurrence of those situations.

Another impasse that occurs in the development of a journal is the period that elapses between the time of reception of the article and when it reaches the public, which usually exceeds the

term during which it must be printed or published by other means. This aspect becomes a headache for the editors, because it is the periodicity that is at stake, an indispensable requirement for maintaining the publication indexed.

In this regard, it is interesting to detail the activities taking place in that period of time: first, receive the document and make an initial assessment to ensure compliance with methodological and formal requirements. Second, find the right peer reviewer and send the item. Third, when the evaluation format arrives filled out, forward it to the writer. Fourth, send it for copyediting . The real and total time cannot be anticipated, simply because the reviewers are delayed, the writers do not correct with celerity the suggestions from the peer reviewers, and copyediting is time consuming; in short, the making of a publication depends on many people, but the person responsible is the editor. For all the above, a qualified and experienced editor is required, and the proposal to create a training program for editors, is amply justified.

Promoting healthy practices with actions of professionalism, internationalization and economic stability, facilitate the work of the editor, and allow that publications, especially serials, comply with the frequency, and the impact may be measured. The measure of impact is complex, to the extent that two main criteria are available to do it: the first specifically addresses the quantitative aspect, i.e. the number of times that an article is cited, and secondly, the qualitative one, which is measured from the change that has emerged in science or in a given society from the findings presented .

Likewise, reference must be made to a sensitive discussion that is being made on arbitration. The question that arises is whether the articles that are postulated to be published must or must not be peer reviewed. This situation has to do with some aspects such as the closed circles of writers and reviewers, that do not allow evidence of transparency of processes, helped by the reduced number of peer reviewers that would contribute to the formation of those closed circles, and the bottleneck that results for the editors the delay of the evaluators, among others. But what if the articles are not refereed; how would the quality, transparency and tolerance to the diversity of opinion, be guaranteed?: it is something that would be answered in time if the decision is not to evaluate. In any case, seeking alternatives of technical and scientific support, building peer and writer networks and suggesting new methodologies that are guarantors of quality, may be the way to minimize the complicated tasks that involve editing a serial indexed publication.

Finally, we invite you to get to know us and contribute with articles, or as peer reviewers; to those that know us, to continue helping spread scientific knowledge of international relations, politics and the like.

Alejandra Ripoll
Editor