

## GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW ARTICLES

Authors must present their systematic review following the guidelines provided by Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, and Altman (2009). Additionally, these articles must adhere to the following structure:

**Title:** It must include an engaging title related to the main objective of the manuscript, with a **maximum of 25 words**.

**Abstract:** The article must include an abstract in Spanish, English, and Portuguese, without headings or subheadings (minimum: 230 words; maximum: 250 words). It should describe, in no more than 250 words, the research objective, methodology, main findings, and key conclusions. Additionally, between 4 and 6 keywords (in Spanish, English, and Portuguese) must be included, using the most significant standardized terms associated with the study topics. It is recommended to use the APA Thesaurus (<https://psycnet.apa.org/home>) or the UNESCO Thesaurus (<https://vocabularies.unesco.org/browser/thesaurus/en/>) as a guide for selecting the keywords.

**Introduction:** It must include the background and conceptual framework of the topic in question, as well as the objectives of the review. The objective should be stated in terms of the concepts of interest such as the population, participants or problem, the intervention or interventions evaluated (if applicable), comparisons between interventions, and the effects of the intervention to be assessed. This section may include bibliographic references that are not part of the analysis sample.

**Method:** This section must present **the Review Protocol**, detailing the entire process followed during the systematic review. If the review was **registered in any international database of prospectively registered systematic reviews**, the relevant identification and access data must be provided (e.g., review code, access link to the published protocol, etc.). Acknowledging that the publication of protocols and procedural guidelines reduces the impact of biases and promotes transparency

in methods, authors are encouraged to register their studies in review databases such as Prospero (<https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/>) and Cochrane (<https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/about-cdsr>).

This section must include the following subsections:

- **Search and Identification of Studies:** In this section, the reviewed databases, languages, keywords, Boolean operators used, and the time window prioritized for the development of the review should be stated, along with the justification for these decisions.
- **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:** In this section, the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the selection of studies should be stated.
- **Assessment of Internal Validity:** In this section, the strategies that ensure internal validity and address potential biases (e.g., double-blind peer review) in the data extraction and analysis process should be indicated (for more details, refer to <http://www.cochrane.org/>). Authors are encouraged to consult the information on <https://www.riskofbias.info/welcome/robins-e-tool>, a useful tool for detecting risks in systematic reviews.
- **Data Analysis Plan:** In this section, the number of studies included in the sample and the items (e.g., participants, population, intervention [if applicable], comparison) observed in each study should be stated. If additional statistical analyses (meta-analysis) were performed, this should be specified in this section. It is recommended to attach as an annex the database used to extract all the information for the comprehensive review.
- **Ethical Considerations:** A brief statement should be included regarding the handling of ethical issues related to each phase of the review (e.g., access to sources, information selection, organization, analysis, etc.), outlining the strategies implemented to ensure transparency, reduce biases, and guarantee replicability.

**Results:** The results should include narrative descriptions, graphs, and tables. Authors must present the results of the search and the process developed through

the flow diagram proposed by the [PRISMA](#) statement. Additionally, the results should provide an overview of the main lines of research identified around the topic, the theoretical and empirical questions derived, and the key conclusions and future projections arising from the study. The use of statistical and bibliometric indicators is also recommended.

In the case of articles presenting meta-analysis results, it should be specified how the effect size and confidence interval were obtained.

**Discussion:** It should synthesize the main findings, emphasizing their relevance for the populations of interest (e.g., patients, therapists, educators). It should also include the main limitations of the included studies and a critical evaluation of the conducted exercise, as well as the limitations and factors to consider for future studies.

**References (must include URL or DOI):** The article must present a **minimum of 50 references** (including those from the literature review and analysis), which should fall within a recent and explicitly reported time window.

The **references** included in the introduction and discussion should not be limited to the studies analyzed in the review. They should also include relevant conceptual and contextual information for framing the research question and objective, as well as for interpreting the obtained data.

**NOTE:** The editorial team of the Journal wishes to inform that the number of review articles published per issue shall not exceed 30% of the total number of articles included in the journal's annual production.

## References

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Annals of internal medicine*, 151(4), 264-269.

Manterola, C., Astudillo, P., Arias, E., Claros, N., & MINCIR, G. (2013). Revisiones sistemáticas de la literatura. Qué se debe saber acerca de ellas. *Cirugía*

*española*, 91(3), 149-155.

Pati, D., & Lorusso, L. N. (2018). How to write a systematic review of the literature. *HERD: Health Environments Research & Design Journal*, 11(1), 15-30.