

The manuscripts received undergo a selection process through peer review made by experts on the different subjects. In a first review, the editorial team of the Journal *CES Odontología* determines whether the manuscript meets the general criteria described above.

A second review considers the scientific value of the document and the usefulness of its publication, this evaluation is performed by national and international professional experts in the field, who review the manuscripts blindly and independently. Every manuscript is submitted for review at least to two experts.

In a third review, based on the general criteria, the scientific value of the article, the usefulness of its publication, and the opinion of the experts, the Editorial Committee makes a decision that may be: rejection, acceptance with the condition that the author incorporates to the text the comments and recommendations made by the experts, or final acceptance.

After conditional acceptance, the revised texts undergo another review to ensure that it has complied with the recommendations requested, and if so, it is definitively accepted, otherwise, it is rejected.

When a manuscript is accepted conditionally, the authors must send back with the revised manuscript a detailed explanation of the changes made to comply with the recommendations of the experts. When disagreeing with some of those suggestions, the author should explain in detail the reasons.

All decisions are communicated in writing to the author as soon as possible. The time depends on the complexity of the issue and the availability of the expert reviewers.

We invite experts in the different areas to participate as peer reviewers. Please submit your resume to the address revistaodontologia@ces.edu.co indicating clearly the areas of knowledge in which you are expert.

Below are the criteria used in the journal *CES Odontología* for the scientific peer review of the articles submitted for review with a view to publication. The following keys are used: B: bad, CI: can improve, G: good, NA: not applicable.

- The title describes the content in a clear and concise way.
- The summary provides a suitable presentation, organized and in accordance with the type of article.
- The keywords match the main topic.
- The introduction or first part of the text presents a suitable contextualization of the main topic.
- The objectives and/or purposes of the article are specified.
- The abbreviations and acronyms used are clarified.
- The type of study used is recorded.
- The ethical aspects are mentioned.
- The aspects related to conflicts of interest, and/or financing are clarified.
- The type of study used allowed fulfilling the objectives and/or purposes.
- The document describes how to obtain the sample, the selection of subjects and the type of assignment.
- The control of errors and biases are reported.
- The methods and statistical and epidemiological packets used for data analysis are explained.
- The statistical and epidemiological methods are suitable for handling data.
- The results are presented in a clear and organized way.
- The results are consistent with the objectives and/or purposes made.

- The results are presented in terms of specific estimates and confidence intervals.
- The number and form of tables and graphs is suitable.
- The loss of subjects of study is explained.
- The complications and/or difficulties during the study are written down.
- The discussion of the article is specific and limited to matters relating to the results and the objectives of the study.
- The results are compared with those reported by others.
- The references are appropriate for this comparison.
- The advantages/disadvantages of the results found are explained.
- Applications or future studies from the results are presented (scientific contribution).
- There is agreement between the results and the conclusions.
- The limitations of the work are shown.
- The references are suitable, timely updated and are cited.
- The references are presented according to the Vancouver rules.