

HOW TO CITE

Almeida-Campos S. Towards a more modern, transparent, and global journal: new editorial policies. Rev Méd Electrón [Internet]. 2026. [cited: date of access];48:e7126-1. Available from:

<http://www.revmedicaelectronica.sld.cu/index.php/rme/article/view/7126-1/6438>

*Corresponding author:

salmeida.mtz@infomed.sld.cu

Reviewer:

Silvio Soler-Cárdenas

Received: 2024/12/08.

Accepted: 2025/12/11.

Published: 2026/01/01.

Editorial

Towards a more modern, transparent, and global journal: new editorial policies

Hacia una revista más moderna, transparente y global: nuevas políticas editoriales

Santiago Almeida-Campos^{1*}  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4351-8817>

Affiliation:

¹ University of Medical Sciences. Matanzas, Cuba.

We present the new editorial policies of *Revista Médica Electrónica*, which take effect at the beginning of the New Year. This update is not merely an administrative adjustment; it represents a significant step in our ongoing evolution toward a more rigorous, transparent, inclusive, and internationally aligned publication.

Our fundamental commitment remains unchanged: to serve as a high-level academic platform for disseminating scientific knowledge in health, promoting research, constructive critique, and dialogue among professionals from Cuba, Latin America, and around the world. The revised wording of our policies explicitly reinforces this international and multidisciplinary vocation, reaffirming our intention to welcome researchers, academics, and students from diverse regions.

Among the most notable changes, we wish to highlight the following:

1. Embracing the future: artificial intelligence (AI) policy. In response to technological advancements, since 2025 we have incorporated—and now updated—a policy on the use of artificial intelligence tools. From now on, we will inform authors that we may use AI as a technical aid during review and editorial processes; for example, to analyze textual coherence or compliance with formal standards. These tools will be used solely for editorial purposes, under strict confidentiality, with no external access to study data.

It is crucial to emphasize that these tools are auxiliary; all final scientific, methodological, and editorial decisions remain the exclusive responsibility of our Editorial Committee and reviewers, thus ensuring the integrity of the process.^(1,2) Furthermore, in line with recommendations from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), we require all authors to declare any use of AI in the creation of their manuscript, clearly describing the nature of such use in both the WAME manuscript checklist and within the manuscript itself.⁽³⁾

2. Simplification and strengthening of author requirements. To streamline the submission process without compromising rigor, we have introduced important changes to required documents:

- A single key supplementary document. Authors will no longer need to submit multiple forms. From now on, the only mandatory supplementary document is the WAME (World Association of Medical Editors) manuscript checklist. This checklist is much more than a formality, it is a fundamental tool that ensures your work meets international standards of good scientific publishing practice, covering ethical, authorship, methods reporting, and transparency aspects. Proper completion is essential for a manuscript to proceed through the editorial process.^(3,4)
- Stability of authorship. Once a manuscript is accepted into the editorial process, no changes in authorship (order or number of authors) will be permitted. This strengthens shared responsibility and the integrity of the work from the moment it officially enters the journal.⁽⁵⁾
- Requirement for updated bibliography: We have raised the standard for citation currency. For most article types, it is required that at least 75% of the bibliographic references must correspond to the last five years, ensuring published content reflects the most current state of scientific knowledge.

3. Methodological transformation of review articles. One of the most substantial and strategic changes in this update concerns review articles: the use of the PRISMA guidelines is required for systematic reviews and meta-analyses, although other recognized methodologies may also be used. The approach must be comprehensive, including foundational articles without temporal restrictions, although the majority of references should be contemporary. Annexes containing detailed search strategies or bias assessments are permitted.

With the aim of enhancing their scientific and methodological quality, we have implemented deep modifications in the requirements of these articles, aligned with international best practices⁽³⁾, particularly with the PRISMA guideline.

- Increased number of allowed authors. Recognizing the collaborative nature of modern scientific reviews, we no longer limit articles to three authors. Now, up to six or more authors are allowed, provided the contribution of each one of them is declared using the CRediT taxonomy.

- Greater length. To allow for deeper and more exhaustive analysis, the word limit has been increased to a maximum of 8,000 words (excluding references), providing sufficient space for rigorous synthesis.
 - Updated bibliographic criteria. The recommended range of references has been expanded to a minimum of 20 and a maximum of 30, with the possibility of exceeding this number if editors deem it justified.
4. Commitment to open access and sustainability. We reaffirm our strong commitment to open access. *Revista Médica Electrónica* uses the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0), allowing copying, redistribution, and adaptation of content as long as proper credit is given and the material is not used for commercial purposes. This step reinforces our mission to democratize scientific knowledge.
- In line with our commitment to open science and editorial transparency, *Revista Médica Electrónica* actively promotes open peer review. Under this model, authors and reviewers know each other's identities during the evaluation process, fostering direct, responsible, and constructive dialogue. This practice not only strengthens accountability at every stage of scientific assessment but also publicly acknowledges the valuable contribution of reviewers in ensuring the quality and integrity of published works.⁽⁶⁾
 - As part of this transparent process, the names of reviewers who participated in the evaluation will be included in the article upon publication, giving them due recognition for their scientific work. Implementing this modality reflects our commitment to a more collaborative, ethical, and visible academic culture, in alignment with international trends fostering continuous improvement in scientific communication.

This update is the result of joint efforts by our Editorial Committee, editors, and advisors, aimed at further elevating the quality of our journal. These changes are not the end of a process, but rather a continuation of our ongoing pursuit of improvement.

We invite you to read the new editorial policies, available on our website, and to continue trusting *Revista Médica Electrónica* as your partner in the dissemination of medical knowledge.

REFERENCES

1. Pinedo Tuanama L. Uso de herramientas de inteligencia artificial generativa en la publicación científica. Rev Peru Ing Architect Medio Ambient [Internet]. 2024 [Accessed 2025/12/08];1(2):61–2. Available at: <https://revistas.udh.edu.pe/repiana/article/view/811>



2. Buitrago Ciro J, Franco-Rico JA. La inteligencia artificial generativa en la publicación científica y el papel de los editores en revistas de biblioteconomía, ciencias de la información y educación en Hispanoamérica. Interdisciplina [Internet]. 2025 [Accessed 2025/12/08];13(36):275–300. Available at: <https://www.revistas.unam.mx/index.php/inter/article/view/90833>
3. Patwardhan K, Tillu G, Jadhav PM. Good practices of publishing AYUSH research: A practical checklist for authors. J Ayurveda Integr Med [Internet]. 2017;8(2):132-6. DOI: 10.1016/j.jaim.2017.02.014.
4. López Marcos JJ, Ortiz Gutiérrez R. Herramientas necesarias para desarrollar y redactar un artículo científico, con solvencia, técnica y confianza: la introducción [Internet]. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid; 2025 [Accessed 2025/12/08]. Available at: <https://docta.ucm.es/entities/publication/a62f608f-6ff7-4770-bdc1-70f6a29dd69e>
5. Chamorro A. ¿Quién es autor? Las autorías múltiples, criterios y lineamientos. Rev Esp Doc Cient [Internet]. 2021 [Accessed 2025/12/08];44(2):e290. Available at: <https://redc.revistas.csic.es/index.php/redc/article/view/1324>
6. Abadal E, Da-Silva L. Open peer review: otro paso hacia la ciencia abierta por parte de las revistas científicas. ThinkEPI [Internet]. 2020 [Accessed 2025/12/08];14. Available at: <https://thinkepi.scimagoepi.com/index.php/ThinkEPI/article/view/thinkepi.2020.e14e02>

