

## Editorial [ENG]

by **Deborah Moreira Guimarães**<sup>1</sup>

DOI: 10.12957/ek.2025.95480

In times measured by productivity, where quantity is valued more than quality, reviewing certain criteria and procedures that guide scientific research and academic work becomes an urgent task.

Brazilian publishing, which is essential for disseminating research results, is currently marked by a discrepancy: everyone wants to publish their *papers*, but few are willing to review them. For those unfamiliar with the editorial flow of a journal that follows the *double-blind peer review* procedure, we clarify that this is a method of evaluation (academic review) in which authors and reviewers remain anonymous in order to ensure impartiality and objectivity. Articles are received through the journal's website and forwarded by the editor to two reviewers, who will write their reviews without any access to the author's data. The editor is involved in all stages of the publishing process, from receiving texts and forwarding them to reviewers to recording the editorial decision, which requires not only a careful reading of the reviews received, but also consideration and discernment when analyzing the submitted text and the reviews received for that text. However, there is an obstacle that makes this process extremely slow and inevitably marked by continuous delays: academic peer review. Every day, it has become more difficult to obtain reviews for submitted papers. Often, requests for reviews remain unanswered. In most cases, the responses boil down to the phrase "unavailable to perform evaluation," a response automatically configured by the OJS (*Open Journal Systems*).

This reluctance to issue opinions is justified by the overload of academic work: teaching hours, participation in committees, publications, management positions, guidance, meetings, etc. How, then, can this issue be resolved if it is not feasible to reconcile so many tasks and perform them with the dedication they require? How can we reduce delays in publications while maintaining academic peer review without, however,

---

<sup>1</sup> Faculty member in the Department of Philosophy at the Federal University of Minas Gerais. Together with Prof. Marco Casanova, she coordinates the research group "From phenomenology to hermeneutic phenomenology: on the path to language," to which UFMG is linked as a partner institution.

generating even more overload? If, for each article, we ideally need two opinions, the demand for evaluations will always be double the number corresponding to the submissions in the editorial flow.

Since phenomenology is, par excellence, a philosophy of attention, let us perform the phenomenological exercise of looking closely at this phenomenon. A careful examination is enough to see that this account will never balance. On the contrary, the outlook is as bad as it could possibly be, especially in the age of Artificial Intelligence, when more is being produced (with less quality, of course), which requires more evaluations, overloading editors and reviewers. If the accounts do not balance, the future will be collapse: some journals will be discontinued due to the unfeasibility of this entire exhaustive process; others will try to adapt by accepting generative AI in their submissions, which is already happening timidly; others will try to adapt by adhering to preprints, which seems to me to be a kind of “outsourcing” of the *double-blind peer review* method, that is, at the very least, an attempt to deal with the general unavailability of reviewers, an attempt that ends up giving the interested public the task of eventually finding problems in the “pre-published” text or, if applicable, to validate its quality so that the text can, in fact, be published; in short, there are several possible scenarios, but there is no scenario in which the balance is satisfactorily achieved, guaranteeing the quality and relevance of the published works.

In fact, it is not easy to gain transparency about one's own problems. Everyone repeats exhaustively that we can only clearly find the flaws in texts that we did not write ourselves. We have learned, since the beginning of our undergraduate studies in philosophy, that reading our colleagues' texts is a fundamental exercise in academic life, both to ensure that problems unseen by the authors themselves are avoided and to ensure that the texts reflect collective research efforts, that they engage in dialogue with the specialized literature on the subject, and that they can effectively contribute to the field in which they are inserted. In short, research in philosophy is an exercise that obviously requires isolation, but which can only be fully realized through collective efforts aimed at building knowledge based on the solidity and validity that can only be achieved through dialogue between peers in the same community. It is not possible to do research in philosophy without dialogue, whether at the national or international level; nor is it possible to work seriously when decisions are made based on urgency and quantity. We

are adapting to this system because we need, for example, to pass competitive exams, enter graduate school, and ensure career progression. However, we are exhausted; involuntarily exhausted from reading the work of our peers and issuing the opinions that are essential for the publication of our papers.

As previously stated, the account will never close if philosophy research is determined by predominantly quantitative factors. In my view, there is only one way out: “slow down”, that is, publish less and engage more in dialogue with the community, producing results that can actually be included in broader discussions, instead of generating more and more content that only serves to accumulate lines in Lattes or score points on scales, but does not produce any effective impact in their respective areas.

\*\*\*

In this edition of *Ekstasis: Journal of Hermeneutics and Phenomenology*, we present a short dossier dedicated to texts presented at the XXIX Heidegger Colloquium, whose theme was “Heidegger as Educator”. The event took place between November 6 and 8, 2024, in the city of São Paulo. These texts were originally conceived for the dossier of the same name organized by *Natureza Humana: international journal of philosophy and psychoanalysis*, which has always welcomed the Heideggerian community by publishing their research. Unfortunately, some trajectories come to an end, as was the case with *Natureza Humana*, which, upon being discontinued, owed its last rooster to Asclepius and was thus unable to publish the dossier as planned.

We present, in the order of the table of contents, contributions from Irene Borges-Duarte, Luís Rossi, Marco Casanova, and Tito Marques Palmeiro. These articles were received and evaluated by the editorial board of *Natureza Humana*, in partnership with its reviewers. Given the decision to discontinue the journal, *Ekstasis* welcomed the texts and incorporated them into this edition, which, in principle, would only feature articles on free themes.

In the articles section, where we generally publish texts received on a rolling basis, we have contributions from the following authors, in the order listed in the table of contents: Adriano Henrique de Souza Ferraz, Daniel Gomide da Silva, Lucas Ribeiro Vollet, Brenda Soares, Lucas Joaquim da Motta, Adam Italiano, Juvenal Savian Filho,

Vítor Hugo dos Reis Costa, Mariana Di Stella Piazzolla, Jefferson Silva, Ida Kublikowski, Adelma Pimentel, and Maria de Nazareth Malcher.

We are also pleased to publish the translation, by Patrícia Mara Rodrigues Silva, of the text *L'être est-il porteur? Réflexions critiques sur l'ontologie de Merleau-Ponty*, by Emmanuel de Saint Aubert, on the occasion of his visit to the Federal University of Minas Gerais in September 2025.

In the reviews section, we feature a contribution by Pedro Damasceno Uchôas on the book *10 lições sobre Husserl*, by Daniel Peluso Guilhermino, recently published by Vozes.

Finally, as usual, we provide a list of reviewers who kindly contributed to the *double-blind peer review* process, and the table of contents, which contains general information about the issue, systematized and organized for the reading public.

On behalf of the editorial board of *Ekstasis*, I would like to thank everyone who contributed directly and indirectly to the production of this edition.

To our readers, we wish you a great read!