

**LITERATURE REVIEW IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH: FOUNDATIONS, SCOPE, AND
METHODOLOGICAL GUIDELINES FOR ITS PREPARATION**

Hermes Emilio Martinez Barrios¹ , Arcelia Rosa Escobar Brochero²

¹ Docente catedrático de la Universidad Popular del Cesar, hermesmartinez@unicesar.edu.co
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6932-157X>

² Docente catedrático de la Universidad Popular del Cesar, arceliaescobar@unicesar.edu.co
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6083-4360>

Abstract

Literature review is an essential component of the research process, as it allows for the identification, interpretation, and organization of available knowledge about a phenomenon. From an interpretive perspective, this exercise is not limited to compiling sources, but rather involves critically analyzing academic discourses to recognize advances, tensions, and gaps in the field. Specialized literature indicates that literature review facilitates the construction of the state of the art, the delimitation of the problem, the foundation of the theoretical framework, and the methodological orientation, while strengthening the researcher's critical thinking. It also makes it possible to situate the study within a broader epistemological context, articulating it with relevant traditions and debates. This article examines literature review as a hermeneutic and epistemological practice, highlighting its functions, foundations, and contributions to qualitative research. It is argued that a rigorous review allows for the production of more solid, relevant, and coherent knowledge in response to contemporary challenges in the social sciences.

Keywords: literature review, scientific research, research methodology

1. Introduction

The literature review is an essential component of the research process, especially in the social sciences, where phenomena are characterized by their complexity, variability, and deep connection to sociocultural contexts. This article aims to analyze the literature review as an interpretive and epistemological practice, emphasizing its functions, conceptual foundations, and contributions to qualitative research. To achieve this, the reflection is grounded in an interpretive paradigm, which conceives knowledge as a socially constructed process mediated by meaning, and understands the review as an activity of deep comprehension rather than a simple documentary inventory.

Under this orientation, the study adopts a qualitative approach focused on the analysis and comparison of theoretical texts that allow for the identification of patterns, tensions, and relevant perspectives within academic production. This approach is operationalized through a hermeneutic method aimed at uncovering meanings, interpreting specialized discourses, and reconstructing the conceptual horizons that underlie previous studies. Complementarily, a state-of-the-art approach [1] is incorporated, which facilitates examining the development of the field, identifying its gaps, and mapping the research trends that have shaped its evolution.

From this perspective, the literature review is neither a secondary activity nor a formal requirement, but a decisive phase that enables an understanding of how a field of study has been configured, what the main theoretical currents are, and which discussions structure the academic debate. Its value lies in providing critical access to accumulated knowledge, identifying the assumptions that have guided previous research, and recognizing the tensions that explain the diversity of approaches present in specialized literature. In this way, the review functions as an exercise of interpretation, comparison, and conceptual reconstruction, indispensable for defining the research problem, theoretically grounding the study, and supporting methodological decisions.

In the field of social sciences, this function takes on particular relevance, as review processes allow the research topic to be situated within specific theoretical traditions, avoiding fragmented approaches or unnecessary duplication. Moreover, they facilitate the identification of gaps, inconsistencies, and contemporary debates that justify the relevance of the research. The literature consistently highlights that critical review strengthens the

researcher's positioning within the disciplinary field by promoting informed dialogue with established perspectives and opening spaces for the generation of new contributions.

The literature review thus emerges as a practice that articulates epistemological, interpretive, and methodological dimensions, constituting an indispensable resource for ensuring internal coherence, analytical rigor, and scientific legitimacy in qualitative studies.

2. Methodology

This article is framed within the interpretive paradigm, which conceives knowledge as a social construction shaped by meanings, contexts, and experiences [2]-[3]. From this perspective, the literature review is not understood as a mere accumulation of data, but as a reflective process through which the researcher interprets texts, discourses, theoretical approaches, and methodological trajectories.

The authors reviewed such as Creswell [4], Denzin and Lincoln [5], Morales [6], Arnau and Sala [7], Donthu et al. [8], Lozano [9], Romero-Sánchez et al. [10], among others—converge in this interpretive conception by asserting that the literature review involves an exercise of dialogue, comparison, and conceptual reconstruction that enables a deep understanding of the evolution and current state of a field of study.

The qualitative approach adopted is expressed through the centrality of critical analysis, conceptual categorization, and deep comprehension of texts. As indicated by Arnau and Sala [7] and Martínez [3], the review requires identifying keywords, conceptual patterns, and thematic relationships through flexible yet rigorous procedures. From this perspective, qualitative analysis involves interpreting discourses rather than simply summarizing them.

The study employs hermeneutic methods, which allow uncovering the meanings present in academic works. Hermeneutics is reflected in deep reading, category analysis, comparison of approaches, and contextualized interpretation. Lozano [9] emphasizes the need for a critical “dialogue” between texts, in which the researcher actively participates in constructing the meaning of the literature. Morales [6] complements this idea by highlighting that the review not only identifies sources but also evaluates their epistemological and methodological relevance.

The article is also grounded in the state-of-the-art method, conceived as the identification, organization, and synthesis of advances, gaps, and research trends. This approach, present in the three documents analyzed, allows contextualizing the review within a broader disciplinary field and reflecting on its evolution and projection [1].

3. Results

The results presented in this section offer a comprehensive analysis of the literature review, highlighting its strategic role in the construction, grounding, and orientation of research processes. Based on a critical examination of the main theoretical sources, the functions, objectives, conceptual and methodological foundations, as well as the different types of review and recommendations for their rigorous development, are described. These results allow the literature review to be understood as an interpretive, epistemological, and systematic practice that sustains the internal coherence of a research study and strengthens its scientific validity.

What is a Literature Review for?

The literature review fulfills a strategic and transversal function in every research process. In general terms, it allows researchers to understand what has been studied, how it has been investigated, and which debates structure a field, enabling the study to be situated within a conceptual map with theoretical and historical grounding [6]-[11]. It does not consist of a mechanical accumulation of sources but rather a critical interpretation of academic discourses to identify contributions, limitations, and tensions, and thus position the study within the current scientific conversation [12]. Along these lines, the review facilitates the identification of trends, patterns, gaps, and controversies, as well as methodological advances and contradictions in existing production. Moreover, it accompanies all phases of the study—from problem formulation and theoretical framework construction to methodological design, analysis, and report writing—becoming a continuous process rather than an isolated step [6]-[13].

At the conceptual level, it provides the foundations of the theoretical framework, as it enables the selection and articulation of relevant categories and approaches while discarding those that do not contribute to the analytical objective [4]. At the methodological level, it guides the choice of designs, techniques, and instruments, helps anticipate reported difficulties, and encourages consideration of recommendations consolidated in the literature [14]. Likewise, it makes it possible to situate the study, delimit core concepts, understand previous methodological decisions, and interpret findings in dialogue with relevant antecedents [7].

In sum, the literature review fulfills epistemic, argumentative, and methodological functions: it allows understanding the state of knowledge, identifying research opportunities, avoiding duplication, grounding the study theoretically, guiding the methodology, and strengthening the researcher's critical thinking. Without a solid review, research loses context, depth, and scientific legitimacy [9]-[6]-[7].

Objectives of a Literature Review

The objectives of a literature review can be understood as a set of interrelated purposes aimed at ensuring the epistemological, theoretical, and methodological robustness of a research study. First, its central function is to identify the state of the art—that is, to determine precisely what is known and what remains unknown about a phenomenon, including relevant theories, debates, approaches, and findings [6]. This initial recognition, in turn, enables the detection of gaps, tensions, and contradictions in academic production, which justifies the relevance of new research and guides the formulation of the research problem. In this regard, Lozano [9] argues that a critical review makes it possible to reveal conceptual and methodological insufficiencies that open opportunities for innovative inquiry.

Likewise, an essential objective of the review is to contextualize the study within a broad conceptual framework, avoiding fragmented analyses and fostering a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. Arnau and Sala [7] emphasize that such contextualization enables articulation of the project with debates, theoretical traditions, and significant antecedents in the scientific field. From this point, the review fulfills the function of grounding the theoretical framework, as it facilitates the selection, comparison, and articulation of concepts, approaches, and interpretive models that will serve as the analytical basis [4].

Similarly, the review guides methodological decisions by allowing the identification of methods, techniques, and instruments previously used, those that have demonstrated effectiveness, and the limitations that should be avoided [14]. This implies not only recognizing established practices but also critically evaluating their scope and constraints. From this perspective, the review requires a critical analysis of theoretical and methodological perspectives, examining not only the content but also the assumptions, dominant approaches, and innovations present in the studies [11].

Finally, a transversal objective is to strengthen the researcher's critical thinking. A rigorous review does not merely summarize information; it involves comparing, contrasting, engaging in dialogue with authors, and taking a position regarding the field's debates. As Lozano [6] notes, this exercise positions the researcher within the academic discussion and enables the development of informed and reflective arguments. In summary, the literature review identifies, organizes, evaluates, and contextualizes available knowledge while also guiding the study theoretically and methodologically, fostering solid, relevant, and critical scientific production.

Conceptual and Theoretical Foundations

The conceptual and theoretical foundations of the literature review allow it to be understood as a complex scientific practice that articulates interpretation, epistemological analysis, critical evaluation, and methodological systematization. First, from a hermeneutic perspective, the review is understood as a process of deep interpretation of academic discourse. For Gadamer [15], understanding involves engaging in a dialogue with the text, in which the researcher interprets and reconstructs meanings, confronts interpretations, and articulates diverse perspectives. Thus, the review does not consist merely of compiling information but of uncovering the horizons of meaning that shape scientific production.

Second, from an epistemological standpoint, the literature review allows researchers to construct a conceptual map of the scientific field, identifying central notions, the assumptions underlying them, and predominant

arguments. Hart [11] points out that this exercise makes it possible to recognize how analytical categories have been shaped and how theoretical approaches evolve, contributing to the understanding of the internal structure of disciplinary knowledge.

Likewise, the review constitutes a critical practice insofar as it requires analyzing, evaluating, and synthesizing information in a reasoned manner. According to Paul and Elder [16], critical thinking involves examining arguments, establishing comparisons, identifying strengths and weaknesses, and questioning assumptions. Under this premise, the literature review acquires an evaluative character that makes it possible to assess the relevance, coherence, and rigor of existing studies, avoiding uncritical or merely descriptive readings.

Finally, its theoretical foundation draws on methodological models and orientations developed by authors such as Webster and Watson [12], Creswell [4], and Booth et al. [17], who emphasize the need to approach the review as a systematic, organized, and transparent process. These contributions help structure the search, selection, analysis, and synthesis of the literature, ensuring that the exercise is conducted with criteria of exhaustiveness, coherence, and academic rigor. In this way, the literature review is configured as an integral activity that combines interpretation, epistemology, critique, and systematization to strengthen the research process.

Types of Scientific Literature Review

The classification of types of literature review reflects the diversity of purposes, approaches, and levels of depth that this process can assume within scientific research. The contributions of Lozano [9], Morales [6], and Arnau et al. [7] allow this variety to be understood from complementary perspectives.

First, Lozano [9] proposes a typology based on the degree of interpretation and the epistemological function of the review. The descriptive review is limited to synthesizing and organizing information without deep analysis, making it useful in exploratory stages. The critical review, in turn, systematically evaluates the quality, internal coherence, and limitations of the sources. The integrative review articulates patterns, categories, and relationships among studies to build a broader understanding of the phenomenon. Finally, the problematizing review enables the identification of gaps, tensions, contradictions, or omissions, and proposes new research agendas, making it particularly valuable for theoretical innovation.

For his part, Morales [6] expands the classification by incorporating internationally consolidated approaches. These include the systematic review, characterized by explicit criteria for search, inclusion, and analysis; the narrative review, which is more flexible and interpretive; and the scoping review, useful for mapping emerging fields. He also includes the integrative review, the conceptual review, the historical review, the qualitative review, the argumentative review, and the realist review, as well as the meta-analysis, which quantitatively synthesizes results from multiple studies to offer solid comparative evidence. This classification highlights that each type responds to different research questions and requires differentiated levels of rigor.

Similarly, Arnau et al. [7] emphasize the narrative review as a fundamental tool for building theoretical frameworks and contextualizing research, particularly in the social sciences. However, they also acknowledge that systematic reviews play a crucial role when methodological thoroughness is required, underscoring the importance of inclusion and exclusion criteria, the use of analytical matrices, and transparency in procedures.

To these contributions, widely recognized typologies in contemporary scientific literature are added. The narrative review, according to Baumeister and Leary [18], allows broad interpretive analysis and is the most widely used modality in the humanities and social sciences due to its theoretical flexibility. The systematic review, in contrast, follows standardized protocols to minimize bias and ensure reproducibility [19]. The integrative review proposed by Whittemore and Knafl [20] combines empirical, theoretical, and methodological evidence, making it useful for developing comprehensive frameworks. The critical review delves into conceptual foundations and theoretical tensions (Grant & Booth [21]), while the bibliometric review uses quantitative methods to examine trends, networks, and academic productivity [8]. Finally, the state of the art provides a detailed overview of advances, gaps, and future directions of a field [22]-[23]-[24]-[1].

Taken together, these classifications show that the literature review is not a homogeneous activity but a practice adaptable to the aims of the study. The selection of the type of review must respond to the research question, the

expected level of depth, and the epistemological nature of the field. As a recommendation, for qualitative, hermeneutic, or socio-critical research, it is particularly relevant to choose narrative, critical, integrative, or problematizing reviews, as these allow for a better understanding of complexity, dialogue with multiple approaches, and promote reflective analysis that transcends mere description. If the objective is exhaustiveness, methodological transparency, or quantitative synthesis of findings, systematic reviews or meta-analyses are the most appropriate alternatives.

Recommendations for Writing a Literature Review

Recommendations for developing a literature review constitute a set of methodological and ethical guidelines designed to ensure rigor, coherence, and quality in the research process. First, it is essential to clearly delimit the topic of study. Lozano [9] argues that the researcher must narrow the conceptual field, define core categories, and formulate clear search questions to avoid thematic dispersion and ensure the relevance of the bibliographic selection. This initial delimitation guides all subsequent stages and makes a systematic process possible.

In line with this, it is recommended to identify relevant keywords and combine them with Boolean operators (AND, OR, NOT), including synonyms, derivative terms, and linguistic variations. Arnau et al. [7] highlight that this procedure optimizes information retrieval and increases the precision of searches in academic databases. Next, exhaustive and systematic searches must be conducted in reliable sources such as Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, PsycINFO, Google Scholar, PubMed, or Scielo, selecting the databases most relevant to the discipline and the nature of the phenomenon.

Another crucial component is the establishment of explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria, which may be thematic, chronological, methodological, linguistic, or based on quality. Arnau et al. [7] note that such criteria allow for filtering information, ensuring the relevance of sources, and granting transparency to the document selection process.

Once the literature is collected, the information must be organized systematically. For this purpose, analysis matrices, reference managers such as Mendeley or Zotero, and literature maps are recommended, as they facilitate categorization, comparison, and visualization of sources [4]. This organization enables orderly analysis of the material and contributes to the coherence of the theoretical framework.

Subsequently, the review requires a critical and comparative analysis of the texts, which involves interpreting, contrasting, and synthesizing theories, approaches, findings, and gaps. It is not enough to describe authors; one must evaluate argumentative consistency, the methodologies used, and the contributions of each study to generate a deep and articulated understanding of the field.

In the writing process, argumentative coherence must be maintained by constructing a guiding thread that articulates the categories, advances, and tensions identified. The review must show conceptual progression, clarity of exposition, and a logical structure that helps the reader understand the evolution of the academic debate.

Finally, research practice demands ethical rigor, which includes properly citing all consulted sources, avoiding any form of plagiarism, and maintaining transparency regarding the processes of search, selection, analysis, and synthesis. Complete citation according to international standards, in addition to ensuring knowledge traceability, contributes to the credibility of the study and supports the integrity of the researcher. Together, these recommendations enable the development of literature reviews that are solid, critical, and methodologically grounded essential for high-quality scientific production.

4. Discussion

The literature review, understood from the interpretive paradigm, acquires a deeply reflective and dialogical character, which allows its comprehension to extend beyond an instrumental exercise of compilation. In this study, the discussion focuses on analyzing how the functions, objectives, and conceptual foundations reviewed converge to consolidate a research practice that articulates interpretation, critical thinking, and systematicity.

First, the literature review emerges as an interpretive process in which the researcher reconstructs meanings, identifies patterns, and evaluates the internal coherence of the field of study. Following Gadamer [15] and Ricoeur

[25], understanding implies engaging in dialogue with texts, and this dialogue materializes when conceptual tensions, persistent debates, and epistemological gaps are recognized. The reviewed literature—particularly Lozano [9], Morales [6], Arnau and Sala [7], and Manterola [26] shows that the review is not a passive act but an active exercise in which the researcher positions their reading, interprets discourses, and selects relevant approaches to support the development of their research.

A second aspect discussed relates to the epistemological importance of the review. Hart [11] emphasizes that bibliographic analysis makes it possible to map the assumptions, models, and categories that support a field of study. Based on the results, it is observed that this epistemological function serves as the foundation for supporting theories, identifying ruptures, understanding historical research trajectories, and conceptually and methodologically delimiting the phenomenon analyzed. The strengthening of the theoretical framework depends largely on the researcher's ability to organize and synthesize existing contributions, selecting those that provide coherence, depth, and relevance to the study.

Another relevant element of the discussion is the role of the review in methodological decision-making. The literature agrees that this action allows researchers to observe which methods have been used previously and which have proven most effective in similar contexts (Snyder, 2019). From a qualitative perspective, this implies not only reproducing techniques but critically evaluating them, recognizing their limitations, and adapting strategies that respond to the nature of the research problem. Consequently, the review becomes a tool for methodological anticipation and rigorous grounding not only theoretical but also procedural.

Likewise, the classification of types of review highlights the need to consider the research intention and the epistemological approach when selecting the appropriate modality. The wide range of options from narrative reviews to systematic reviews or meta-analyses requires the researcher to reflect on the level of analytical depth needed and the type of evidence they aim to construct. In qualitative and interpretive research, such as those commonly conducted in the social sciences, narrative, critical, and integrative reviews appear to offer greater flexibility for understanding the complexity of social phenomena.

Finally, the discussion underscores the ethical dimension and academic responsibility in the literature review. Transparency in the search process, proper use of inclusion and exclusion criteria, and rigorous citation not only ensure the quality of the work but also preserve scientific integrity. Critical thinking, as noted by Paul and Elder [16], is essential for evaluating the validity and soundness of the studies reviewed, avoiding reductionist perspectives or superficial readings.

In summary, the literature review, from an interpretive–qualitative approach, constitutes a complex practice that integrates hermeneutic understanding, epistemological rigor, and methodological systematicity, positioning itself as an indispensable element in the construction of scientific knowledge.

5. Conclusions

The literature review, analyzed from the interpretive paradigm and the qualitative approach, is established as an essential practice that provides coherence, depth, and legitimacy to the research process. First, it is concluded that the review is not an accessory or preliminary procedure, but a continuous process that accompanies all stages of the study. Its hermeneutic character allows the reconstruction of meaning, the interpretation of scientific discourses, and the positioning of the research within a broader conceptual framework. This deep interpretation facilitates the identification of debates, trends, tensions, and gaps, contributing to the rigorous delimitation and justification of the research problem.

Likewise, the literature review fulfills a decisive epistemological function, as it allows the construction of a conceptual map of the field, the identification of relevant theoretical foundations, and the understanding of how analytical categories have evolved. The critical examination of available theoretical and methodological perspectives facilitates the selection of relevant approaches and the elimination of those that do not contribute to the study's objective, thus strengthening the structure of the theoretical framework and consolidating the internal coherence of the research.

From a methodological standpoint, the review emerges as a key resource for guiding the selection of designs, techniques, and instruments, anticipating potential difficulties, and assessing the relevance of procedures implemented in previous research. For qualitative studies, this guidance is particularly valuable, as interpretive flexibility must be supported by solid conceptual criteria and a deep understanding of the field of study. The review therefore becomes an informed guide that supports coherent and contextualized methodological decisions.

The diversity of types of review demonstrates the need to select the modality most appropriate to the objectives, the epistemological approach, and the required analytical depth. While narrative, critical, and integrative reviews are particularly suitable for interpretive and socio-critical research, systematic reviews and meta-analyses are more appropriate when exhaustiveness, replicability, or quantitative synthesis are sought. This typological plurality broadens the possibilities for analysis and strengthens the researcher's ability to adapt the review to the nature of the phenomenon studied.

In conclusion, the literature review implies an ethical commitment and an academic responsibility. Transparency in processes, accuracy in citation, and integrity in interpretation constitute essential requirements to ensure the credibility of the study. Added to this is the promotion of critical thinking, which enables the researcher not only to describe but also to evaluate, compare, question, and engage in dialogue with the sources consulted.

The study contributes to the research field by demonstrating that the literature review not only organizes existing knowledge but also acts as a mechanism for generating new knowledge. This contribution is expressed at various levels:

1. **At the epistemological level**, it redefines the review as an interpretive practice that constructs meaning rather than merely synthesizing information, enriching the understanding of scientific production processes.
2. **At the theoretical level**, it proposes an integrative articulation between hermeneutics, critique, and systematicity as a foundation for developing more coherent and contextualized conceptual frameworks.
3. **At the methodological level**, it shows that the review is an innovative tool that allows the identification of opportunities, the proposal of new research agendas, and the strengthening of grounded decision-making.
4. **At the practical level**, it offers a set of criteria and recommendations that can improve the quality of future reviews and the robustness of qualitative research in various disciplinary areas.

Taken together, it is concluded that the literature review is an interpretive, critical, and systematic exercise that not only accompanies research but also produces new, meaningful, and relevant knowledge, becoming the basis for rigorous scientific production and for the formulation of coherent and deeply grounded studies.

References

- [1] Martínez, H. E., Pumarejo, H. M., Montero, M. J., & Monter, E. (2024). State of the art design: Reflections, meaning, objective, structure and example. *Russian Law Journal*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.52783/rj.v12i1.3931>
- [2] Schutz, A. (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world*. Northwestern University Press.
- [3] Martínez, H. E. (2025). Fundamentos filosóficos del conocimiento científico: gnoseología, epistemología, paradigmas y enfoques de investigación. En *Filosofia, essência e existência: questões fundamentais e reflexões filosóficas* (pp. 117–149). Atena Editora. <https://doi.org/10.22533/AT.ED.7501125240310>
- [4] Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage,
- [5] Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). Sage.
- [6] Morales La Paz, L. (2020). *La revisión de la literatura en el proceso de investigación*. En *La creación de conocimiento en ciencias sociales*.
- [7] Arnau Sabatés, L., & Sala Roca, J. (2020). *La revisión de la literatura científica: Pautas, procedimientos y criterios de calidad*. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

- [8] Donthu, N., Kumar, S., Mukherjee, D., Pandey, N., & Lim, W. M. (2021). How to conduct a bibliometric analysis: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 133, 285–296.
- [9] Lozano, L. E. (2024). *Guía detallada para elaborar una revisión de literatura*. El Colegio de México.
- [10] Romero-Sánchez, A., Perdomo-Charry, G., & Burbano-Vallejo, E. L. (2025). Factores determinantes en la creación de Spin-Off Académicas: Una perspectiva multiteórica. *Revista De Ciencias Sociales*, 31(1), 162–181. <https://doi.org/10.31876/rcs.v31i1.43496>
- [11] Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination*. Sage.
- [12] Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), xiii–xxiii.
- [13] Randolph, J. J. (2009). A guide to writing the dissertation literature review. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 14(13), 1–13.
- [14] Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339.
- [15] Gadamer, H.-G. (1993). *Verdad y método*. Sígueme.
- [16] Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2014). *Critical thinking: Tools for taking charge of your learning and your life* (3rd ed.). Pearson.
- [17] Booth, A., Sutton, A., & Papaioannou, D. (2016). *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- [18] Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1997). Writing narrative literature reviews. *Review of General Psychology*, 1(3), 311–320
- [19] Higgins, J. P. T., & Green, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. Wiley. DOI:10.1002/9780470712184
- [20] Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(5), 546–553.
- [21] Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91–108.
- [22] Londoño, O. L., & Maldonado, M. E. (2014). El estado del arte en la investigación educativa: revisión conceptual. *Revista Educación y Pedagogía*, 26(68), 21–38.
- [23] Martínez Barrios, H. E., Salcedo Mosquera, J. D., & Romero Sánchez, A. (2022). Observation as a research technique. (Reflections, types, recommendations and examples). *Russian Law Journal*, 10(4), 792–798. <https://doi.org/10.52783/rj.v10i4.4348>
- [24] Martínez, H. E. (2025). Fundamentos filosóficos del conocimiento científico: gnoseología, epistemología, paradigmas y enfoques de investigación. En *Filosofia, essência e existência: questões fundamentais e reflexões filosóficas* (pp. 117–149). Atena Editora. <https://doi.org/10.22533/AT.ED.7501125240310>
- [25] Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- [26] Manterola, C., et al. (2023). *Revisiones narrativas y sistemáticas*. Revista Médica de Chile.

i

i