

CALIDAD TÉCNICA Y METODOLÓGICA DE METAPERICIAS EN INFORMES PSICOLÓGICOS FORENSES EN SANTO DOMINGO (ECUADOR)

TECHNICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL QUALITY OF SECOND OPINIONS IN FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGICAL REPORTS IN SANTO DOMINGO (ECUADOR)

Iván Marcelo Bayas Romero¹, Kevin Jhordy Sinchiguano Álvarez², Bernardo Peña Herrera³, Andrés
Ricardo Delgado Reyes⁴

{ivanbaro1977@gmail.com1, kevincho1993@hotmail.com2, bpenah@ube.edu.ec3, ardelgador@ube.edu.ec4}

Fecha de recepción: 01/04/2026 / Fecha de aceptación: 21/04/2026 / Fecha de publicación: 12/05/2026

RESUMEN: La psicología forense desempeña un papel importante para el sistema de justicia porque aporta criterios técnicos para sustentar la toma de decisiones judiciales, siendo en este sentido que la calidad metodológica de los informes psicológicos periciales es un aspecto fundamental para certificar su validez científica. Sin embargo, en el ámbito ecuatoriano existe escasa evidencia empírica que habilite la evaluación sistemática de los informes psicológicos para la práctica forense, lo que pone de manifiesto un vacío en la supervisión de la rigurosidad técnica de la práctica en esta área. El presente estudio tiene como finalidad analizar la calidad técnica y metodológica de las metapericias realizadas sobre informes psicológicos forenses en Santo Domingo (Ecuador). Se realizó una investigación cualitativa, descriptiva y de carácter exploratorio, que descansó, entre otras fuentes, en el análisis documental de diez informes psicológicos forenses. Se aplicó el método de evaluación de la calidad del Modelo Metodológico de Meta-análisis de Peritajes Psicológicos de Maffioletti, complementado por la Guía de Buenas Prácticas del Consejo General de la Psicología de España en una matriz de verificación de variables con respuestas dicotómicas (sí/no). Los resultados evidencian que un número importante de variables críticas no se cumplen en los informes analizados, señalándose la falta de explicitación metodológica, control de sesgos, triangulación de datos, formulación de hipótesis alternativas y análisis estructurado de resultados, así como una escasa o nula utilización de instrumentos psicométricos estandarizados. Se concluye que en la muestra estudiada existen debilidades metodológicas que pueden afectar la calidad técnica de los informes psicológicos periciales, lo que pone de manifiesto la importancia de la metapericia como instrumento para su evaluación y mejora continua de la práctica en el ámbito de la psicología forense.

Palabras clave: metapericia forense, psicología forense, informes psicológicos periciales, valoración judicial de la prueba pericial, calidad metodológica

ABSTRACT: Forensic psychology plays an important role in the justice system because it provides technical criteria to support judicial decision-making; in this regard, the methodological quality of expert psychological reports is a fundamental aspect in establishing their scientific validity. However, in Ecuador, there is little empirical evidence to enable the systematic evaluation of psychological reports for forensic practice, highlighting a gap in the oversight of the technical rigor of practice in this area.

English translation of the original article published in Ecuacientífica, Vol. 4, No. 9, pp. 17-34.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the technical and methodological quality of meta-expert evaluations conducted on forensic psychological reports in Santo Domingo (Ecuador). A qualitative, descriptive, and exploratory study was conducted, based, among other sources, on the documentary analysis of ten forensic psychological reports. The quality assessment method of Maffioletti's Methodological Model for Meta-analysis of Psychological Expert Reports was applied, supplemented by the Guide to Good Practices of the General Council of Psychology of Spain, using a variable verification matrix with dichotomous responses (yes/no). The results show that a significant number of critical variables are not met in the reports analyzed, highlighting a lack of methodological transparency, bias control, data triangulation, formulation of alternative hypotheses, and structured analysis of results, as well as little or no use of standardized psychometric instruments. It is concluded that the sample studied exhibits methodological weaknesses that may affect the technical quality of expert psychological reports, highlighting the importance of meta-expertise as a tool for evaluating and continuously improving practice in the field of forensic psychology.

Keywords: *Forensic meta-expertise, forensic psychology, expert psychological reports, judicial assessment of expert evidence, methodological quality*

1 Universidad Estatal de Bolívar (UEB), <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6823-5379>.

2 Universidad Estatal de Bolívar (UEB), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2680-4897>.

3 Universidad Estatal de Bolívar (UEB), <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3667-0522>.

4 Universidad Estatal de Bolívar (UEB), <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9128-8094>.

INTRODUCTION

Forensic psychology has consolidated itself as a fundamental discipline within the system of administration of justice, upon providing scientific knowledge that permits analyzing aspects of human behavior relevant for the judicial processes. In this context, the expert psychological reports constitute a means of proof of great importance, since they contribute technical criteria that can influence in the taking of decisions on the part of the operators of justice. Owing to their relevance, these reports must comply with scientific and methodological standards that guarantee their objectivity, validity and coherence. In the last years, diverse studies have highlighted the necessity of evaluating the quality of the psychological expertises, highlighting the meta-expertise as a specialized mechanism to review and analyze the technical consistency of the expert reports (1), (2).

The meta-expertise or meta-expert appraisal consists in the critical revision of an expert report with the aim of determining if this responds adequately to the judicial question, if it applies correctly the methods of evaluation and if the conclusions are found duly founded. According to what is expressed by (3), this process grants the possibility of detecting methodological weaknesses and/or incoherences in the expert reports valuing in such form the quality of the expert proof in the judicial process. However, of the relevance of the meta-expertise, in the Ecuadorian context there exist scarce studies that analyze in a systematic form the quality of the forensic psychological reports and the meta-expertises, and therefore the state of the art in the matter is practically at zero, a situation that gives account of an evident gap of knowledge in the professional practice and the academic practice.

In this sense, it becomes necessary to realize investigations that make emphasis on the application of methodologies of evaluation of psychological expert reports, such as the model of meta-analysis proposed by (4), whose norms permit analyzing the structure, coherence and foundation of the different expert reports. Exactly from this necessity the present study has as purpose the evaluation of the technical and methodological quality of the system of meta-expertises applied on forensic psychological reports in the city of Santo Domingo, Ecuador, during the year 2024, seeking thus to present evidence that permits reinforcing the practice of the psychological expert proof, as well as improving the quality of the expert proof in the judicial practice.

Despite the relevance of the meta-expertise as mechanism to utilize in order to be able to carry out a control of quality in the forensic psychological reports, in the Ecuadorian context there exist scarce investigations that analyze in a systematic form the technical and methodological quality of this type of procedures. This absence of evidence permits evidencing the low scientific rigor of the expert reports utilized in the judicial processes.

The objective of this study is to analyze the technical and methodological quality of the meta-expertises realized on forensic psychological reports in Santo Domingo (Ecuador).

The Meta-expertise in the Forensic Psychological Reports in Ecuador

The psychological expert evaluation unlike other areas of application of the psychology acquires a more complex connotation in the juridical context owing to that it requires the selection of a theory that makes possible the explanation of a determined case and the generation of a hypothesis that facilitates the selection of methods and techniques of evaluation appropriate, supporting itself in great measure of the clinical psychology and the psychopathology (5).

Its evaluation implies the administration of a semi-structured interview, the detailed examination of the clinical history, the analysis of the judicial resolutions and criminal antecedents, the study of the vital history: family, school, work, couple and others, supporting itself in external informants and in some test of personality (6).

Forensic psychology is a specialty that is exercised, basically, before the tribunal, to which one advises and counsels in those decisions in which the knowledge in Psychology is necessary. Thus the role of the forensic psychologist is that of expert who emits reports that can be utilized as proof in a judicial process.

It is essential to consider the form in which the processes of psychological evaluation are implemented, in particular the use of psychometric instruments. This analysis encompasses not only their intrinsic psychometric properties, but also the extrinsic factors related with the legal framework, which will be examined in detail later.

As is the case of the forensic juridical environment the user does not present himself in a voluntary form before the professional, but that his acting, in these diligences, is mediated by his role within a judicial process: denounced/denouncer or defendant/plaintiff. At the same time, the direct consequences of the expert dictamen, of the findings found in the expertise and drafted in a report, that must be defended by the expert psychologist, makes that the evaluated increase the probability of manipulation of the information, contributed in order to achieve a benefit or avoid prejudice.

Forensic Psychological Meta-expertise

The forensic psychological meta-expertise is understood as the critical, systematic and documentary process that realizes an expert denominated meta-expert, whose fundamental objective is to verify the scientific, technical and methodological suitability of a psychological expert report already elaborated.

In this sense, the meta-expertise contemplates diverse elements and technical considerations that orient its application in the forensic ambit, as is shown next in Table 1.

Table 1. Elements and considerations in the forensic meta-expertise

Elements	Considerations
Objective:	Aids the taking of judicial decisions.
Evaluator – subject relation:	Skeptical, but with establishment of an adequate rapport.
Professional secrecy:	No.
Destination of the evaluation:	Variable (judge, lawyer, insurances...).
Standards and requirements:	Psycho-Legal.
Sources of information:	Interview, test. Observation, medical reports and judicial files.
Attitude of the subject toward the evaluation:	Risk of simulation or dissimulation or deceit (involuntary demand).
Ambit of the evaluation:	Mental state in relation to the expert object.
Type of report:	Very documented, reasoned technically and with conclusions that answer to the judicial demand. Legal document.
Intervention in the hall of justice:	Expectable. In quality of expert.

This process does not imply a new evaluation of the evaluated subject, but an exhaustive revision of the original report in order to guarantee that it complies with the norms of technical rigor, validity and professional ethics established in the Ecuadorian judicial ambit (7).

Meta-expert

The meta-expert is the specialized professional and with advanced formation in forensic psychology, who possesses methodical and ethical experience to elaborate a counter-report or critical dictamen on a previous forensic psychological report, identifying possible errors, biases, or methodological deficiencies.

The labor of the meta-expert consists in evaluating the replicability, validity and objectivity of the report under analysis, contributing clarity and transparency to the judicial process.

Next, in Table 2, the operational definitions of the principal concepts utilized in the study are presented:

Table 2. Differentiated concepts

Term	Operational Definition	Source
Meta-expertise	Critical, systematic and documentary analysis to verify the scientific and methodological validity of forensic psychological reports.	Jarrin Chiriboga (2025), (7)
Meta-expert	Professional with technical and ethical competence who elaborates counter-reports to evaluate errors, biases and validity of the original report.	Garrido et al. (2023), Torres (2022)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Type of investigation

The present investigation was developed under a qualitative approach, with a descriptive design of documentary analysis, oriented to examine the technical and methodological quality of forensic psychological reports. Likewise, the study is framed in an exploratory reach with design of multiple case, owing to that a specific sample of reports was analyzed in depth, permitting identifying patterns, recurrences and methodological deficiencies in the expert practice, without intending statistical generalization, but the analytic comprehension of the phenomenon in its real context.

This approach results pertinent considering the limited empirical evidence existing in the Ecuadorian context with respect to the meta-expert evaluation of forensic psychological reports, which justifies the necessity of exploratory studies that permit approaching the phenomenon from a systematic perspective.

Population and sample

The population of study remained constituted by forensic psychological reports generated in the system of administration of justice Ecuadorian. The sample was constituted by ten forensic psychological reports belonging to a provincial jurisdiction of the country and had been elaborated the year 2024 by forensic psychologists accredited in the judicial ambit.

The selection of the reports of the sample was realized from a technique of non-probabilistic sampling, intentional type, where criteria of inclusion were fixed that assured the congruence and quality of the analyzed reports. The criteria of inclusion considered were:

- a) forensic psychological reports elaborated belonging to the year 2024,
- b) realized by experts accredited by the Council of the Judicature,
- c) reports that were object of meta-expertise in the judicial processes, and
- d) that counted with full access to their content.

Those reports that were incomplete, that counted with documentation, not verifiable or those that did not have at least the minimal conditions of analysis were not considered. These criteria of inclusion guaranteed reducing the possible biases of selection and counting with a congruence between the sample and the objectives of study.

The reports were provided by professionals in the forensic ambit, more specifically by an expert psychologist who is found functional within the police ambit, who acts as expert peer together with the accredited forensic juridical psychologist. The meta-expertises of the reports were dictated by the general prosecutor's office of the Nation by means of the System of Drawing of Experts, guaranteeing thus the form, legality and traceability of the process.

Environment of study

The investigation was developed in the context of the system of administration of justice of an Ecuadorian province, specifically in the ambit of the forensic psychology applied to judicial processes. This environment is characterized by the interaction between

professionals of the psychology and juridical operators, in where the expert reports constitute a relevant means of proof for the taking of judicial decisions.

For ethical and legal considerations, the confidentiality of the information was maintained, utilizing generic denominations and avoiding the identification of persons, institutions or specific cases.

Materials and instruments of collection of data

The principal technique of collection of information was the documentary analysis, employing as units of analysis the forensic psychological reports.

As instrument a structured analysis matrix was utilized, based on the Methodological Model of Meta-analysis of Psychological Expertises proposed by (8). This model contemplates a set of 28 variables organized in five fundamental dimensions:

- (i) characteristics of the expert,
- (ii) format of the report,
- (iii) methodology employed,
- (iv) presentation and analysis of results,
- (v) coherence of the conclusions.

Each one of these variables was evaluated by means of a system of dichotomous coding (Yes/No), in function of the presence or absence explicit of the criterion in the analyzed report. This procedure permitted objectifying the evaluation, reducing the subjectivity of the analysis and facilitating the comparison among the distinct cases.

Procedure of application of the model of Maffioletti

The application of the methodological model was carried out by means of a systematic and sequential process that guaranteed the rigor of the analysis. In the first place, an exhaustive reading of each expert report was realized, with the aim of identifying its structural and methodological components.

Next, the identification of the variables proposed by Maffioletti of the distinct documents was carried out, paying attention to the characteristics such as the explicitation of the methodology, the use of techniques of evaluation, the existence of control of biases, the coherence of the analysis of results and the foundation of the conclusions.

In the third place, the coding of the variables was finished, from a coding of dichotomous values (Yes/No) to determine if they complied or not. This constructive coding permitted us to construct the comparative matrix of the distinct reports.

Finally, the data were systematized in a comparative analysis, visualizing the common practices, the findings of the methodological omissions and the structural weaknesses of the evaluated reports. This permitted visualizing common practices of the analyzed expertise.

The utilization of this methodological model guaranteed the replicability of the study, by means of the elaboration of clear, objective criteria and that can be verified by means of posterior investigations.

English translation of the original article published in Ecuacientífica, Vol. 4, No. 9, pp. 17-34.

Analysis of data

The analysis of the information was realized by means of techniques of qualitative comparative analysis, complemented with basic descriptive statistics, specifically the calculation of frequencies of compliance of the evaluated variables.

The results were organized in matrices and tables, which permitted visualizing in a structured manner the level of compliance of the methodological criteria in the analyzed reports.

Owing to the qualitative nature of the study, neither inferential statistical tests nor specialized statistical software were employed; however, the systematization of the information permitted identifying relevant patterns and establishing founded analytic inferences.

Ethical considerations

The study was developed respecting fundamental ethical principles, such as the confidentiality, the anonymization of data and the responsible use of the information. Neither personal data nor elements that permit the identification of the evaluated subjects or of the analyzed judicial processes were included.

Likewise, the access to the reports was realized within a framework of legality and institutional authorization, guaranteeing the compliance of the norms in force in the ambit of the forensic psychology and the scientific investigation.

RESULTS

An approach was realized with the lady Forensic Juridical Psychologist M.A.N.B. the same who is accredited on the part of the Council of the Judicature of Ecuador, and with her expert peer the Forensic Psychologist I.M.B.R., in order to be able to identify the results of the 10 analyzed reports, the Methodological Model of Meta-analysis of Psychological Expertises of (8) was applied, complemented with the Guide of Good Practices for the Forensic Psychological Evaluation of the General Council of the Psychology of Spain (9). Both use binary verification lists (Yes/No) to objectify the revision.

Upon reviewing the forensic psychological reports elaborated by accredited experts and applying the methodological model of (8) a scarce level of compliance of the evaluated technical criteria was evidenced. Of the 28 variables presented in the model, 14 do not appear in the consulted reports, which verified lacks and deficiencies in the structural characteristics relative to the quality of the methodology of the expert dictamens.

The global results of the evaluation are presented next in Table 3.

Table 3. Methodological model of Meta-Analysis of psychological expertises (Maffioletti, 2016).

PERITO / EXPERTISE	FORMAT / METHODOLOGY / RESULTS	Code	VARIABLES	VALUE
EXPERT	Formation	Suitability	Specialty (postgraduate in the area)	YES
EXPERTISE	FORMAT	a	Possesses format adequate to expert report	YES
		b	Identifies correctly the evaluated	YES
		c	Explicates adequately the methodology	NO
		ch	Explicates psycho-legal question	YES

		d	Identifies the requester of expert report	YES
		e	Identifies the No. of cause and tribunal	YES
	METHODOLOGY	f	Methodology adequate to the forensic end	YES
		g	Considers mechanisms of Control of Bias	NO
		h	Considers control of expert peer in expertise	-----
		i	Explicates the documents that it had in view	NO
		j	Describes the fact and its circumstances	YES
		k	The "margin of error" is considered	NO
		l	Indicates bibliography (updated)	NO
	RESULTS	ll	Describes adequately all the results	NO
		m	Gives account of the process of analysis of results	NO
		n	Handles other possibilities hypotheses (alternatives)	NO
		o	Considers other sexual experiences previous or posterior	YES
		p	Establishes causal nexus	YES
		q	The obtained data are triangulated	NO

Regarding the Expertise – Variable – Describes Adequately All the Results

As we have been able to observe in the 10 reports realized on the part of the forensic psychologist experts accredited by the Council of the Judicature, it can be evidenced, in their sections "Integration of Results or Results," that no type of results of quantitative nor qualitative type is described.

Regarding the Expertise – Variable – Gives Account of the Process of Analysis of Results

In the 10 analyzed reports the same which were realized on the part of the forensic psychologist experts accredited by the Council of the Judicature, There does not exist any process of analysis of results, solely we can find in the sections "INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS" that no response of results nor the logical sequence of the tabulation of said results is given, solely the name of the test and its qualification is presented Example:

Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-2)

Result: Score of 35 points: Severe Depression.

We can observe that there does not exist a reflexive analysis with respect to what it means that the evaluated have Severe Depression, or what type of scale was utilized to mention that upon obtaining 35 points the evaluated would have a Severe Depression.

Regarding the Expertise – Variable – Handles Other Possibilities Alternative Hypothesis

In the 10 psychological reports the handling of other possible hypotheses is not evidenced by the fact that in the reports there did not exist the presentation of a single hypothesis that is to say that this variable never was presented as alternative.

Regarding the Expertise – Variable – Establishes Causal Nexus

The causal nexus is not evidenced in 06 of the 10 forensic psychological reports realized, likewise it could be found in the conclusions of the 04 remaining reports the symptomatology that the presumed victim presented for disorders of depression and disorders of anxiety or at the same time also they presented presumptive diagnoses of mixed disorders of anxiety and depression, but without any type of affirmation that

these disorders diagnosed in the victim be product of the event related on the part of the victimizer, without existing thus a CAUSAL NEXUS.

Regarding the Expertise – Variable – The Obtained Data Are Triangulated

Within the methodology employed on the part of the 10 psychological reports never could the presence of the utilization of the “Methodology of triangulation of data” on the part of the experts of the Council of the Judicature be appreciated, the methodology of “Triangulation of data,” which in itself is the utilization of several sources, methods, theories or investigators to collect and analyze information on a same phenomenon, with the objective of increasing the validity, depth and comprehension of the study, as well as diminishing biases and errors, the same which support that the report have a robust validity and strengthen the conclusions.

Regarding the Expertise – Variable – Social Desirability Is Controlled

There does not exist in none of the 10 analyzed psychological reports that the term of “social desirability” has been referred or utilized, likewise if the social desirability were controlled in the evaluations one should utilize tests to avoid said bias such as, for example:

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS): measures the tendency to respond in a socially acceptable manner, identifying the bias in the responses.

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR-6): evaluates two dimensions, the self-deception and the management of the impression, providing a more detailed analysis of the bias.

Regarding the Expertise – Variable – Simulation Is Controlled

In the 10 analyzed psychological reports, it is evidenced that there does not exist control to the simulation of the presumed victims, owing that a psychological test oriented to the conscious and deliberate imitation of false or exaggerated physical or mental symptoms with the purpose of obtaining an external benefit, such as avoiding a sanction, receiving an indemnification or eluding legal or labor responsibilities is not applied. In order to be able to control the simulation one must measure with standardized reagents such as are:

Structured Inventory of Malingered Symptomatology (SIMS).

Test of Memory Malingered (TOMM).

Regarding the Conclusions – Variable – The Conclusions Are Derived from the Results

In the 08 forensic psychological reports of the 10 analyzed psychological reports it could be evidenced that there does not exist a relation between the results with the conclusions by the fact, that the results do not figure a qualitative nor quantitative content, but more well in the majority of the psychological reports they manifest that they only present a diagnosis of anxiety and depression, but the type of depression or anxiety is not registered, the score obtained on the part of the presumed victim, as also the type of range established in the scale, and these that are found projected in the section of conclusions.

Regarding the Conclusions – Variable – The Conclusions Respond to the Psycho-legal Question

In the 10 psychological reports on the part of the experts the psycho-social question is not responded by the fact that the psycho-legal question is not mentioned within the report, solely a reference of what could be a psycho-legal question is made in the object of the expertise, which is the mission entrusted to the expert on the part of the prosecutor's office in where it is indicated what type of expertise the expert has to realize and who disposes that it be executed, in this case always it is evidenced that it is the Gender Prosecutor's Office Unit 1,2 or 3.

Regarding the Conclusions – Variable – The conclusions at long and short term are identified.

In the 10 forensic psychological reports realized on the part of the Forensic psychologists, within the conclusions the consequences that the presumed victims could have is not found, because there does not exist a real diagnosis to indicate a psychic damage which affects the mental health of the presumed victims in multiple dimensions (cognitive, affective, somatic, behavioral, and social), being able to generate some type of severe and permanent disorders that impact their quality of life and functionality at short or long term.

Regarding the Conclusions – Variable. - The Conclusion Is Objectivized and Founded

In the 10 forensic psychological reports realized on the part of the experts, it is indicated that the conclusions that said professionals realized, are not objective by the fact of not realizing adequately the psychological evaluations to the presumed victims, by means of the utilization of psychometric reagents that seek a true psychic affection in the presumed victim, that is to say that upon not existing the presence of techniques of evaluation such as are the psychological tests of standardized type, said psychological reports do not present essential characteristics of being objective, technical, nor scientific.

DISCUSSION

From the epistemological perspective, the meta-expertise is framed in the principle of certainty, oriented to found the judicial proof in solid and rigorous scientific evidences. In this sense (11), defines it as a practical tool to analyze previous expertises, identifying the epistemological, syntactic and pragmatic coherence of the original report, permitting systematizing scientific criteria in the expert evaluation.

In the same manner (12), understand that the forensic report must characterize itself by a determined level of technical foundation, submit itself to the principle of contradiction and initiate from a position that must be methodologically skeptical before the possible simulation of the evaluated. Such approaches reinforce the relevance of the meta-expertise as a type of control of quality oriented to avoid possible errors such as the confirmation bias or the overreaction of the results.

In this manner (13), argue that the meta-expertise is a systematic instrument to examine if a report adapts or not to the scientific criteria, leaving aside the counter-expertise that is defined by its qualitative guidelines. In the Ecuadorian context (14), stipulates it as a



“expertise of the expertise,” which examines not only the theoretical content, but also the structure, the language and the own coherence of the report, aspects that are basic in its impact within the judicial process.

Nevertheless, the findings obtained in the present investigation evidence that a significant proportion of the analyzed forensic psychological reports presents relevant methodological deficiencies, which coincides with studies developed in other Latin American contexts. In particular, investigations realized in Ecuador by (15), signal that the expert reports present limitations in the scientific foundation, highlighting the absence of structured methodologies, control of biases and rigorous analysis of results, which guards direct relation with the results obtained in the present study.

Equally, in the Spanish ambit (16), identify as habitual problematic the lack of explicitation of the Methodology and the emission of conclusions without sufficient empirical foundation. The results obtained in this study concur with these same results, since in the majority of the analyzed reports there is not an adequate description of the methodological process followed, nor the exposition of the results in a disaggregated form, limiting themselves many of them to the presentation of the diagnoses, but without a sufficient technical support.

Equally, the lack of control of biases, social desirability, and simulations that has been found in the analyzed reports resemble what already (17) point out, when it is signaled that the ambit of the forensic evaluation presents great probabilities of manipulation of the information on the part of the evaluated, which requires the application of determined instruments for its detection. However, in the case of the reports evaluated in the context of Santo Domingo, that was not thus, which puts of manifest a great discrepancy between the local expert practice and the norm that is accepted to the international practice.

In what concerns the application of techniques, the results make clearly the existence of an important conceptual confusion, when the subjects make reference to the use of the emotional containment, which is easily identifiable as a resource/explicit of the expert methodology. In this respect (18), define taking as reference the emotional containment as a resource/strategy of help with the purpose of stabilizing emotionally the person in crisis, which nothing has to do with the purpose to which the forensic evaluation must orient itself, which is no more than the technical, diagnostic and psycho-legal examination of the case. This methodological confusion convenient in the purpose of an expert report, since it makes that the same lose its scientific and of the right reason of being.

In another order of ideas, the results relative to the lack of triangulation of the information, the lack of alternative hypotheses and the weakness in the establishment of the causal nexus coincide with what marks the specialized literature, which sentences the necessity of integrating diverse sources and specific techniques with the purpose of guaranteeing a solid interpretation of the expert analysis. In this sense, the lack of the same in the analyzed reports affects directly the scientific validity of the same and its utility as means of proof.

In the context of Ecuador, the results obtained of this investigation confirm what (19) affirm when they sustain that the expert reports usually prioritize the compliance of

institutional formats, instead of a greater adjustability to the exigency of scientific rigor. That also can be observed in the analyzed expert reports, which, although they comply in a partial form with the formal aspects, are not found exempt of important deficits in the utilization of scientific methods, in the analysis of the results and in the justification of the conclusions.

It is put of manifest that the exercise of the juridical-forensic psychology is a challenge, given that the evaluated does not have will of his own evaluation, and counts with the permanent risk of the simulation or of the dissimulation, such as (20) make note. In this context, the correct application of techniques such as the semi-structured interview and of valid psychometric tests are a fundamental aspect to assure the quality of the process of evaluation.

In this sense, the literature emphasizes the importance that criteria related with the pragmatism, the scientific quality and the optimization of the time in the application of the instruments and those that permit adapting the evaluation to the characteristics of the subject exposing thus these tools in order to reduce biases, increase the validity of the results and adapt the evaluation to the characteristics of the evaluated person have. However, these criteria are not evidenced in a recurrent form in the analyzed reports, which emphasizes the necessity of pursuing the technical formation of those experts involved in the psychological evaluation.

In last place, given that the expert report has to assume itself as a means of proof within the process, necessarily it has to respect the principle of contradiction, which implies the necessity of making known, in a clear form for the judge, the methodology, the results and the scientific criteria utilized (21) the non evidence of all these elements, as was evidenced in the results, takes away probative value and diminishes its contribution to the act of contributing in the better taking of decisions of the judicial ambit.

In this point, the meta-expertise appears as a fundamental tool for the realization of the control of quality in the practice of the psychological expertise, permits bringing to light the methodological lacks, obtaining a greater scientific exigency but also it is desired to improve the quality of the technical standards in the elaboration of the forensic psychological reports in Ecuador.

CONCLUSIONS

The meta-expert analysis of the ten forensic psychological reports included in the present investigation, corresponding to a specific jurisdiction of the city of Santo Domingo during the year 2024, permitted identifying recurrent methodological deficiencies that affect the technical quality of the evaluated dictamens.

From the application of the Methodological Model of Meta-analysis of Psychological Expertises of Maffioletti, complemented with the Guide of Good Practices of the General Council of the Psychology of Spain, it was evidenced that a significant number of variables is not complied with in the analyzed reports, particularly in aspects related with the methodological explication, the control of biases, the triangulation of data, the formulation of alternative hypotheses and the establishment of the causal nexus.

Among the principal lacks that we could identify in the valued sample, clearly can be signaled the lack of a structured analysis by means of obtained results, the scarce utilization of standardized psychometric instruments for the control of simulation and social desirability, in addition to the use of obsolete bibliographic references. In the measure that it treated of reports in which diffuse concepts between the interventions proper of the clinical intervention (emotional containment), and procedures of the expert evaluation were reflected and that, from the optic of its validity for the report in another environment, could have affected the same in the judicial ambit.

These limitations, analyzed specifically on the analyzed reports, could have had an impact on the technical baggage of the expert report and of its utility as means of proof in which the judgment develops. In this sense, the results that we obtained warn that it is necessary to reinforce methodological criteria for the elaboration of forensic psychological reports in the studied context.

Nevertheless, given the exploratory nature of our study and because the size that the sample presented was very reduced, what was obtained cannot be generalized at the same time that it could suppose an analytic approximation to that of the expert practice in the studied jurisdiction.

Finally, the meta-expertise can be considered as an ideal tool for the evaluation of the scientific quality of the forensic psychological reports, it is going to permit us to contemplate weaknesses in the same and in the improvement of the expert practice and, in consequence, contribute to the improvement of the administration of justice.

REFERENCES

1. Salamea, D. (2021). La prueba metapericial en los procesos judiciales. *Revista Pares*, 8(1), 55-72. https://revistapares.com.ar/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/1.-La-prueba-metapericial-en-los-procesos-judiciales_pagenunder.pdf
2. Echeburúa, E., Muñoz, J. M., & Loinaz, I. (2011). Evaluación psicológica forense: Fiabilidad, validez, prevención de errores y problemas éticos. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 11 (1), 67-81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1697-2600\(11\)71013-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1697-2600(11)71013-5)
3. Moroy, L. (2006). Revisión crítica e informes periciales: la metapericia en el debate judicial. *Cuadernos de Medicina Forense*, 12(45), 23-34.
4. Maffioletti, F. (2016). Modelo metodológico de meta-análisis de peritajes psicológicos. *Polo del Conocimiento*, 11(3), 45-67. <https://polodelconocimiento.com/ojs/index.php/es/article/view/6468>
5. Pérez, M. A., & Rodríguez, N. (2022). Análisis metapericial psicológico forense de 12 informes psicológicos periciales de trastornos de personalidad. *Revista Perspectivas Psicoforenses Latinoamericanas*, 15 (2), 120-135. <https://doi.org/10.5890/psicoforense.2022.15.2.120>
6. Esbec, E., & Echeburúa, E. (2010). Violencia y trastornos de la personalidad: implicaciones clínicas y forenses. *Terapia Psicológica*, 28(2), 205-212.
7. Castro,(2024). La metapericia psicológica forense: Rigor científico y principios éticos. Universidad de Cuenca. <https://dspace.ucuenca.edu.ec/bitstreams/19018097-23b3-4a0b-b69e-a1624811114f/download>

English translation of the original article published in Ecuacientífica, Vol. 4, No. 9, pp. 17-34.

8. Maffioletti, F. (2016). Modelo metodológico de meta-análisis de peritajes psicológicos. *Polo del Conocimiento*, 11(3), 45-67.
9. Consejo General de la Psicología de España. (2014). Guía de buenas prácticas para la evaluación psicológica forense y la práctica pericial. <https://www.infocop.es/pdf/GuiaForense2014.pdf>
10. Rodríguez, M. P., & Sánchez, L. F. (2019). Contrainforme psicológico pericial: Conceptualización y caso práctico. *Revista de Psicología Jurídica*, 15 (2), 89-105. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/7887932.pdf>
11. Tapias, A. (2022). Metapericia psicológica forense: Guía práctica para el análisis de pericias previas. Ediciones de la Universidad de los Andes. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv2f1b8zq>
12. Echeburúa, E., Muñoz, J. M., & Loinaz, I. (2011). La evaluación psicológica forense frente a la evaluación clínica: propuestas y retos de futuro. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 11(1), 141-159.
13. Pérez, M. A., & Rodríguez, N. (2022). Análisis metapericial psicológico forense de informes psicológicos periciales de trastornos de personalidad. *Revista Perspectivas Psicoforenses Latinoamericanas*, 15(2), 120-135.
14. Zurita, A., Gómez, R., & Vargas, M. (2021). Debilidades existentes en los dictámenes periciales: lineamientos para una evaluación objetiva. *Anuario Ecuatoriano de Ciencias Forenses*, 5(1), 34-50.
15. Álvarez-Bello, F. (2013). El control del engaño en la evaluación psicológica forense: Posibilidades y limitaciones. *Anuario de Psicología Jurídica*, 23(1), 53-60.
16. Guarnera, J., Muratori, P., & Paciello, M. (2017). El juicio profesional estructurado en la evaluación forense: limitando la subjetividad. *Revista de Psicología Legal*, 9(3), 112-128.
17. Artacho-Mata, E. (2023). Propuesta de estructura para la realización del contrainforme psicológico pericial. *Cuadernos de Psicología Forense*, 16(1), 177-196. <https://ifc.dpz.es/recursos/publicaciones/39/75/07artachomata.pdf>
18. Fortúnez del Valle, J. M. (2015). Buenas prácticas en la evaluación psicológica forense. *Revista de Psicología Jurídica y Forense*, 2 (1), 45-62. <https://doi.org/10.14198/RPJForen2015.2.1.03>
19. García, A. M., & López, J. M. (2024). Contrainforme psicológico pericial de un caso de abuso sexual infantil: Análisis del Statement Validity Analysis (SVA). *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología y Salud*, 73, 1-15. <https://www.rips.cop.es/pdf/art732024.pdf>
20. Martínez, L. (2023). Desafíos metodológicos en la psicología forense y la integración de hallazgos objetivos. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología Jurídica*, 15(2), 99-115.
21. Neimeyer, R. A., Taylor, J. M., & Weary, G. (2014). The rapid evolution of forensic psychology knowledge. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 59(4), 1012-1018.
22. Vázquez-Mezquita, M. (2005). Proceder y técnicas en psicología forense. *Papeles del Psicólogo*, 26(2), 87-98. DOI: 10.23923/pap.psicol2005.26.2.5.