# Evaluation form

TITLE OF THE PAPER:

EVALUATOR´S NAME:

We trust that you will complete the evaluation of the paper in the most committed way possible. For each type of paper, we have attached some guidelines that may be useful as a working guide. We ask you to elaborate on everything you consider important in each item. Similarly, if you consider it necessary, you can add other items not covered in the form.

You are informed that the material to be analyzed is the private and confidential property of the author(s), therefore, it must be treated confidentially and evaluated as soon as possible. Please let us know if, for any reason, you are unable to evaluate the text or need a considerably longer time to do so.

Your comments may be forwarded to the author without identifying the source; your suggestions will be of great help to the author and to the editors of the publication.

If you suggest modifications to the text (substantial or slight), you are asked to clarify whether or not a further revision of the final text resulting from the author's correction is necessary, or whether you consider that this can be supervised by a member of the Editorial Board.

### Scientific article:

Evaluate the fulfillment of the following minimum aspects:

* Problem to be addressed clearly explained
* Title and keywords appropriate to the content of the article
* Theoretical and methodological relevance:
* Contributions to the scientific discipline/technological field considered:
* Coherence and cohesion in development; integration of the theory consulted with the object of study, with the analysis of the results and with the discussion or conclusions reached:
* Original and novel information, resulting from a research and/or development process:

### Essays:

Evaluate the fulfillment of the following minimum aspects:

* Problem to be addressed clearly explained.
* Title and keywords appropriate to the content of the article
* Original, argumentative and critical academic discussion
* Innovative contributions or from an original approach to the subject matter addressed.
* Argumentation with empirical and theoretical references on the subject under analysis.

### Review Articles:

Evaluate the fulfillment of the following minimum aspects, noting the corresponding observations:

* Completeness: degree to which the topic was covered by the article.
* Analysis: continuity and depth of the analysis, degree of organization of the information, from different sources and from the evaluation applied in the analysis.
* Added value: identification of new specialties, introduction of new hypotheses or theories, suggestions for future work, inspiration, encouragement.
* Treatment of updated bibliography.

In any of the cases, once the evaluation has been completed, we ask you to express your opinion on the decision to be taken from among the following, which will finally be considered by the Editorial Committee Editorial Board:

a) Publishable without modifications.

b) Publishable with slight modifications, *i.e*., the work is returned to the author with a list of minor corrections, requesting that they be incorporated into the final version of the manuscript.

Examples of minor changes: typographical errors, articles cited in the text that do not appear in the cited literature or vice versa, moderate changes to the wording.

c) Return of the article for substantial modifications, *i.e*., the article is returned with a list of important issues that the author must address in order for the work to be considered again.

Examples of major changes: justifying arguments, adding or redoing tables and figures, rewriting the discussion in light of unconsulted literature, substantial changes to the wording.

d) Non-publishable, *i.e*., the evaluation of the referees is communicated, informing the reasons for non-publication. This decision will almost always be final.