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# FORM FOR EVALUATING ARTICLES / ESSAYS / POPULAR SCIENCE NOTES

TITLE OF THE PAPER:

DATE OF SUBMISSION:

EVALUATOR´S NAME:

We trust that you will complete the following form in the most committed way possible. 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, or part of them, 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of the paper**: Does it have coherence and linkage with the text?  YES / NO  Comments/suggestions: | Indicators: it is a label of the work, sufficiently indicative of the content. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abstract in Spanish**/**Abstract in English**  Does it relate to the general content of the article? YES / NO  Does it state the contextualization of the work? YES / NO  Does it state the problem or objectives of the work? YES / NO  Does it state the results or conclusions reached? YES / NO  Comments/suggestions:  \* Not applicable for reviews | Indicators: it is a short version of the article. It condenses all its parts. It clearly presents the theme to be developed.  Length: up to 200 words. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Keywords in Spanish**: YES / NO **Keywords in English**: YES / NO  \* Not applicable for reviews | Indicators: up to 5 descriptors |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Writing.**  Comments/suggestions: | Indicators: Clarity. Coherence and internal organization. Grammatical correctness. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Internal structure of the work.**  Comments/suggestions: | Indicators: Parts of the paper clearly marked. Use of subtitles. Coherence of these with the contents developed in each part. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Bibliographic references.**  Comments/suggestions:  \* Not applicable for reviews | Indicators: They comply with the standards of the publication - they are relevant and sufficient for the topic, its treatment, the approach, the discipline. |

**COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING ACCORDING TO THE TYPE OF PRESENTATION:**

**FOR SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scientific rigor** Exc. Good Reg. Def.  Originality of the work | Text whose objective is to disseminate in a clear and precise manner the results of research carried out on an area of knowledge. It presents the background, its justification, the methodology used, the results obtained, the scope of the work and suggestions for future research.  Length: from 7,000 to 10,000 words[[1]](#footnote-1). |
| Clarity of the problem and/or objectives |
| Methodology employed |
| Formulation of hypotheses/assumptions  (if applicable) |
| Theoretical-methodological discussion |
| Results and conclusions |
| Comments/suggestions: |

**FOR SCIENTIFIC ESSAYS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scientific rigor** Exc. Good Reg. Def.  Originality of the work | Text that contains a theoretical and methodological reflection around a specific problem; an exercise of argumentation around an initial question, objective or hypothesis. It must contain: introduction, argumentation and conclusions (with or without the corresponding subtitles).  Length: 3,000 to 10,000 words. |
| Clarity of the initial hypothesis or question |
| Clarity and pertinence of the argumentation |
| Original and critical academic discussion |
| Results and conclusions |
| Comments/suggestions: |

**FOR POPULAR SCIENCE NOTES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Content**.  Clarity in the formulation of the topic to be addressed: YES / NO  Sufficient substantiation: YES / NO  Conclusions related to the development of the work: YES / NO | Research project progress - dissemination of results - dissemination of aspects of a specific disciplinary field.  Length: from 3,000 to 7,000 words. |
| Comments/suggestions: | |

**FOR reVIEWS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Content**.  Bibliographic data of the book reviewed according to editorial standards / data of the reviewer / type of book and readership / content / context of appearance / clear and coherent wording / formulation of opinion | Clear and orderly writing, not very long (500 to 1,000 words) that provides information about the content developed in a book, its contributions and importance for the discipline, and provides an assessment justified by solid arguments. |
| Comments/suggestions: | |

**the following to be completed in all cases:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Contributions** of the work to the specific area of knowledge.  Comments/suggestions to the author:  Confidential comments/suggestions to the editor: | Indicators: scientific interest of the topic - new contributions or explanations - deepening of a topic from new perspectives - relevant questions or new questions are asked. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluator´s decision**  Publishable without modifications  Publishable with slight modifications  Publishable with substantial modifications  Non-publishable  Date of evaluation: | Indicators: scientific interest of the topic - new contributions or explanations - deepening of a topic from new perspectives - relevant questions or new questions are asked. |

Also…

|  |
| --- |
| We would appreciate it if you could suggest one or more possible evaluators for papers submitted to our journal, by kindly providing us with the following information:  Full name:  Institutional affiliation:  E-mail address: |

1. **Important**: We clarify that the length specification of the different types of texts is only for illustrative purposes and to provide the author with a basic parameter. Therefore, the non-fulfillment of this requirement will not be excluding in the decision of the evaluator. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)