

PROTOCOL FOR ASSESSING ARTICLES – EVALUATORS

ARTICLE TITLE:	
TYPE OF CONTRIBUTION:	
NAME OF THE EVALUATOR:	
RECEPTION DATE:	
SHIPPING DATE:	

INSTRUCTIONS

The aim of evaluating articles is twofold: in one hand they serve to determinate the publication or not of the originals sent to the academic journal and, in the other, is an essential tool for the one`s apprenticeship to the research teams and thereby contribute to the development of a better research. From this perspective is very important to provide constructive guidance that provides data to improve it or other future articles.

This evaluation, conveniently unbiased, will be sent to the authors of the article without their personal data, therefore, the language should be as concrete, positive and constructive as possible.

Please, complete and return the evaluation sheet one month before the date on which it was received.

EVALUATION

1. TITLE

Is adequate?

It reflects the content of the article?

2. RESUME

Does the text include the following elements? (IMRYD format):

- a) Introduction
- b) Objectives
- c) Methodology
- d) Significant results

3. DESCRIPTORS:

Are they the appropriate ones?

1. PRESENTATION AND MONITORING OF THE RIEJS PUBLICATION STANDARDS

Is it properly written and organized?

Follows the latest edition of APA standards?

The tables, images, figures are numbered, have a title and **source**?

Does citation correspond with the bibliographic references?

2. RELEVANCE OF THE ARTICLE

Does the contribution provide meaningful ideas for the scientific or educational community, and/or outstanding innovations?

6. LITERATURE` REVIEW (IF IT IS APPROPRIATE)

Revised literature is current, relevant? Does this review support enough the article?

7. TECHNICAL CIENTIFIC QUALITY OF THE ARTICLE (DIFFERENT ACCORDING TO THE TYPE OF ARTICLE)

- a) Methodology and design
 - b) Participants, collection techniques and analysis of information
 - c) Results
 - d) Discussion
 - e) Conclusions
8. Other commentaries

8. GLOBAL VALORATION

EXCELLENT GOOD REGULAR UNSATISFACTORY

9. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS:

RECOMEDATIONS

- I suggest publication as it is (or with minor formal changes)
- I suggest publication after corrections and substantive improvements of content and/or presentation are made
- I suggest publication after substantive corrections of content and/or presentation improvements are made.
- Not publishable

NAME AND SIGNATURE OF THE EVALUATOR