

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES

Article name: _____

Evaluator Name:* _____

Article Type (Mark with an X):

<input type="checkbox"/> Scientific and technological research	<input type="checkbox"/> Reflection derived from research	<input type="checkbox"/> Thematic Review
<input type="checkbox"/> Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Reflection not derived from research	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Which?) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Short article	<input type="checkbox"/> Systematic review	

General instructions for the evaluation: The criteria that will allow you to complete the evaluation are presented below. We ask that you assign the score according to each in the first part and describe the reasons supporting the evaluation. Ultimately, the author needs to state your support for his decision to publish. (If you wish, you can make additional comments on the article file)

CRITERIA	TOP SCORE	SCORES ASSIGNED	QUALITATIVE SUPPORT (REASONS)
1. ORIGINALITY			
1.1 The central theme of the article is original.	50		
2. METHODOLOGICAL RIGOR			
1.2 2.1 The type of study is clearly described and corresponds to the results.	20		
1.3 2.2 Clarity in the handling of information is evident in the text.	20		
1.4 2.3 There is coherence between the results and the objectives.	20		
3. STRUCTURE OF THE TEXT			
3.1 Clear, concise, and precise title.	20		
3.2 It includes all the components of an article (abstract, keywords, introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion, conclusions, bibliographical references).	20		
3.3 Correspondence between the title, the abstract and the content.	20		
4. TREATMENT OF THE SUBJECT			
4.1 It presents adequate sequence and coherence in the development of the topic.	20		

¹ Diligenciar el formato de Hoja de Vida, y anexarlo a esta evaluación. Si el evaluador considera necesario, puede añadir nuevas páginas a este formulario con otros comentarios.

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES

4.2 The treatment of the topic's consults updated and reliable sources.	80		
5. RELEVANCE			
5.1 The text is important for the community, the institution, and the advancement of knowledge in the area.	100		
5.2 The author's contributions present argumentative coherence.	50		
6. FORMAL ASPECTS OF THE ARTICLE			
6.1 Style (clarity, conciseness, precision, and coherence).	20		
6.2 Grammar (agreement, punctuation and spelling).	30		
6.3 Presentation (use of standards or guidelines for authors).	20		
6.4 The Bibliographic References are sufficient, current, pertinent and in accordance with the norm.	10		
TOTAL	500		

FINAL DECISION ON PUBLICATION: (Mark with an X)

- Approved without change.
- Approved subject to MINOR changes and does not require reassessment.
- Approved subject to MAJOR changes and requires reassessment.
- It is rejected, it is not publishable in the journal.

GENERAL REASONS FOR THE FINAL DECISION:

Conflict of interest statement of the evaluator: (Mark with an X):

As an evaluator, I state that I DO NOT have a conflict of Interest to carry out the requested evaluation.

Evaluator's confidentiality and plagiarism statement: (Mark with an X):

As an evaluator, I promise to preserve my anonymity and NOT disclose the results of the evaluation carried out, and in case of identifying an alleged plagiarism, I will notify it in the comments included in this form.

Article Reception Date: __/__/____ **Evaluation Date:** __/__/____