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Dear reviewer: below you will find a series of criteria on the basis of which you will be able to referee the reference manuscript. For this purpose, you will find three sections where you will be able to evaluate general aspects of the article (which obey elements of form), those related to the content (which evaluate the core aspects according to the type of article) and finally, those associated with the bibliographical references (according to their quality, temporality and style of citation and referencing) [it is recommended that you leave your comments on each item to achieve a comprehensive evaluation for the author(s)' feedback].

|  |
| --- |
| **General Elements** |
| Please evaluate on a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being the highest score. The number may vary according to the importance of the item). Please comment on your score. |
| **Item** | **Score** | **Observation** |
| **Title of the article:** Present the original title of the article, with a maximum of 14 words, consistent with the content. |  |  |
| **Abstract and keywords:** Include a brief summary of the problem, objective, methodology, findings and conclusions. It presents 4 to 6 keywords that contextualize the content of the article. |  |  |
| **Clarity and coherence:** The writing of the article is adequate in grammar, spelling and style for a scientific journal. |  |  |
| **Originality and Relevance:** The article presents a novel contribution in its field, expanding the frontiers of knowledge on the problem or phenomenon addressed. |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Research** | **Review** | **Reflection** |
| **What type of article reviews** |  |  |  |

Below, you will find three tables containing the core elements of the scientific article. Please rate only the table corresponding to the type of article you are reviewing: research article, review article, or reflection article.

|  |
| --- |
| **Core elements for a RESEARCH article** |
| Please evaluate on a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being the highest score. The number may vary according to the importance of the item). Please comment on your score. |
| **Item** | **Score** | **Observation** |
| **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction provides a general context of the article and a solid overview of the main arguments of the problem or phenomenon to be addressed, supported by bibliographical references. |  |  |
| **Methodology:** Th**e** approach of the study is detailed, including the data collection and analysis instruments, the reference population and other aspects that demonstrate the methodological rigor to achieve the proposed objective. |  |  |
| **Results:** The main findings of the study are clearly detailed, congruent with the methodological design, demonstrating the fulfillment of the objective. |  |  |
| **Discussion:** The implications of the findings are analyzed, contrasting them with previous positions of other authors in the field and highlighting the added value of the study. |  |  |
| **Conclusions:** It details the main inferences based on the results obtained and suggests new study perspectives or questions derived from the exercise carried out. |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Core elements for a REVIEW article** |
| Please evaluate on a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being the highest score. The number may vary according to the importance of the item). Please comment on your score. |
| **Item** | **Score** | **Observation** |
| **Introduction and justification:** Introduction: Provides a general context of the article and a solid overview of the main arguments that consolidate the problem or phenomenon addressed, backed by bibliographic support. |  |  |
| **Selection criteria:** The article defines the criteria for selecting relevant and quality sources, justifying their impact on the validity of the review. |  |  |
| **Literature synthesis:** The article coherently and critically summarizes the main findings of the literature reviewed, highlighting trends, inconsistencies and areas of agreement. |  |  |
| **Critical analysis:** The article evaluates in a detailed and reflective manner the studies reviewed, identifying strengths, limitations and significant contributions to the field. |  |  |
| **Conclusion:** The article summarizes the key findings of the review, highlights major implications, and suggests directions for future research. |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |

| **Core elements for a REFLECTION article** |
| --- |
| Please evaluate on a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being the highest score. The number may vary according to the importance of the item). Please comment on your score. |
| **Item** | **Score** | **Observation** |
| **Introduction:** The introduction provides a general context and a solid overview of the main theoretical arguments motivating the reflection, supported by current and relevant sources. |  |  |
| **Argumentative development:** The article presents ideas and reflections in a logical and orderly manner, demonstrating how the author seeks to persuade the reader. The reflections are supported by a continuous analysis of existing theoretical contributions. |  |  |
| **Depth of analysis:** The article offers a deep and detailed analysis of the theoretical reflections, exploring their implications and contexts in an exhaustive manner. |  |  |
| **Theoretical implications:** The article explores how the reflections presented affect and enrich existing theories, and how they bring new perspectives to the field of study. |  |  |
| **Conclusions:** The author's main inferences based on reflection are detailed, and he suggests new study perspectives or questions derived from the analysis. |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **References**  |
| Please evaluate on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest score. The number may vary according to the importance of the item). Please comment on your score. |
| **Item** | **Score** | **Observation** |
| **APA Standards:** The article correctly uses the citation and referencing protocols according to the latest version of the APA Standards. |  |  |
| **Quality and currency of the sources:** The article uses up-to-date references, mainly from the last 5 years, and of quality, mostly from rigorous scientific sources such as articles, books, chapters and conference proceedings. |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Additional comments (optional)** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Final score** |  | **Article verdict**  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Standards for publication verdict definition** |
| Less than 65 points | Rejected |
| Between 65 and 85 points | Approved with structural modifications  |
| Between 86 and 99 points | Approved with basic modifications |
| 100 points | Approved without modification |

Please add the totals of the three completed sections for a **final score** and accordingly, reflect the **verdict of the article** taking into account the values you find below.
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