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**FORMAT FOR PEERS REVIEWERS**

The first thing you must do is to define what type of article has been assigned to you as referee in order to know if the manuscript fulfills the corresponding conditions.

1. **Scientific research article:** Document that presents clear and truthful original results of a project already finished through the application of a scientific method in a structured way. The structure generally contains the following sections: title, summary, keywords, introduction, methodology, results, conclusions and bibliographical references.
2. **Article of Reflection:** Document that presents research results on a specific topic, fundamental concepts or prevalent ideas in a field from the author´s analytical, interpretative or critical perspective. This type of articles should be backed by evidence.The structure generally contains the following points: title, summary, keywords, introduction, methodology, development of the topic, conclusions.

It is characterized because:

- It leans on the point of view of the person who writes, since its essence is the research itself more than an encyclopedic or doctrinal exhibition.

- It is a persuasive and argumentative essay because it presents the author´s point of view and at the same time seeks to convince the reader.

- This type of writing usually proposes a topic that, sometimes, is not resolved since it is an attempt or an approximation. However, its free and open nature does not suppose neither superficiality nor lack of rigor.

(These two types of articles will have an extension that ranges between 15 and 20 pages, including the title and the summaries.)

1. **Review articles:** Document that provides a critical and constructive analysis of existing published literature in a field (state of art), through summary, analysis, and comparison, often identifying specific gaps or problems and providing recommendations for future research in order to: update and report on the status of a topic, organize and synthesize fragmented knowledge, compare information from different sources, learn about trends in investigations or suggest future work. They are characterized by presenting a careful bibliographic review of at least 50 references, whose difference will be the unit of analysis. The structure generally contains the following points: title, summary, keywords, introduction, methodology, development of the topic, conclusions of the review and bibliographical references.

(It will have a maximum extension between 12 and 15 pages).

Please be aware of the editorial norms applied for the Juridical Journal Mario Alario D’Filippo during the evaluation process.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE ARTICLE TO BE EVALUATED** | | | |
| Title Of The Article: | | | |
| Date Of Receipt: | | Date Of Delivery: | |
| **2. REFEREE IDENTIFICATION** | | | |
| Names and surnames | | Address | Telephone/s |
| E-mail: | | City: | Country: |
| Position in Institution | Institution: | Research Field/s | |
| Last academic title obtained/University/Year | | ID or passport number: | |
| ORCID:  COLCIENCIAS Registry: | | | |
| **3. ACADEMIC EVALUATION INFORMATION** | | | |
| **PURPOSES**  The aim of the double-blind peers evaluation is that international experts in the field of Law evaluate the articles presented for publication in the Journal Mario Alario D'Filippo and offer a concept about their originality, relevance, contributions, treatment of the topic, form of presenting the information , strengths and weaknesses. The comments and recommendations of the peers evaluation are very important for the Editorial Committee of the Journal; based on them ─ and also on the editorial quality report ─ this Committee makes the decision on the publication of the article in the number being prepared.  For this reason, it is important that the evaluation does not focus on the orthographical -typographical aspects since, in case of publication, the Editorial makes a previous style correction. | | | |
|
|
| **CONFIDENTIALITY**  To guarantee the impartiality of the evaluation by peers, the Editorial Committee of the Magazine Mario Alario D'Filippo never reveals the name of the author. The name of the evaluators is also confidential and at no time will the authors or persons outside the Committee be made known. The confidentiality of this document implies that none of its parts can be used for a purpose other than that established. | | | |
|
| **INSTRUCTIONS**   * Please answer all the questions on this form. * Fill in the form on the computer. * Do not modify or alter the questions or options on this form. The structure of this evaluation is planned and responds to the publication policies of the Juridical Journal Mario Alario D'Filippo, so its modification will immediately invalidate the concept. * Once you have finished filling out the form, you must return it signed by e-mail to the person who contacted you or, failing that, to the following email address: [rmarioalario@unicartagena.edu.co](mailto:rmarioalario@unicartagena.edu.co) * The concepts issued should focus on the content and methodology, not on the formal aspect or the writing style. These two processes will be carried out in case of favorability, once the evaluation process is done. * Be clear and precise in your answers. * The answers of the scientific aspects of the evaluation must be detailed. * In case of not being able to meet the deadline, please inform the editorial team of the Journal in advance of the expected delivery date. * Any additional information that you require will be provided through the institutional OJS platform (<https://revistas.unicartagena.edu.co/index.php/marioalariodfilippo>) or by e-mail. | | | |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|

**Evaluation Format**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. The article contains:** | | | | | | |
| **ITEMS** | | **YES** | | **NO** | **Comments** | |
| Title in the article language | |  | |  |  | |
| Title in English or some other language if the article is written in English | |  | |  |  | |
| Key words (min. 3, max. 5) in the article language. | |  | |  |  | |
| Key words (min. 3, max. 5) in English or some other language if the article is written in English. | |  | |  |  | |
| Abstract in the article language (min. 95, max. 150 words). | |  | |  |  | |
| Abstract in English or some other language if the article is written in English (min. 95, max. 150 words). | |  | |  |  | |
| List of References. Min. 15 titles of doctrine (Please do not add national or foreign jurisprudence). | |  | |  |  | |
| References observe APA norms 6. | |  | |  |  | |
| **2. Scientific Aspects:** | | | | | | |
| **ITEMS** | **YES** | | **NO** | | | **Comments** |
| Are the objectives of the article clearly stated and probed? |  | |  | | |  |
| Does the article use an appropriate scientific methodology for the development of the objectives? |  | |  | | |  |
| Is the presentation and argumentation of the ideas coherent? |  | |  | | |  |
| Is the treatment of concepts, theories and data accurate? |  | |  | | |  |
| Is there a relationship between the title, the problem, the objectives, the theoretical or methodological framework and the conclusions? |  | |  | | |  |
| Is the topic relevant and provides inputs or new explanations to your area of knowledge? |  | |  | | |  |
| Does the structure of the article allow identifying an introduction and conclusions? |  | |  | | |  |
| Is the work planning used by the author logical and articulated in its parts and sub-parts? |  | |  | | |  |
| **3. About the presentation of the information** | | | | | | |
| **ITEMS** | **YES** | | **NO** | | | **COMMENTS** |
| Does the author uses a clear and precise language? |  | |  | | |  |
| Is there coherence between the presentation and the development of the ideas? |  | |  | | |  |
| Are the different sections of the article articulated with each other?  Do they satisfy the scientific objectives? |  | |  | | |  |
| Does the author use scientific and updated bibliographical sources? |  | |  | | |  |
| Is the author's language handling adequate (spelling, writing, syntax, punctuation)? |  | |  | | |  |
|  |  | |  | | |  |
| **4. Use of documentation and sources** | | | | | | |
| **ITEMS** | **YES** | | **NO** | | | **COMMENTS** |
| Does the author make an adequate use of the bibliographic sources in the elaboration of quotations, paraphrases, summaries and footnotes? |  | |  | | |  |
| Is the text original? |  | |  | | |  |
| Is it possible to differentiate the contributions of the author from the information in other texts? |  | |  | | |  |
| Is it possible to classify the bibliographic sources used as originals? |  | |  | | |  |

**Evaluation Results**

**Write an “X” where corresponding**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Publishable without modifications |  |
| Publishable with basic modifications |  |
| Publishable with basic modifications and some conceptual modifications |  |
| Rewrite the article for a new evaluation |  |
| Not publishable |  |
| **Additional comments, general and specific recommendations of the referee:** | |

**Additional comments:**

**Declaration of Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest**: I understand that I will have access to confidential information, for which I will not be able to make use of that data such as disclosure of results prior to publication, or disclosure of the concepts developed, for my personal benefit, make it known or put it at the disposal of the benefit of any other person and organization. If in the reading of the work I find that there is an ethical impediment or conflict of interest that may affect my concept, I will inform the editor to reassign the document to another referee.

**Standards of ethics in research:** I declare that I know and accept the international standards of scientific publication to which the journal is attached, particularly those related to the handling of plagiarism and the process of review of external peers:

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Evaluator's signature**