**ARTICLE EVALUATION FORMAT**

**HILOS journal: Pedagogy, Innovation and Digital culture**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. General data of the article | | | | | | | | |
| Article title: | |  | | | | | | |
| Evaluation date: | |  | | | | | | |
| 1. Document type | | | | | | | | |
| Scientific and technological research article | | | | | | | |  |
| Reflection Article | | | | | | | |  |
| Review Article | | | | | | | |  |
| Other. ¿Which ones? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Article estructure and content | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Quality according to its rigor, coherence and depth. | | | | | | | | |
| High level |  | Moderate level | | |  | Low level | |  |
| 2. Originality with respect to the conceptual and theoretical formulation, as well as its development and contributions. | | | | | | | | |
| High level |  | Moderate level | | |  | Low level | |  |
| 3. Relevance and pertinence in accordance with the area of study. | | | | | | | | |
| High level |  | Moderate level | | |  | Low level | |  |
| 4. ¿Does the article achieve the stated objective? | | | | | | | | |
| YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | |
| 5. ¿Does the introduction identify the problem statement? | | | | | | | | |
| YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | |
| 6. ¿Do the conclusions and results relate to the stated objectives? | | | | | | | | |
| YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | |
| 7. ¿Does the article offer an innovative contribution in relation to the research line worked on? | | | | | | | | |
| YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Articule form | | | | | | | | |
| 8. ¿Does the title adequately reflect the content of the article? | | | | | | | | |
| YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | |
| If the above answer is NO, in this space you can describe suggestions for change or adjustment. | | | | | | | | |
| 9. ¿Does the abstract adequately reflect the content of the article? | | | | | | | | |
| YES\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | |
| If the above answer is NO, in this space you can describe suggestions for change or adjustment. | | | | | | | | |
| 10. ¿Are the keywords appropriate and sufficient? | | | | | | | | |
| YES\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | |
| If the above answer is NO, in this space you can describe suggestions for change or adjustment. | | | | | | | | |
| 11. ¿Is the length of the article adequate? | | | | | | | | |
| YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | | |
| If the above answer is NO, in this space you can describe suggestions for change or adjustment. | | | | | | | | |
| 12. ¿Are there errors of presentation and content in the bibliography? | | | | | | | | |
| YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_ ¿Which ones? | | | | | | | | |
| 13. ¿Does the article contain, of your knowledge, significant omissions or errors? | | | | | | | | |
| YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_ ¿Which ones? | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Recommendations to the editor | | | | | | | | |
| Accepted (no changes) |  | Accepted (with minor changes) |  | Accepted (with substantial modifications) | |  | Rejected |  |
| 1. Recommendations to the author   ((Recommend specific changes, indicating the sections of the article where they should be introduced, or general changes in the structure of the document). | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator's information | |
| Name |  |
| Document type and number |  |
| Phone number |  |
| E-mail |  |
| ORCID |  |
| Degree |  |
| Postgraduate degree |  |
| CvLAC |  |
| Specialized Areas |  |
| Date of receipt of article |  |
| Evaluation date |  |
| Signature |  |