Title of the document to

be reviewed Reviewer's name







Guidelines for essay evaluations

The journal "Innovaciones Educativas" is a biannual electronic publication, of an academic nature, which includes research results, essays, systematizations of experiences and bibliographic reviews in the field of educational innovation and related topics about the study of educational sciences. We thank you for your collaboration and ask you to provide the following information.

ay assessment criteria. Consider the criteria listed in ording to your assessment of compliance with the nments and suggestions.			•		
Criteria	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor
General Aspects					
1. The title is left-aligned, translated into English, and complies with the indicated word count.					
2. The abstract complies with the number of words (250), explains what the essay is about, the subject matter, the analysis performed and the main conclusion. It is translated into another language.					
3. Keywords from the UNESCO thesaurus are included.					
Suggestions for improvement:					
1. Introduction					
1.1. It reflects the contents of the essay.					
1.2. The contextualization of the essay and its importance are presented.					
1.3. The objective or purpose of the essay is included.					







2. Development of the topic: proposal and argumentation					
2.1. It deals with new or underdeveloped topics in the field of educational sciences.					
2.2. It shows mastery and depth in the theoretical and conceptual aspects addressed.					
2.3. It includes the contributions of the main					
theories, authors and/or paradigms related to the topic covered in the essay.					
2.4. There is a balance and coherence between					
the ideas presented, the theoretical positions and the position of the author.					
2.5. The discourse is fluent, clear and the					
arguments are theoretically supported. 2.6. Bibliographic citations are included to					
support the argumentation.					
2.7. It complies with ethical standards throughout the document.					
Suggestions for improvement:					
3. Synthesis and final thoughts					
3.1. The conclusions are clear and consistent with					
the content developed in the essay in the introduction and the theoretical arguments.					
3.2. It provides new empirical or theoretical					
evidence in the field of educational sciences.					
3.3. It offers input for the development of new work in the field of educational sciences.					
Suggestions for improvement:	<u> </u>		L	L	
4. Format/Structure/Editing and Spelling					
4.1. In-text citations and references are presented					
in accordance with APA standards, seventh edition 2020.					
4.2. The reference list has been constructed in					
accordance with APA standards, seventh edition					
2020, and shows only the sources referenced within the text.					
4.3. The way ideas are organized in the document					
contributes to its uniqueness.					
4.4. The wording of the document allows for easy					
comprehension of ideas and fluency in its reading.					
4.5. There is no suspicion of plagiarism in any of					
ts parts.					







Suggestions for improvement:		

Verdict based on the evaluation of the article.

At your discretion, this article should (mark with an X):

Published as submitted	
Published if corrections are addressed	
Not published at all	

General and brief justification of your verdict

Comments and observations on the verdict – OPTIONAL-	

Confidential comments for the editor or editorial board of the journal (as many as deemed necessary).







Reviewer information.

This information is required for the preparation of the reviewer's certificate under the double-blind modality.

Full name as you wish it to appear on the certificate:	
Entity to which you are attached (School, High School, University or other):	
Position held in the entity:	
Country of birth of the reviewer:	
E-mail address to which you want the certificate to be sent:	
Would you like your name to be publicly displayed as a reviewer of the Journal on a page for that purpose? (To clarify, the inclusion of the name would not be linked to the document reviewed, this to safeguard anonymity between the parties)	() Yes () No.