



Guidelines for the evaluation of scientific articles

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.

Title of the document to be reviewed	
Revision date	

I. Assessment of document quality criteria. Consider the criteria listed in the column on the left and place an "X" in the box on the right according to your assessment of compliance with these guidelines. In the comments section you can indicate recommendations to the author(s).

Criteria	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor
General Aspects:					
- The title is left-aligned, translated into English, and complies with the indicated word count.					
 The abstract complies with the number of words, explains what the article is about, the population, methodology, main result, and conclusion. It is translated into another language. 					
 Keywords from the UNESCO thesaurus are included. 					
Recommendations for improvement:					
1. Introduction to the topic					
1.1. Reflects the contents of the article.					
1.2. The objectives, both general and specific, on which the experience is based, are presented.					
1.3. The research problem, justification and background that serve as the basis for the					



Criteria	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor
research that supports the article are evidenced.					
1.4. The introduction evidences a global integration of the article, where it informs about the subject to be dealt with, its relationship with the title, the relevance within the field of interest of the educational sciences, the purpose and the general aims pursued with the text presented.					
1.5. The conceptual references on which the work is based are relevant for the approach to the subject matter and objectives.					
Recommendations for improvement:					
2. Materials and methods used					
2.1. Clearly explains the methodological approach or method, the forms of data collection, the subjects of study and/or sources of information and the selection of the sample, the techniques and instruments, validity criteria, data analysis and the context of the research.					
2.2. There is coherence between the methodology used, the objectives set, and the information provided.					
2.3. There is coherence between the processing of information with the methodology used, the collection of the information and the objectives set.					
Recommendations for improvement:					
3. Results and discussion					
3.1. The way of presenting and revealing the results is consistent with the methodology.					



Criteria	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor
3.2. The document presents the most relevant data showing a sufficient balance of information to meet the objectives of the article.					
3.3. The processing of data makes it possible to capture the relevance of the subject and the contribution to the educational field.					
3.4. The tables and figures have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the journal.					
Recommendations for improvement:					
4. Conclusions					
4.1. The conclusions are related to the results discussed, and are relevant, clear, and precise.					
4.2. It contrasts the results presented with theoretical sources or other studies related to the subject matter.					
4.3. It contributes to new empirical or theoretical evidence in the field of educational sciences.					
4.4. It provides input for the development of new research in the field of educational sciences.					
Recommendations for improvement:					
5. 4. Format/Structure/Editing and Spelling					
5.1. In-text citations and references are presented in accordance with APA standards, seventh edition 2020.					
5.2. The reference list has been constructed in accordance with APA standards, seventh					



Criteria	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor
edition 2020, and shows only the sources referenced within the text.					
5.3. The way ideas are organized in the document contributes to its uniqueness.					
5.4. The wording of the document allows for easy comprehension of ideas and fluency in its reading.					
5.5. There is evidence of originality of the document.					
Recommendations for improvement:					

II. 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	

III. General and brief justification of your verdict

Comments and observations on the verdict - OPTIONAL-

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



V. Reviewer's 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.