

Innovaciones Educativas

Guidelines for the evaluation of bibliographic / literature / systematic reviews

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					
1. The title is left-aligned and reflects the contents of the review.					
2. The informative summary complies with the number of words (250), explains the objective of the systematization, the analyses performed and the main conclusion. It is translated into another language.					
3. Keywords from the UNESCO thesaurus are included.					
Recommendations for improvement:					
1. Introduction					
1.1. Expresses the main ideas in accordance with the objective of the bibliographic research.					
1.2. The critical apparatus on which the work is based is pertinent for the approach to the subject matter.					
1.3. The positions are duly argued and supported theoretically or by factual investigation.					
Recommendations for improvement:					

Innovaciones Educativas

Criteria	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor
2. Literature on the topic and method.					
2.1. It reflects the contents of the review.					
2.2. It expresses the main ideas in accordance with the objective of the bibliographic research.					
2.3. The literature reviewed is relevant to the area of study being addressed and presents updated discussions on the subject.					
2.4. The positions are duly argued and supported theoretically or by factual research.					
2.5. There is coherence between the methodology used, the stated objectives and the treatment given to the literature analyzed.					
2.6. The discourse is fluent, clear and the arguments are supported by theory.					
2.7. The review deals with new or underdeveloped topics in the field of Educational Sciences.					
Recommendations for improvement:					
3. Results.					
3.1. The way of presenting and the information are coherent with the methodology implemented.					
3.2. The work presents the most relevant data. There is an informative balance, and it compares the fundamental findings of each bibliographic source analyzed, in order to respond to the objective of the review.					
3.3. The treatment of the data allows to capture the relevance of the topic and the contribution to the educational field.					
3.4. The tables, figures, and other resources for the presentation of results have been made appropriately for an academic publication.					
Recommendations for improvement:					

Innovaciones Educativas

Criteria	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor
4. Conclusions					
4.1. The conclusions are clear in the contribution that systematization makes to the academic discipline and/or professional development.					
4.2. Provide new theoretical or conceptual evidence in the field of Educational Sciences.					
4.3. Offer input for the development of new lines of research in the field of Educational Sciences.					
Recommendations for improvement:					
5. 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 way ideas are organized in the document contributes to its uniqueness.					
5.3. The wording of the document allows for easy comprehension of ideas and fluency in its reading.					
5.4. There is no suspicion of plagiarism in any of its parts.					

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	

Innovaciones Educativas

CINED
Centro de Investigaciones en Educación



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:	
Do you have a profile on Publons?	(<input type="checkbox"/>) Yes. (<input type="checkbox"/>) No.
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)	(<input type="checkbox"/>) Yes. (<input type="checkbox"/>) No.