**Article Evaluation Format - Peer Evaluators - Type 4**

The following format has been designed to cover the most important aspects of a scientific manuscript that is submitted for evaluation by peer reviewers, for possible publication. Below you will find eight items, in which a series of questions are related to which you will be able to answer after reading the article. To do this, you must mark with approval (****) the option that you consider most favorable (Yes/No). In addition, you will find a space entitled ‘Observations’, where you can expand on the recommendations you consider pertinent. Remember that your evaluation criteria contribute to the expansion of research knowledge and to the professional, academic, and human training of the applicant authors.

**Evaluation date**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Day**  | **Month**  | **Year**  |
|  |  |  |

1. **Title of the scientific manuscript**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Classification of the scientific manuscript**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research Article:** Manuscript that presents in detail the original research results. It is structured as follows: Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusions. |  |
| **Reflection Article:** Manuscript that presents research results from an analytical, interpretive, or critical perspective of the author, on a specific topic, using original sources. |  |
| **Review Article:** Manuscript resulting from a finished investigation where the results of published or unpublished investigations on a field of science or technology are analyzed, systematized, and integrated, to account for the advances and development trends. It is characterized by presenting a careful bibliographic review of at least 50 references. |  |
| **Others:** |
| **Short Article:** Brief document that presents original, preliminary, or partial results of a scientific or technological investigation that, in general, requires prompt dissemination. |  |
| **Case Report:** Document that presents the results of a study on a particular situation, to publicize the technical and methodological experiences considered in a specific case. It includes a systematic commented review of the literature on analogous cases. |  |
| **Topic Review (Thematic Review):** Document resulting from the critical review of the literature on a particular topic. |  |
| **Translation:** Translations of classic or current texts or transcriptions of historical documents or documents of particular interest in the journal’s domain of publication. |  |
| **Reflection Paper not derived from the research:** Essay. |  |
| **Bibliographic Review:** |  |
| **Observations**: (If you find it pertinent)  |

1. **Thematic importance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Thematic contents expressed in the scientific article are:** |  |
| Significant |  |
| Important |  |
| Unnecessary |  |

1. **Preliminaries**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title Identification** | **Yes** | **No**  | **Observations (If improvements are required)** |
| Does the title identify the theme? |  |  |  |
| Is the title clear, specific, and precise? |  |  |  |
| Does it have translations into English and Portuguese? |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Abstract Identification**  | **Yes** | **No**  | **Observations (If improvements are required)** |
| Does it cover the topic of the article in a general way?  |  |  |  |
| Is it clear, coherent, and succinct? |  |  |  |
| Does it have translations into English and Portuguese? |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identification of the keywords** | **Yes** | **No**  | **Observations (If improvements are required)** |
| Are the keywords related to the topic of the article? |  |  |  |
| Do they allow the thematic location of the content of the article? |  |  |  |
| Do they have translations into English and Portuguese? |  |  |  |

1. **Content**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identification of the Introduction** | **Yes** | **No**  | **Observations (If improvements are required)** |
| Is the introduction a preamble of the aspects to be developed in the article? |  |  |  |
| Is the fundamental purpose of the review stated? |  |  |  |
| Does it comment on the type of methodology in which the review will be developed? |  |  |  |
| Does it include relevant and accurate theoretical material that supports the first approach to the content of the manuscript? |  |  |  |

\*Fill in this item only if the article presents the section called Methodology.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identification of the Methodology** | **Yes** | **No**  | **Observations (If improvements are required)** |
| Is the procedure developed for the location, selection, analysis, and validation of the sources consulted described? |  |  |  |
| Is the author clear when explaining the processes and threads implicit in the development of the article, which led to the structuring and compilation of the referenced material? |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Development of the topic** | **Yes** | **No**  | **Observations (If improvements are required)** |
| Does the development of the theme have subtitles that account for the information collected, classifying and integrating it appropriately? |  |  |  |
| Is there discursive coherence that allows fulfilling the communicative purpose of the text? |  |  |  |
| Is it possible to guide the reader through the theoretical contribution of the sources chosen for this article? |  |  |  |
| Is there a comparative analysis that makes it possible to identify meeting points and differences between the various theories offered? |  |  |  |
| Is the conceptual basis used by the author rigorous, up-to-date, and truthful in his/her area of knowledge? |  |  |  |
| Does the article use primary and secondary sources of information? |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identification of the Conclusions** | **Yes** | **No**  | **Observations (If improvements are required)** |
| Are the conclusions your own reflections, the product of the analysis of the sources that were cited? |  |  |  |
| Are the conclusions specific and clear, and do they evoke the most significant aspects that were obtained as a result of the review exercise? |  |  |  |

1. **General concept of writing quality**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Generalities**  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Deficient** |
| Adequate and pertinent use of concepts and terms. |  |  |  |
| Appropriate and coherent writing with the topic of study. |  |  |  |
| Relevance of figures and tables (if presented). |  |  |  |
| Clear, fluent, and concrete disciplinary language. |  |  |  |
| **Observations:** |

1. **Other observations regarding the relevance and quality of the scientific manuscript**

What improvements should the author of the article make?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Decision and provisions**

Taking into account the aspects evaluated above, it is recommended that:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The article is published without changes. |  |
| The article is published incorporating the suggested changes. |  |
| The article is published as long as it is verified that significant changes have been made to it. |  |
| The article is not published. |  |

**Main information of the external evaluator**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Full name:** |  |
| **ORCID Code:** |  |
| **CvLAC link:** |  |
| **Google Scholar link:** |  |
| **Date of birth:** |  |
| **Nationality:**  |  |
| **Citizenship card:** |  |
| **Undergraduate degree:** |  |
| **Postgraduate studies:** |  |
| **Labor affiliation:**  |  |
| **Research group(s) to which the evaluator belongs:** |  |
| **Landline and cell phone** |  |
| **Email:** |  |
| \* All fields are mandatory  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Signature of the Peer Evaluator |  |

**Declaration of confidentiality and conflict of interest:**

When carrying out this evaluation, you have access to confidential information, so you may not use this information (such as disclosure of results prior to its publication, or disclosure of the concepts developed) for personal benefit, make it known, or make it available to the public benefit of any other person and organization. In addition, if in reading the work you find any ethical impediment or conflict of interest that may affect your concept, you must inform the editor so that the document can be reassigned to another peer reviewer.