**Initial review concept**

This document presents the verification of compliance with the general guidelines established by the journal for the documents submitted. Based on this, the editorial team identifies both the possibilities of improving the quality of the documents according to the editorial criteria of style and rigor, prior to sending them to peer reviewers, as well as the reasons for their rejection.

Editorial revision date: OJS Code:

**Postulated document information**

**General information:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of document |   |
| Date of sent |   |
| Number of words |   |
| Complementary files |   |
| Originality |  |

**Type of document:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research articles:** They present in a detailed and rigorous way the original and unpublished results of systematic processes and research projects. The following structure is suggested: introduction, literature review (theoretical framework), methodology, results, discussion and conclusions. |  |
| **Reflection articles:** They present academic discussions based on a review of relevant literature and the presentation of a specific theme-problem. Analytical, interpretative, and critical perspectives on the specific topic-problem of the reflection are accepted, as long as they contribute in an original, novel and plausible way to the state of the art in a given field or specific disciplinary subfield. The following structure is suggested: introduction, logical-argumentative development of the topic, the author's own (original) contribution, repercussions, inferences or conclusions. |  |
| **Review articles:** They present the systematization of a methodical and rigorous process of literature review, under its various modalities. Thus, this type of article contributes to the specific disciplinary field by providing detailed and plausible analyses of the state of the art on a given research topic-problem. An article will be considered of this typology if and only if it sufficiently and rigorously accounts for the systematization of the literature of a specific field. It is suggested to review, at least, fifty documents in this regard. The following structure is suggested: introduction, methodology, results, discussion and conclusions. |  |
| **Book reviews:** These are papers presenting and discussing a work of specialized literature, usually books. Reviews will be published for papers that, preferably, have no previous reviews; however, if reviews of such a paper already exist, the new review is expected to have a novel and plausible approach. The author is expected to give an account of the objective, development, contributions and limitations of the paper. |  |
| **Other:** Not identified with the preceding typologies. |  |

**Initial review criteria**

1. **Preliminaries, extension and tables/figures**

 Title:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| It is concise and corresponds to the content |  |  |
| It has between 12 and 20 words |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

 Abstract:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Presents a brief introduction to the topic/problem of study |   |  |
| Presents the objective of the work |   |  |
| Briefly outlines the methodology and methods used |   |  |
| Point out the main results and contributions |   |  |
| Mention the main limitations |   |  |
| Avoid including bibliographic references |   |  |
| Is 210 words or less in length |   |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

 Key words:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| At least 5 keywords are specified |   |  |
| These are found in the title and summary of the document |   |  |
| These are presented in alphabetical order |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

Journal of Economic Literature (JEL) classification:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3 JEL codes are specified |   |  |
| Codes have one alphabetic and two numeric characters (e.g. M41) |   |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

Authors, enumeration and headers of the document::

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Send an anonymous document without including the names of the authors |   |  |
| Avoid including headers |   |  |
| All pages are numbered in Arabic numerals  |   |  |
| Indicates the hierarchy of titles using Arabic notation (1, 1.1, 1.1.1) |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

Document length:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| It has a minimum length of 6,000 and a maximum of 10,000 words, including references, footnotes and tables. |   |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

Presentation of tables and figures:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| All are editable in the document or an additional file is sent for editing |   |  |
| All of them are in grayscale |   |  |
| All are listed and cited in the text prior to their presentation |   |  |
| All have a title |   |  |
| All of them have a source of elaboration |   |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

1. **Body of the text**

 Introduction:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Presents a brief delimitation of the research topic/problem with respect to a specific disciplinary field |   |  |
| Presents a background review of the research topic/problem |   |  |
| Indicate the novelty of the work |   |  |
| Justifies the importance of the work in the specific disciplinary field |   |  |
| Presents the objective of the work |   |  |
| It presents a paragraph in which the structure of the document is explained |   |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

Theoretical framework, frame of reference or literature review:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Presents a logical linkage of the background of the research topic-problem in the specific disciplinary field |   |  |
| The bibliography is pertinent and the presentation is well managed |   |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

Methodology:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Presents the methodology, methods, documentary and scholarly sources used |   |  |
| Justifies the methodology, methods, documentary and academic sources used |   |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

Results and discussion:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Presents a relationship between the framework and the results of the research |   |  |
| Analytically presents the results and evidences the central contributions of the work |   |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

Conclusions:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Presents a brief summary of the structure of the document |   |  |
| Presents the contributions of the document to the specific disciplinary field |   |  |
| Identifies and points out the main limitations of the work |   |  |
| Proposes future lines of research derived from the work |   |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

1. **Citation and bibliographic references**

Citation and document references:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Uses the American Psychological Association (APA) referencing system, seventh edition |   |  |
| Presents the list of bibliographic references in alphabetical order |   |  |
| There is a correspondence between the citation in the body of the text and the references included |   |  |
| Include the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) at the end of the reference for all documents that have it |   |  |
| Include at the end of the reference a link to consult documents that do not have Digital Object Identifier (DOI) |   |  |
| There is a high level of self-citation by authors |  |  |
| Innovar articles are cited in more than 20% of the total number of bibliographic references |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

1. **Writing and style**

Academic writing standards:

 Yes No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Presents spelling errors |   |  |
| Presents typographical errors |   |  |
| Presents punctuation errors |   |  |
| Presents cohesion, coherence and/or concordance errors |   |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

1. **General characteristics of the document**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Null | Bad | Regular | Good | Excellent |
| Clarity in writing |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relevance and thematic pertinence with respect to the journal's editorial line |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relevance and bibliography management |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rigor in the presentation of the methodology |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up-to-date, systematic and presentation of the bibliography |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Concept of the editorial team**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The article must comply with the observations indicated in the comments section of this document in order to be considered for formal acceptance in the editorial process |  |
| The article does not meet the guidelines and expectations of the journal Innovar and is therefore rejected in the initial review round |  |

1. **Note:**

Dear authors:

This initial review concept ***does not guarantee*** *that your article has been formally accepted into the editorial process of Innovar Journal*. If the postulated document has no aspects to improve, the editorial team will notify you of its formal acceptance in the editorial process. If the document has aspects to be improved, then the authors will have one month to make the modifications[[1]](#footnote-1). If the adjusted document **is not** received within this period, the application will be rejected in OJS and a new submission must be made. If your document is rejected at this stage, we invite you to receive the comments as opportunities to improve the quality of your document and submit it to another dissemination channel.

1. Thirty calendar days will be counted from the date of notification of the delivery of the initial review concept. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)