**PEER REVIEW FORM (ROUND 1)**

Dear reviewer:

*Innovar* journal appeals to you in your capacity as an expert in the research topic-problem of the paper you are going to evaluate. Below you will find some basic characteristics of the document that we kindly ask you to evaluate and comment on. Please fill in the qualitative evaluations and comments for each characteristic. You will then find a space for comments to the editors. Finally, please let us know your editorial suggestions.

We thank in advance for the time and work you have spent on this academic collaboration. Your contribution is essential for our editorial project to continue publishing quality work for our readership. *Remember to be the evaluator you would like to have as an author.*

**Title of document:**

**Name of reviewer:**

**Institutional affiliation:**

**1. Evaluation of document characteristics** (make a comment about the aspect to be evaluated and mark with an X the valuation of this aspect)

Originality

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |
| None |  | Marginal |  | Modest  |  | Notable |  | Quite high |  |

Interest and actuality of the subject

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |
| None |  | Limited |  | Modest  |  | Notable |  | Important |  |

Contribution to knowledge

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |
| None |  | Scarce |  | Modest  |  | Significant |  | Important |  |

Theoretical and conceptual robustness

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |
| None |  | Limited |  | Acceptable  |  | Good |  | Excellent |  |

Relevance and mastery of the bibliography

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |
| None |  | Limited |  | Acceptable  |  | Good |  | Excellent |  |

Rigor in methodology

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |
| None |  | Limited |  | Acceptable  |  | Good |  | Excellent |  |

Analysis and discussion of the results

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |
| None |  | Limited |  | Acceptable  |  | Good |  | Excellent |  |

Validity and relevance of the conclusions

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |
| None |  | Limited |  | Modest  |  | Good |  | Excellent |  |

Clarity of the structure and writing

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |
| None |  | Somewhat confusing |  | Adequate  |  | Good |  | Excellent |  |

Other Comments for authors

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

**2. Comments for editors (these comments will not be sent to the authors):**

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

**3. The article must be (mark with an X):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Approved without modifications[[1]](#footnote-1) |  |
| Approved with minor modifications[[2]](#footnote-2) |  |
| Approved with deep modifications[[3]](#footnote-3) |  |
| Rejected[[4]](#footnote-4) |  |

1. The article has no areas for improvement in its content and can be published as submitted. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The article has minor aspects to be improved, such as, for example, expansion and clarification of paragraphs. These modifications can be resolved by the authors within a period of no more than one month. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The article has major shortcomings in any of its sections. These changes would take more than a month to be fixed by the authors. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The article does not meet the quality parameters expected for an academic paper. The article should be rewritten in its entirety. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)