| **EVALUATION BY PEERS**  **INITIAL EVALUATION** |
| --- |

This form is a peer review tool used to review and evaluate academic articles prior to their possible publication in the journal Matices en Lenguas Extranjeras (MALE). The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the quality, relevance, and clarity of the article, such as to provide feedback to the author or the editor on its suitability for publication.

| **General Information:** In this section you will enter basic information about the article, such as the title of the article, the date in which it was received and evaluated, the language of the article, your personal information as an evaluator, and the institution to which you belong. Please, provide this information below. | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title |  | | | |
| Date of Receipt | Day / Month / Year | | Evaluation Date | Day / Month / Year |
| Language of the article |  | | | |
| Evaluator’s full name | |  | | |
| Institution | |  | | |

| 1. **Type of article:** Select the type of article to be evaluated | |
| --- | --- |
| Article of scientific and technological research: *A document that presents, in detail, the original results of completed research projects. The structure generally used contains four major sections: introduction, methodology, results and conclusions.* |  |
| Article of reflection: *A document that presents the results of completed research from an analytical, interpretative or critical perspective of the author, on a specific issue, using original sources.* |  |
| Article of review: *Document resulting from completed research which analyzes, systematizes and integrates the results of published or unpublished research in a field in science or technology, to account for the advances and the development tendencies. It presents a detailed bibliographical review of at least 50 references.* |  |
| Case study: *Document that presents the results of a study of a specific case to consider the technical and methodological experiences. It includes a commented systematic review of the literature on analogous cases.* |  |

| **II. Title:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the clarity of the title with which the author presents the subject of the article? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **III. Abstract:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the author's referencing of the methodology, results and conclusions? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **IV. Keywords:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the clarity of the keywords used by the author in relation to the subject matter?  Are they selected from international databases? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **V. Relevance of the topic:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the originality, innovation and relevance in the field of foreign languages within the central theme in the article? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **VI. Problem statement:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you assess the clarity with which the research problem is stated?  How do you evaluate the clarity of the research problem in such a way that the reader can identify the approach just by reading the first few paragraphs?  How do you evaluate the theoretical vocabulary used to state the research problem? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification:   * Approach to the topic |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **VII. Introduction:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the clarity and importance of the article's topic with respect to the author's approach?  How do you evaluate the author's citation of previous work or facts from which the problem is derived?  How do you evaluate the clarity of the paper's question and the derivation of a possible organization of the discussion? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **VIII. Objectives:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the precision and clarity with which the author describes the objectives?  How do you evaluate the clarity of the statement of what the research is intended to achieve?  How do you evaluate the response of the objectives to the research problem? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **IX. Organization:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the clarity of the arguments made by the author?  How do you evaluate the clarity of the argument on the central axis?  How do you evaluate the readability and comprehension of the article?  How do you evaluate the logical structuring of the parts of the article?  How do you evaluate the clarity and coherence of the ideas presented in the article? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |
| **X. Methodology:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the author's explicit description of the method and analysis employed?  How do you evaluate the clarity with which the hypotheses and/or methodological guidelines that indicate to the reader what specifically has been studied are stated?  How do you evaluate the objectivity with which the techniques and methods were used in the article? | | |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **XI. Results - Discussion:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the relation of the results to the objective or research question(s)?  How do you evaluate the coherence of the results with respect to the development of the article?  How do you evaluate the comparison of the results obtained in the article with other results? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **XII. Conclusion:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the synthesis of the conclusions with the most relevant elements?  How do you evaluate the coherence of the conclusions with the development of the document?  How do you evaluate the author's suggestion to carry out future research or reflections on the subject? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **XIII. Writing:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the author's use of language appropriate to the discipline?  How do you evaluate the author's proper use of form (punctuation, spelling, syntax, grammar)?  How do you evaluate the author's use of coherent and cohesive academic discourse in his/her article? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **XIV. Bibliography:** Mark with an X your evaluative judgment according to the options "Excellent", "Good", "Acceptable", "Insufficient". Use the following question(s) as a guide:  How do you evaluate the inclusion of a recent, extensive and recognized bibliography related to the research topic?  How do you evaluate the proper handling of references in the paper? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Justification: |
| Good |  |
| Acceptable |  |
| Insufficient |  |

| **XV. Conclusions of the evaluator:**  How do you evaluate the inclusion of a recent, extensive and recognized bibliography related to the research topic?  How do you evaluate the proper handling of references in the paper? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommended for publication:   * As it is * Must incorporate certain suggestions. Which ones? |  | Justification: |
|  |
| Not recommended for publication |  |