

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS' PROTOCOL

(Protocol that the journal will make available to its reviewers on the website or hard copy to improve and facilitate the manuscript review process. For the purpose of proving editorial transparency, the journal may publish this protocol to make the authors aware of the evaluation aspects to which their manuscripts will be subjected.)

Dear reviewer, The attached template is intended as a guideline for conducting the assessment, but not a limitation to the same. The evaluator may add any aspects to this protocol deemed to be appropriate, in line, when possible, with one of the principles of the Peer Review; that is, to improve the formal presentation and scientific content of the manuscript when it is worthy of a favorable assessment.

The Instructions for the Authors for the journal are also included, although they can also be found on the website _____

Once completed, send the evaluation by e-mail to _XXXXXX@XXXXX.es_____

Journal Logo	J o u r n a l : E d i t o r i n C h i e f :
Manuscript Ref. No.:	
Manuscript Title:	
Evaluator:	
Date sent to evaluator:	Date returned:
Instructions for the Evaluator (Before beginning the evaluation, I accept or reject the same under the following conditions.)	
1. I am capable, as an expert, to evaluate the subject covered in the manuscript.	
2. I will follow the attached protocol as a guide to preparing the content, style and format of the review, specific aspects of the original that I must evaluate and those to be ignored, always maintaining respect for the authors.	
3. I will return the manuscript once read and after issuing the report.	
4. I will issue the report within a maximum period of _____	
5. I will declare any personal, academic, research, economic or financial conflict of interest related to the manuscript.	
6. I will maintain the confidentiality of both the manuscript and the review.	
7. I am aware of the journal's economic compensation or recognition.	
- Final Acceptance / Rejection decision	

Journal Logo

J o u r n a l :

E d i t o r i n C h i e f:

Manuscript Ref. No.:

Manuscript type:

Reviews	
Original Articles	
Short Notices	
Technical Notes	
Other	

Manuscript Title:

Evaluator:

Date sent to evaluator:

Date returned:

(Complete as final evaluation conclusion)

1. RECOMMENDATION:

Accept	
Accept with minor corrections	
<i>Accept with major corrections</i> (New review process)	
Reject	
Publication priority	

2. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE WORK

Highest	
Good	
Average	
Low	

3. ORIGINALITY AND RELEVANCE ASSESSMENT (regarding the scientific information contained in the article: -new and valuable, - results already known, - irrelevant)

Highest	
Average	
Low	

4. TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS:				
4.1 STRUCTURE AND STYLE		YES	NO	Improve or Change
♦ Appropriate title (clear, concise and informative)				
- Spanish				
- English				
♦ Correct summary (it is clear and includes the objectives, design, methods, variables considered, primary results and most relevant conclusions)				
- Spanish				
- English				
♦ The structure of the discussion is appropriate				
♦ The style is appropriate (clear, concise and following a logical sequence)				
4.2 FOUNDATION, METHODOLOGY, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION		YES	NO	Improve or Change
♦ Is the theme, subject or general problem identified immediately and clearly?				
♦ Are the theme(s), subject or specific problem outlined and defined clearly?				
♦ Does the bibliographic review take into consideration the most important and up-to-date works related to the study theme?				
♦ Are the work objectives presented clearly?				
♦ Is the methodology or technique proposed for reaching the study objective(s) appropriate?				
♦ Are the data, materials, sources, etc. provided sufficient for replicating the study?				
♦ When applicable, are the statistical facts used appropriate for the analysis variables used and to respond to the hypotheses formulated?				
♦ When applicable, are the samples, number of cases considered and/or follow up on the tests or trials appropriate?				
♦ Are the results appropriate and do they correspond with the data obtained in the work?				
♦ Do the results provide pertinent information as regards the objectives of the study?				
♦ Are the bibliographic references sufficient, appropriate and up-to-date?				
♦ Do the conclusions interpret and correspond with the results obtained in the work?				
♦ Illustrations (figures, photographs, etc.) and tables		YES	NO	Improve or Change
- They are sufficient and appropriate				
- They are excessive and redundant. Eliminate nos.				
- They could be improved in presentation and interpretation in nos.				
♦ Other				

Manuscript Ref. No.	Journal:
Manuscript No.	Editor in Chief:
Manuscript Title:	Journal:
Manuscript Title:	Editor in Chief:

EVALUATION COMMENTS (Write them while keeping in mind that they may be sent to the authors). Use additional sheets if necessary.

We recommend that the comments follow the order established in point 4 of this protocol; that is, Technical-Formal aspects and Scientific Content aspects. This evaluation is necessary to justify the decision of the editors and to enable them to send the pertinent explanations to

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS (Comments on the acceptability of the manuscript only; for the Editor only).

I have reviewed the article and hereby declare: that I have no financial, intellectual or personal interest in this article and that I will not disseminate the information obtained through the review of the article prior to its publication.

Name:
Location and date:

Signed:

Additional sheets