**I. Review**

**Submission information:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title: |  |

**Reviewer information:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: |  | | | |
| Position: |  | | | |
| Field: |  | | | |
| Email: |  | | Telephone: |  |
| Department: | |  | | |
| Faculty/Institute: | |  | | |
| Affiliation: | |  | | |
| Work address: | |  | | |
| Research group, if any): | |  | | |
| Research projects in which you are currently involved (name and reference): | |  | | |

**II. OVERALL ASSESSMENT**

*Tick the appropriate boxes.*

**Work type**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Research |
|  | Dissemination |
|  | Didactics |

**Authorship:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Individual authorship |
|  | Although authorship cannot be definitively established as either individual or collective, the work demonstrates a clear non-miscellaneous character. The contents are well structured and all the chapters contribute to the internal cohesion of the work, which is duly justified in the introduction |
|  | Collective authorship and miscellaneous in nature, which makes it inadvisable to consider it as a monograph |

**Recommendation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Accept the publication without modifications. |
|  | Accept the publication, subject to the implementation of the minor corrections indicated herein. |
|  | Conditional rejection - resubmission encouraged after substantial revision. |
|  | Reject – does not reach the required scholarly standard. |

**Comments:**

**III. CRITICAL REVIEW**

*Tick the appropriate boxes.*

**ORIGINALITY AND TIMELINESS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Novel/Cutting-edge/Ground-breaking work |
|  | The topic addressed and/or the approach to the topic is/are original and/or relevant |
|  | Contributes to the advancement of knowledge in the field |
|  | Important for the dissemination of novel and/or relevant research results |
|  | No interest |

**Comments:**

**TARGET AUDIENCE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Specialists |
|  | Graduate students in the field” |
|  | Undergraduate students in the field |
|  | University students in general |
|  | General audience |

**SCIENTIFIC QUALITY. FORMAL ISSUES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | The title adequately reflects the content of the work |
|  | The style is clear |
|  | Linguistic register and terminology are adequate |
|  | The book structure is adequate and coherent |
|  | For collective works: all the above apply to all chapters |

**Comments:**

**METHODOLOGY ISSUES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Appropriate to the object of study |
|  | Confused |
|  | Outdated |
|  | Innovative |
|  | Average |

*In the case of collective works, indicate whether this assessment applies to all chapters.*

**RESULTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Conclusions are both relevant and appropriate to the objectives/goals |
|  | Lacks relevant conclusions/results |
|  | Uninteresting and inappropriate conclusions |
|  | Conclusions are vague, imprecise, or inaccurate |
|  | Conclusions need revising and expanding |

*In the case of collective works, indicate whether this assessment applies to all chapters.*

**Other comments:**

**REFERENCES**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Outdated |  | Updated |
|  | Incomplete |  | Very poor |

*In the case of collective works, indicate whether this applies to all chapters.*

**FORMAL EVALUATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Is the final list of works cited homogenous? (YES/NO) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Does it fit the citation parameters in the field of expertise? (YES/NO) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Are the chapters in the volume homogeneous in terms of heading numbering, abbreviations, footnote usage, abstract and keywords...? (YES/NO) |  |

**Comments:**

**ARTWORK** (If any)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Adequate |
|  | Insufficient |
|  | Excessive |

**Comments:**

**IV. QUANTIVATIVE ASSESSMENT**

Rate the following.

1= very low; 2 = low; 3 = mean; 4 = high; 5 = very high.ACU

Account for your rating if necessary.

**GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The title reflects the content(s): |  |
| The goal is clearly established: |  |
| The results are clearly discussed: |  |

**PRESENTATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Adequacy of the length and contributions: |  |
| Reading easiness: |  |
| Conciseness and clarity: |  |
| Grammatical correction: |  |
| Correct use of terminology: |  |

**ACCURACY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Primary sources: |  |
| References: |  |
| Content organization: |  |
| Style: |  |

**CONTRIBUTION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Originality: |  |
| Data accuracy: |  |
| Argumentation: |  |
| Validity of the conclusions: |  |
| Importance of contribution: |  |

**Comments:**

**V. FINAL REMARKS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Should the models, methods and theories used be better presented?: |  |
| Would it be necessary to expand some of the content/some chapters? |  |
| Would it be necessary to reduce some of the content/some chapters?: |  |
| Would it be necessary to improve bibliographic references: |  |
| Would a formal review be necessary?: |  |
| Would it be necessary to review any translation: |  |

**VI. FINAL OVERVIEW**