SUPERVISION21 Magazine
Collection of education articles
supervision21@usie.es

TITLE OF THE WORK:

<u>RECOMMENDATIONS </u>FOR PREPARING EVALUATION REPORTS

NOTE: ALONG WITH THIS REPORT – NOT MANDATORY -, IT IS APPRECIATED THAT YOU INDICATE CORRECTIONS AND / OR OBSERVATIONS IN THE COPY SENT OF THE ARTICLE.

1. The judgments made: substantiation and explanation, if applicable.

2. Consistency between the evaluation of the manuscript and the publication recommendation.

3. Positive aspects of the work evaluated and indication on correction of deficiencies.

4. Reasons for non-admission of manuscripts:
   - little scientific interest or relevance
   - serious methodological errors that compromise the validity of its content
   - superficial, purely descriptive, or informative approach
   - inadequate interpretation and handling of information
   - weak bibliographic and documentary support
   - poor writing and need for partial or total rewriting.

5. Review with major fixes:
   - with correctable methodological errors without thorough reworking
   - rigor and debatable depth in secondary or collateral points
   - good study of the issues and the handling of the data, except in some points
   - sufficient bibliographic and documentary apparatus, although it can be improved
   - generally acceptable wording, albeit with errors and inaccuracies

6. Revision with minor corrections:
   - no major methodological errors
   - level of cieentifico and rigorous analysis, with nuanced aspects
   - lack of bibliographic and documentary deficiencies that are not very relevant
   - proper wording with only a few corrections

Rules for publication
RATE EACH SECTION FROM 1 (very bad) TO 5 (very good)

BAREMACIÓN:	1	2	3	4	5
1.Title: Does the title correspond to the content of the work?					
2.Summary: Is the main line of work well summarized?					
3. Introduction: Is it clearly indicated?					
4. Work Development: Is the presentation clear, systematic and easy to follow?					
5.Conclusions: Are the conclusions clear and properly related to the content of the work?					
6.Bibliography: Is it adequate, current and sufficient?					
1 Relevance					
2 Originality					
3 Sequencing/Logical organization					
4 Quality in Methodology					
5 Quality in Experimentation/Application					
6 Scientific contextualization, bibliography, webography					
Form: Grammar, Style, Vocabulary					

SUGGESTED DECISION:

	Approved	1-Overall assessment of the quality of the work: Maximum ( ) Good ( ) Medium ( ) Low (x) 2-Assessment of originality and relevance (irrelevant) Maximum ( ) Good ( ) Medium ( ) Low (x)
	Accepted minor reforms	-----------
	Accepted with major reforms	-----------
	Rejected	Reasons: *Specify:.*

SUPERVISION21 Magazine
Collection of education articles
supervision21@usie.es

REJECTED:

Indicate with X the reasons why the work has been rejected:	
Lacks originality	
Lack of interest	
There are errors of foundation	
The exhibition is confusing and incomplete	
Needs major modifications Other (specify)	

EVALUATOR IDENTIFICATION

NUMBER	
FILIATION / INSTITUTION	
ACCEPTANCE OF SECOND REVISION	
EMAIL	