**BOLETÍN GEOLÓGICO**

**Evaluation form**

The evaluations of the *Boletín Geológico* are double-blind. This evaluation will be sent to the author without your personal data. Please perform the evaluation in the most objective, complete and detailed possible way, emphasizing in the substance of the article.

All articles, after being approved, will go through a strict spelling and style review and figure and image design.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Article’s title:** |  |
| **Date:** |  |

1. **Reviewer personal data:**

Name:

ID:

Organization:

Country:

E-mail:

Academic degree:

1. **General evaluation: mark with an X as appropriate (weight 30%)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **High** | **Medium** | **Low** |
| 1. It is the article’s subject relevant, current, and provides contributions to the area of knowledge?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. What is the level of the reviewed literature?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the bibliographic sources enough and updated?
 |  |  |  |

1. **Specific evaluation: mark with an X as appropriate (weight 50%)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **High** | **Medium** | **Low** |
| 1. Does the title describe the content properly?
 |  |  |  |
| b. Does the abstract summarize the objectives, methods and tests, results and conclusions? |  |  |  |
| c. Are the objectives deﬁned and clearly supported? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the content original? Does it represents a contribution to the subject area compared with other published articles or documents?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the organization and argumentation consistent?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was used an adequate methodology to develop the objectives?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Were used enough measurements and/or samples?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the figures and tables useful for developing the argument?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the results match up with the objectives?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the discussion of results show an analysis about the theoretical referents and contributes to the area of ​​knowledge?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the conclusions consistent with the methods and the results?
 |  |  |  |

1. **Format evaluation: mark with an X as appropriate (weight 20%)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **High** | **Medium** | **Low** |
| 1. Is the article well written? Is the text clear and easy to read?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the article follow the spelling rules in English?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the APA referencing standard followed?
 |  |  |  |

1. **Comments to the author and suggestions to improve the content, structure and writing of the article: please write in detail your suggestions**
2. **Comments to the Editorial Committee:**
3. **Recommendations: mark with an X as appropriate**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| No modifications are required: |  |
| Minor modifications are required:  |  |
| Substantial modifications and a new revision are required: |  |
| It is not considered suitable to continue in the process: |  |

**Confidentiality:**

I agree that I will not be able to make use of this information for personal use, to make it known, or to be used for any other person or organization.

**Ethics in Research:**

I know and accept the international standards of the scientific publications, witch the *Boletín Geológico* has accepted, and those referring to the handling of plagiarism and review of external peers:

<http://publicationethics.org/files/International%20standard_editors_for%20website_11_Nov_2011.pdf>

**Reviewer signature**

**Space to be filled out by the Editorial Committee**

|  |
| --- |
| **Weighted total evaluation** |
| **Qualification****by section** | **Section** | **Average** | **Weighting** | **Weighted rating** |
|
| 1 General evaluation |  | 30% |  |
| 2) Specific evaluation |  | 50% |  |
| 3) Format evaluation |  | 20% |  |
| **Total Weighted Evaluation Rating** |  |