



MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION PROTOCOL			
Evaluation of the following category (please mark the suitable box):	Article	DocenTIC	Monograph
Manuscript title:			
Sent for review (date):			
Returned after review (date):			
ELEMENTS TO EVALUATE			
1. The title of the paper is clear and reflects the issue of the paper adequately. <i>(Focus on grammatical, syntax or other kinds of errors in all three languages).</i>			
Comments:			
			Rate from 0 to 5 <input type="text"/>
2. The abstract and the keywords are chosen adequately.			
Comments:			
			Rate from 0 to 5 <input type="text"/>
3. In case of tables, graphs and other illustrations: Are they relevant and are they compiled correctly? In case there are no tables, graphs and other illustrations, please indicate it.			
Comments:			
			Rate from 0 to 5 <input type="text"/>
4. The language of the paper is chosen properly according to the academic and scientific purposes.			



Comments:	
	Rate from 0 to 5 <input type="text"/>
5. The authors comply with the submission guidelines and structure the paper adequately.	
Comments:	
	Rate from 0 to 5 <input type="text"/>
6. Do you think the authors should improve the wording in general? If so, could you give some guidance in this respect? *	
Comments:	
	Rate from 0 to 5 <input type="text"/>
7. Relevance and currency of references and literature review.	
Comments:	
	Rate from 0 to 5 <input type="text"/>
8. Evaluate if the arguments are used properly.	
Comments:	
	Rate from 0 to 5 <input type="text"/>
9. Evaluate the paper's originality and scientific contribution referring to own knowledge of the issue presented.	
Comments:	
	Rate from 0 to 5 <input type="text"/>
10a. In terms of research papers: Is the paper clear and are the paper's objectives, hypothesis, methodology and conclusions consistent? Evaluate the methodological	



rigour, research tools and results.					
Comments:					
Rate from 0 to 5					
10b. In case of a discussion paper on some current status, literature review or divulgation of a concrete issue, how would you evaluate the rigour, depth, topicality of these aspects and the interest to be published in @tic?					
Comments:					
Rate from 0 to 5					
11. Is the bibliography relevant, current and broad? Evaluate also if the bibliographical references and literature references follow the Harvard guidelines. Evaluate if the references in the text are used adequately.					
Comments:					
Rate from 0 to 5					
12. Do you recommend its publication in @tic. revista d'innovació educativa?*					
Yes		No		Yes, revisions suggested	
13. Indicate the revisions you consider necessary (in case of "Yes, revisions suggested").					
Comments:					
14. When you mark "No", please write down your reasons.					
Comments:					