

**EXTERNAL REVIEWERS' PROTOCOL**

*(Protocol that the journal will make available to its reviewers to improve and facilitate the manuscript review process. For the purpose of proving editorial transparency, the journal is publishing this protocol to make authors aware of the evaluation aspects to which their manuscripts will be subjected.)*

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

**The Instructions for the Authors for the journal can also be found on the website:** [www.unav.es/ese](http://www.unav.es/ese)

**Once completed, send the evaluation by e-mail to:** [carceles@unav.es](mailto:carceles@unav.es)

**INFORMATION ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS:**

1. The journal *Estudios sobre Educación* (ESE) is indexed in the following databases: Social Science Citation Index (Thomson-Reuters, USA), SCOPUS (Elsevier, Holland), Fuente Académica (EBSCO, USA); International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (London School of Economics, UK); INIST (CNRS, France), IBZ Online - International Bibliography of Periodical Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences (de Gruyter, Germany), Latindex (Mexico); IRESIE (Mexico); CREDI (Organization of American States); In-Recs (EC<sup>3</sup> Spain); ISCOC (CINDOC, Spain); and Dialnet (University of La Rioja, Spain).
2. The original material received is first assessed by one or more members of the Editorial Committee, to evaluate its suitability in terms of the content encompassed by the journal's remit and the established publication criteria.
3. So as to guarantee quality standards in published articles, and to meet the requirements established by indexed databases, *Estudios sobre Educación* (ESE) follows an external peer-review system in relation to research topics and methodologies.
4. Original articles (author(s) names removed) are sent by the Editorial Committee to two external reviewers, who deliver their reports. These reports form the basis for the Editorial Committee's decision to reject or accept the article, or to accept a modified version of the article. It is hoped that the evaluation system may be as transparent as possible. Thus, the non-confidential parts of evaluators' reports are sent to the authors, excluding any details that may indicate the identity of the external reviewers. Some formal changes may be made to the text, while at all times respecting its content. Once the changes suggested by the evaluators have been incorporated, the new version is submitted for a second evaluation process.
5. Evaluators' reports are written in line with a Protocol which includes: a) a general recommendation; b) assessment of overall quality; c) evaluation of originality and relevance; d) evaluation of technical and academic content: background, methodology, structure and formal features; e) additional comments.

### **Recommendations for evaluation reports**

1. The evaluations issued are to be well-grounded and clearly explained.
2. In terms of style, personal or pointed expressions or comments, and/or phrases open to any misinterpretation, are to be avoided.
3. The evaluation of the manuscript and the recommendation regarding acceptance or rejection should be congruent.
4. In so far as possible, the positive aspects of the evaluated text should be highlighted and suggestions made regarding how any deficiencies it contains may be corrected.
5. A manuscript is to be rejected when:
  - it is of little or no academic interest or relevance;
  - the validity of its content is compromised by serious methodological failures;
  - the focus is superficial, of a merely descriptive or general-interest nature;
  - the interpretation or organization of information is generally inadequate;
  - the text lacks significant bibliographical and documentary support;
  - the written expression of the text is so inadequate as to require a significant or total re-write.
6. Major corrections will be required in texts:
  - that contain methodological errors which can be corrected without a complete re-drafting of the text;
  - whose academic depth or coherence may be questioned in relation to secondary or supplementary arguments;
  - wherein the approach to questions or information-management requires improvement in certain areas;
  - whose bibliographical or documentary apparatus could be slightly improved;
  - where the written expression is acceptable, although it may contain a range of errors or imprecise terms.
7. Minor corrections will be required in texts:
  - that contain no significant methodological errors;
  - that reach a coherent and detailed standard of analysis, although there may be room for more nuanced discussion;
  - wherein gaps in the bibliographical or documentary apparatus are insignificant;
  - where the written expression is generally good, although a number of small corrections may be suggested.

Manuscript Ref. No.:

Manuscript Title:

Evaluator:

Date sent to evaluator:

Date returned:

<u>Instructions for the Evaluator</u>	Accept / Reject
1. I am <b>qualified</b> , as an expert, to evaluate the subject covered in the manuscript.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
2. I will follow the attached <b>protocol</b> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
3. I will <b>return</b> the manuscript once read and after issuing the report.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
4. I will issue the report within the <b>established period</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
5. I will declare any personal, academic, research, economic or financial <b>conflict of interest</b> related to the manuscript.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
6. I will maintain the <b>confidentiality</b> of both the manuscript and the review.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
7. I am aware of the journal's <b>compensation</b> in terms of recognition.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>- Final Acceptance / Rejection decision</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Manuscript Ref. No.:

Manuscript Title:

Evaluator:

Date sent to evaluator:

Date returned:

(Complete as final evaluation conclusion)

**1. RECOMMENDATION:**

Accept	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accept with minor corrections	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Accept with major corrections</i> (New review process)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE WORK**

Highest	<input type="checkbox"/>
Good	<input type="checkbox"/>
Average	<input type="checkbox"/>
Low	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Highest	<input type="checkbox"/>
Average	<input type="checkbox"/>
Low	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

ESTUDIOS SOBRE EDUCACIÓN

**ESE**

**Journal:** *ESE. Estudios sobre Educación*

**Editor-in-Chief:** *Concepción Naval*

**EVALUATION COMMENTS** (That these comments may be sent to the authors should be borne in mind.) 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 the authors.

ESTUDIOS SOBRE EDUCACIÓN

**ESE**

**Journal:** *ESE. Estudios sobre Educación*

**Editor-in-Chief:** *Concepción Naval*

**CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS** (Comments on the acceptability of the manuscript; for the editors 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:

Place and date:

Signed: