

Centro de Estudios Avanzados
en Niñez y Juventud

ALIANZA



REVISTA LATINOAMERICANA
DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES, NIÑEZ Y JUVENTUD

FORMAT FOR THE EVALUATION OF THEORETICAL ARTICLES

Dear reviewer:

We would appreciate your evaluation of this manuscript within a maximum period of four weeks. If for any reason you are unable to meet this deadline, please suggest another reviewer.

Please provide comments on the issues that you identify with the article next to the guiding questions, in the boxes to the right of these questions. You can also use this box to explain your evaluation of each point. If you feel it is necessary, you can include an additional report at the end of this form. These comments are essential to help the author(s) improve their article and for the editors to make a final decision on publishing the paper.

We recommend that you read our *Guide on Reviewing Qualitative Research Articles* to support your evaluation process as the articles may have a high variability in the elements they include.

Thank you again for your time and help.

-The *Editors*



@RevistaLatinoamericanadeCSNYJ



@revista-latinoamericana-ciencias-
sociales-niñez-y-juventud



revistaumanizales@cinde.org.co



<https://revistaumanizales.cinde.org.co/>



A. General

Interest of the article: Is the article or document accessible and interesting for a Latin American and, in general, international audience?

Location in the academic field. Please provide your assessment of the following statements, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree”:

	1	2	3	4	5
The article is clearly placed in a specific problem area related to <i>children</i> or <i>youth</i> that is of interest and is current.					
This specific problem area is of interest and topical.					
The article significantly contributes to enriching that field.					
The article reflects suitable knowledge of and use of previous research from this academic field in general and, in particular, related to the specific topic covered by the article.					

Any additional comments for the author(s) or the editors?

B. Constituting elements

Title, abstract and keywords. Please provide your assessment of the following statements, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree”:

	1	2	3	4	5
The title summarizes the thematic core of the article.					
The title helps attract readers to the article.					
The abstract is understandable without having to read the whole article.					
The abstract is precise, coherent and concise.					
The abstract describes the problem or theory being discussed or analyzed and the main conclusions.					
The keywords are appropriate.					
The abstract does not require any other keywords.					





Please add any additional comments to the above point for the author(s) or editors:

Introduction. Please provide your assessment of the following statements, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree”:

	1	2	3	4	5
This section is appropriate for the type of article.					
The introduction is interesting and draws the reader in so that they will read the rest of the article.					
It includes a presentation and contextualization of the problem that is concise and clearly presented.					
It justifies the research that has been carried out.					
The introduction presents its conceptual references explicitly and concisely.					



It includes the review, criticism or summary of relevant literature, as well as a minimal literature review from the last three years.					
It clearly and explicitly states its objective and question.					

Please add any additional comments to the above point for the author(s) or editors:

Method: Does the description of the method used present the following elements in a clear and detailed manner?

	Yes	No
Epistemological foundation or research focus.		
Description of the researcher's background (if relevant or if it has influenced the findings).		
Data collection processes.		
Data analysis strategies.		

Please add any additional comments to the above point for the author(s) or editors:

Theoretical development: Please provide your assessment of the following statements, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree”:

	1	2	3	4	5
The theory developed has a logical and epistemological coherence.					
The various arguments presented support the theses that are defended.					
The arguments are organized logically and progressively and are properly connected.					
The argument is organized hierarchically.					

Please add any additional comments to the above point for the author(s) or editors:

Discussion or conclusion. Please provide your assessment of the following statements, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree”:

	1	2	3	4	5
The discussion or conclusions are drawn rigorously from the results without adding new elements that are not clearly supported by the results of the study.					
The discussion or conclusions answer the research question and its objectives.					
The importance or significance of the main contributions has been analyzed in an in-depth manner.					
The author’s argumentation in this section is original and suggestive.					

Please add any additional comments to the above point for the author(s) or editors:

Bibliographic references. Please provide your assessment of the following statements, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree”:

	1	2	3	4	5
The references are relevant.					
The references are sufficient.					
Most of them are current (from the last 3 years and the current year).					
They're all necessary.					
The references also include authors who are considered classics in the field.					

Please add any additional comments to the above point for the author(s) or editors:

C. Argumentation

Precision and conceptual clarity. Please provide your assessment of the following statements, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree”:

	1	2	3	4	5
The article is precise, concrete and uses economy of language.					
The concepts used are relevant for the arguments presented.					
When the concepts are defined, these definitions are precise.					

Please add any additional comments to the above point for the author(s) or editors:

Textual cohesion. Please provide your assessment of the following statements, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree”:

	1	2	3	4	5
The text is grammatically accurate and its syntax is cohesive.					
It's written in clear language.					
It needs further style correction / proofreading.					

Recommendations. We would be grateful if you could provide us with your general suggestions. If you wish, you can make other specific annotations directly in the article file using the Comments tool in the MS Word software.



Final concept. Please mark your decision with an x in only one of the following options:

	The article is publishable as is (or with minor editorial corrections).
	The article can be published with minor modifications without the need for a new evaluation.
	The article is publishable but requires substantial modifications and a new evaluation.
	The article is not publishable in the Journal.