

Paper number	
Paper title	

Reviewer: _____

1. The form below aims to provide a general structure to evaluate the articles. Any additional comments can be provided in the Additional Comments box at the end of this form.
2. If any sections are not relevant to your review, please indicate other comments and observations in the last column of the table.

Instructions for the reviewer:

For each criterion, please write in the Comments' box your evaluation (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) and provide comments for each criterion.

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Result & Comments
Editorial team section					
Title	<u>Excellent</u> connections with the purposes of the journal and with the article content	<u>Good</u> connections with the purposes of the journal and with the article content	<u>Fair</u> connections with the purposes of the journal and with the article content	<u>Poor</u> connections with the purposes of the journal and with the article content	
Abstract	<u>Excellent</u> description of the paper (theoretical clarifications, main findings, and conclusions)	<u>Good</u> description of the paper (theoretical clarifications, main findings, and conclusions)	<u>Fair</u> description of the paper (theoretical clarifications, main findings, and conclusions)	<u>Poor</u> description of the paper (theoretical clarifications, main findings, and conclusions)	
Keywords	<u>Excellent</u> relevance and connections with the article content	<u>Good</u> relevance and connections with the article content	<u>Fair</u> relevance and connections with the article content	<u>Poor</u> relevance and connections with the article content	
Importance of the topic	<u>Great importance</u> to advancing educational thought and practices	<u>Somewhat important</u> to advancing educational thought and practices	<u>Marginally important</u> to advancing educational thought and practices	<u>Not likely</u> to advancing educational thought and practices	

Organization and structure	<u>Excellent</u> organization of the sections	<u>Good</u> organization of the sections	<u>Fair</u> organization of the sections	<u>Poor</u> organization of the sections	
Reviewer section					
Relevance of the literature. Theoretical foundation	Provides an <u>excellent analysis and synthesis</u> of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a <u>good analysis and synthesis</u> of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a <u>fair analysis and synthesis</u> of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a <u>poor analysis and synthesis</u> of the major points in the relevant literature	
Statement of the problem	<u>Excellent</u> statement of the theoretical or practical problem	<u>Good</u> statement of the theoretical or practical problem	<u>Fair</u> statement of the theoretical or practical problem	<u>Poor</u> statement of the theoretical or practical problem	
Contribution to the literature	Provides <u>significant</u> original contributions to the literature	Provides <u>important</u> original contributions to the literature	Provides <u>marginal</u> original contributions to the literature	<u>Does not provide</u> original contributions to the literature	
Clarity of the research (according to the template of the journal)	<u>Excellent</u> clarity	<u>Good</u> clarity	<u>Fair</u> clarity	<u>Poor</u> clarity	
Methodology	Research methodology is <u>excellent</u>	Research methodology is <u>good</u>	Research methodology is <u>fair</u>	Research methodology is <u>poor</u>	

Results	a) The results are <u>excellent</u> explained, in relation with the research objectives and questions. b) The results are described in an <u>excellent</u> connection with the hypothesis and establish its' validation/ invalidation.	a) The results are <u>good</u> explained, in relation with the research objectives and questions. b) The results are described in a <u>good</u> connection with the hypothesis and establish its' validation/ invalidation.	a) The results are <u>fair</u> explained, in relation with the research objectives and questions. b) The results are described in a <u>fair</u> connection with the hypothesis and establish its' validation/ invalidation.	a) The results are <u>poor</u> explained, in correlation with the research objectives and questions. b) The results are described in a <u>poor</u> connection with the hypothesis and establish its' validation/ invalidation.	
Discussions	The discussions are organized <u>excellently</u> and provide strong arguments of the specialized literature.	The discussions are <u>well-</u> organized and provide strong arguments, but the references to the specialized literature are not enough (others could be added).	The discussions are organized fairly and are based only on few references.	The discussions are organized poorly and are not based on specialized literature.	
Conclusions	<u>Excellent</u> conclusions with justification based on evidence presented.	<u>Good</u> conclusions with justification based on evidence presented, but it could be made clearer.	<u>Fair</u> conclusions, without sufficient justification based on evidence presented.	<u>Poor</u> or inadequate conclusion.	
Academic Writing	No errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and language	<u>Some</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and language	<u>Many</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and language	<u>Major</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and language	
Citations in text (According with the APA 7 Style)	All correct	The most correct	Many correct	Many incorrect	

References (According with the APA 7 Style)	All correct	The most correct	Many correct	Many incorrect	
<u>Ethical rules</u>	Fully respected	Mostly respected	Partially respected	Not respected	
Coherence	<u>Excellent</u> coherence of ideas between sections	<u>Good</u> coherence of ideas between sections	<u>Fair</u> coherence of ideas between sections	<u>Poor</u> coherence of ideas between sections	
Additional comments					

The review result:

Accepted

Accepted with the following corrections (in short):

The author has to:

1. ...
2. ...
3. ...
4. ...

Rejected

Signature:

Date