

Review Guidelines

All submitted articles must be rigorous, technically precise, and should put forward a progressive perspective in relation to the state of art. They should also elucidate and circumscribe the significance of the subject matter, as well as the conceptual and methodological orientations; the research enquiry; the revision of the correlative and most relevant publications on the subject; and the presentation of all results and conclusions. The manuscripts must be essentially problematical; that is, they should draw research vectors that open up new theoretical paths while suggesting methods to deal with intrinsic interrogations. They must also add new perspectives to current writings.

In order to be published, the articles must focus on issues that can resonate with an international audience, which is why they should promote and be engaged in wide-ranging issues and debates that can be inscribed within a non-local agenda.

Sisyphus Form for Peer Review

Fill in the following form taking into account that 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest. We would appreciate if you are clear in your recommendations, so we may send them to the article authors.

Once the form is completed, you must state your recommendation by selecting a "Recommendation". At the end, please don't forget to "Submit Review".

* * * *

Does the article contain original and relevant information that justifies its publication?

1 (lowest)

2

3

4

5 (highest)

Is the writing style appropriate?

1 (lowest)

2

3

4

5 (highest)

Does the abstract clearly and accurately describe the article content?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)

Is the theoretical approach relevant (main authors, high impact journals, authors, classical research on the subject)?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)

Is the theoretical approach updated (50% of references from the last 5 years)?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)

Is the theoretical approach internationally sanctioned (at least 50% of references indexed in SCOPUS and/or WoS)?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)

Is there an explicit formulation of the study purpose, objectives and/or hypotheses?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)
- Not applicable

Is the methodological design included and explained?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)
- Not applicable

Is the methodological design coherent with the research objectives and/or hypotheses?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)
- Not applicable

Is the participant selection or sampling adequately described?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)
- Not applicable

Are the instruments, as well as their characteristics of reliability and validity, adequately described?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)
- Not applicable

Is the data analysis adequate and sufficient to meet the article objectives?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)
- Not applicable

Do the conclusions and implications of the article bear useful contributions to the subject matter of the article?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)

Are the article conclusions and interpretations adequate and justified by the results?

- 1 (lowest)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (highest)
- Not applicable

Are the article conclusions discussed with other research results?

1 (lowest)

2

3

4

5 (highest)

Not applicable

Are citations in the text included in the references and vice versa?

1 (lowest)

2

3

4

5 (highest)

In your opinion, with what priority should this article be published?

1 (lowest)

2

3

4

5 (highest)

Commentaries

If the article is to be improved, **please specify the changes to be made**

Other observations
