

## Review form for research studies

**Note.** This document is for reference purposes only. In no case should it be completed by reviewers. The review form can only be completed online, once the reviewer is registered on the platform as an evaluator and has been assigned an article for evaluation.

Please rate the article in all the sections that appear in this protocol, making the comments and suggestions that you deem appropriate in each one of them. Kindly **submit your report no later than 30 days from the date of the review request** (if this is not possible, please inform the journal in order to avoid delays).

### GENERAL ISSUES

1. Is this a research study or a bibliographical review? \*

Research Studies

Bibliographical Review

2. Is the subject of the article relevant to the journal? \*

Yes

No

3. Are there significant contributions to knowledge in technology, science and education? \*

Yes

No

4. Briefly state the main contributions: \*

5. Is the article the product of a funded project?

Yes

No

Not stated

6. Is the inclusion of a gender perspective relevant to the topic under review?

Yes

No



7. If relevant, briefly explain the reasons for doing so.

8. Has the author declared the use of artificial intelligence in the manuscript?

Yes

No

Partially

9. If the use of artificial intelligence has been declared, is its use justified and does it not compromise the authorship or the scientific integrity of the work?

Yes

No

Partially

10. If there is a suspicion of undeclared use of artificial intelligence, do you consider an additional review of the work necessary?

Yes

No

Partially

If any of the above answers is negative, please state the reason here (if applicable):

\* Questions marked with an asterisk are mandatory.



## SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT

Please rate taking the following into consideration

0 = Not presented	1 = Very bad	2 = Bad	3 = Average	4 = Good	5 = Very good
-------------------	--------------	---------	-------------	----------	---------------

As a potential reference, to be accepted with or without modifications, the article should attain a score of at least 42 points in the following sections.

## About the content

## 1. Article presentation data: title, abstract, keywords. \*

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

## 2. Scientific basis for the article. Review of the literature. Relevance of references. Current status of the review performed. \*

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

## 3. Research design. Scientific and methodological rigor. \*

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**4. Data collection techniques and tools. Scientific and methodological rigor of the article. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**5. Opportunities, relevance, timeliness and interest of the topic addressed for the research and academic community in the field of technology and/or education. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**6. Originality and novelty of the content. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**7. Internal organization and coherence. Clarity of presentation. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**8. Data interpretation and analysis. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**9. Research results. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**10. Relevance and quality of the discussion and conclusions. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**11. Overall assessment of the quality of the article. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5



**You recommend that the manuscript (check all that apply):\***

Be published as is.

Be published after minor corrections and improvements have been made as indicated.

Be published after making the corrections and substantial improvements indicated.

The publication should be rejected.

**List of suggested corrections and improvements. Rating for the authors:\***

**Confidential comments to the editor:**

DOCUMENT FOR REFERENCE ONLY

## Review form for academic projects or contributions

**Note.** This document is for reference purposes only. In no case should it be completed by reviewers. The review form can only be completed online, once the reviewer is registered on the platform as an evaluator and has been assigned an article for evaluation.

Please rate the article in all the sections that appear in this protocol, making the comments and suggestions that you deem appropriate in each one of them. Kindly **submit your report no later than 30 days from the date of the review request** (if this is not possible, please inform the journal in order to avoid delays).

### GENERAL ISSUES

1. Is this a project or an academic contribution? \*

Project

Academic contribution

2. Is the subject of the article relevant to the journal? \*

Yes

No

3. Are there significant contributions to knowledge in technology, science and education? \*

Yes

No

4. Briefly state the main contributions: \*

5. Is the article the product of a funded project?

Yes

No

Not stated

6. Is the inclusion of a gender perspective relevant to the topic under review?

Yes

No



7. If relevant, briefly explain the reasons for doing so.

8. Has the author declared the use of artificial intelligence in the manuscript?

Yes

No

Partially

9. If the use of artificial intelligence has been declared, is its use justified and does it not compromise the authorship or the scientific integrity of the work?

Yes

No

Partially

10. If there is a suspicion of undeclared use of artificial intelligence, do you consider an additional review of the work necessary?

Yes

No

Partially

If any of the above answers is negative, please state the reason here (if applicable):

\* Questions marked with an asterisk are mandatory.





## SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT

Please rate taking the following into consideration

0 = Not presented	1 = Very bad	2 = Bad	3 = Average	4 = Good	5 = Very good
-------------------	--------------	---------	-------------	----------	---------------

As a potential reference, to be accepted with or without modifications, the article should attain a score of at least 30 points in the following sections.

### About the content

#### 1. Article presentation data: title, abstract, keywords. \*

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

#### 2. Opportunities, relevance, timeliness and interest of the topic addressed for the research or academic community in the field of technology and/or education. \*

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

#### 3. Originality and timeliness of the contribution presented. \*

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**4. Internal organization and coherence. Clarity of presentation. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**5. Substantiation of the article: review of the literature and/or background information. Adequacy of the references used. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**6. Clarity and precision in the communication of the project or the academic contribution presented. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**7. Clarity and relevance of the conclusions. \***

Not presented

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**8. Overall assessment. \***

Not presented

1

2

3

4

5

**You recommend that the manuscript (check all that apply): \***

Be published as is.

Be published after minor corrections and improvements have been made as indicated.

Be published after making the corrections and substantial improvements indicated.

The publication should be rejected.

**List of suggested corrections and improvements. Rating for the authors: \***

Confidential comments to the editor: