



UNIVERSIDAD DE  
COSTA RICA



## Evaluation guide for articles and investigations

**Dear Evaluators,**

Below you will find the guidelines for evaluation based on three aspects: format, content, and the final ruling.

Data of the manuscript

Name of evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of article:

---

---

---

Date received: \_\_\_\_\_

Date returned: \_\_\_\_\_

A. Format

Criteria	Excelent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Not enough
1. The title is clear and concise.					
2. The summary contains a maximum of 100 words (max.15 líneas), without parragraphs.					
3. The summary is clear and true to the article.					
4. The purpose of the job and its conclusions are evident in the summary.					
5. The summary is presented in a first language (spanish or the authors main language)					
6. The summary is presented in a second language such as english.					
7. The key words are shown in a first language below the summary.					
8. The key words are shown in a second language below the summary.					
9. The manuscript averages a length between 12 to 25 pages.					
10. The manuscript follows citation norms from APA or Chicago					

## B. Content

Criteria	Excelent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Not Enough
1. The introduction briefly mentions the objective of the paper.					
2. The introduction explains globally the contents of the paper.					
3. The article is divided into several sections, not too long, that give it order and coherence.					
4. The document is coherently written.					
5. The article has plenty bibliography.					
6. The article has up to date bibliography (if possible).					
7. The paper engages in new knowledge or goes in depth into existing topics.					
8. The published paper is product of and investigation, teaching experience or tackles an avant- garde theme.					
9. The manuscript presentes depth and scientific nature.					
10. The article has a coherent relation between its title and the content and conclusions.					
11. The tackled topic is relevant to Humanities.					
12. The paper shows originality in its proposal.					

C. Final ruling

As a reviser I consider that:	Yes	No	Observations
1. The document is publishable			
2. The document is publishable only if the corrections pointed out are made.			
3. The document is not publishable.			

**D. Global appreciation of the paper as an academic contribution.**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---