

PROTOCOL OF MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION FOR REVIEWERS

The review is one of the most important activities in the evaluation of manuscripts, this format is intended to be of assistance to the reviewers in the arbitration process of the manuscripts sent to INGENIUS Journal.

Written comments are commonly the most helpful part of the review. Please, contribute with your comments in the fields designated for the effect. The rating section is intended to help identify points for written comments, and also allow comparisons between different reviewers. A good article should have a high rating, but is not necessarily perfect in all aspects. For example, a concise and critical review article (state of the art) is a valuable publication, although it may contain small intrinsic originality; An article presenting important new concepts could be valuable, even with limited experimental work.

If you have any doubts about the review process, please contact the INGENIUS Journal at: revistaingenius@ups.edu.ec

Thank you for your kindness in contributing as a reviewer.

Reviewer data

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Email address: _____
Telephone: _____
Address: _____

Manuscript data

Submission date:		Return date:		Code:	
Title of the article:					

Type of document:

Evaluation elements

Relevance and originality in the topic	5 4 3 2 1 0	Reformulation of existing knowledge	
Clear, concise and effective presentation	5 4 3 2 1 0	Sloppy, obscure.	
Organized, well written and argued	5 4 3 2 1 0	Unorganized, weak grammar, poor argumentation	
Technically and mathematically precise	5 4 3 2 1 0	Not logical, contains significant errors	
Methodologically well structured and clear	5 4 3 2 1 0	Limited methodology, lacking experience	
Effective illustrations and charts	5 4 3 2 1 0	Poor figures, figures and charts without discussion	
Interesting for readers, it stimulates new ideas	5 4 3 2 1 0	Without interest; topic is almost a cliché	
Good argumentation in research results	5 4 3 2 1 0	Without results, no contribution	
Valid for engineering practice	5 4 3 2 1 0	Non-practical or very commercial	
Useful references, considering previous work	5 4 3 2 1 0	Vague references or only of work of the authors.	
Score			

Recommendation

The INGENIUS Journal, Stipulates the following criteria of the obtained score for the recommendation:

From 00 to 29 No publishable

From 30 to 50 Publishable.

Publishable with suggested changes.

Publishable with mandatory changes.

Publishable. The manuscript can be published without changes.

Publishable with suggested changes. The manuscript may be published, incorporating suggested changes, by the reviewer.

Publishable with mandatory changes. The manuscript cannot be published in its current form, must obligatorily make the changes indicated by the reviewer.

Non Publishable. The manuscript cannot be published.

Recommendation:

Comments and suggestions

Title of the article: _____

Review date: _____ **Code:** _____ **Obtained Score:** _____

Reviewer comments (Use additional pages if necessary)

1. REDACTED OPINION (What is the contribution of this work, has added value?)

Comments to the author(s) to improve the article / explain mandatory changes required / justify the rejection: