This review aims to specify the academic and scientific contribution of the article, as well as its impact on the conservation, transmission, expansion and renewal of current knowledge in the area. It is important to note that it is mandatory for the reviewer to argue his/her answers in each of the criteria reviewed according to the typology of the article. The journal team appreciates your concept and asks you to pay special attention to the academic and scientific quality of the work and its relevance to the community for which it is intended.

|  |
| --- |
| **About the RHS:**Its purpose is to contribute to the dissemination of research, reviews, analysis and theoretical developments related to humanistic, social and educational problems. The magazine issues unpublished articles in Spanish and English that contribute to relevant national and international discussions on human and social development. |
| **Reviewer Information:** * Full names and surnames:
* Identification document:
* Academic titles:
* Email address:
* Phone number:
* Address:
* Institution where the reviewer works:
* Start date (the date the relationship between the researcher and organization began (can be specified down to year, month, and day):
 |
| **Full Title of the Reviewed Article:****Typology of the Article:** Elija un elemento. |
| Date the article was received by the reviewer: Haga clic aquí o pulse para escribir una fecha.Date the article was submitted by the reviewer to the Editorial Committee: Haga clic aquí o pulse para escribir una fecha. |
| **Confidentiality Agreement**Due to the nature of the work, it is necessary for the parties to handle confidential information or information subject to intellectual property rights, before, during and in the subsequent stage of the review. |
| **Conflict of Interest Declaration** The reviewer declares that he/she has no potential conflict of interest related to the article. | **Does the reviewer have a conflict of interest related to the article?**Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
| 1. **Do you consider that the article corresponds to the typology declared by the author?**

Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Please provide reasons for your answer if necessary: |
| 1. **In the introduction of the article, is the problem to be addressed clearly and sufficiently defined? Does the introduction briefly refer to other research or work carried out in the field of the topic addressed?**

Yes [ ]  No [ ] Justify your answer: |
| 1. **Is the methodology used in the construction of the work specified and adequate? (applies only to research articles)**

Yes [ ]  No [ ] Justify your answer: |
| 1. **Are the results and the discussion developed in an adequate, coherent and reflective manner?**

Yes [ ]  No [ ] Justify your answer: |
| 1. **Do the conclusions that emerge directly from the development of the work, attend and are related to the purpose of the article?**

Yes [ ]  No [ ] Justify your answer: |
| 1. **Do you consider the writing style, clarity and grammar of the text, etc., suitable for publication in the RHS?**

Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Justify your answer: |
| 1. **Is the bibliography used adequate, up-to-date, and structured in accordance with APA standards?**

Yes [ ]  No [ ] Justify your answer: |
| 1. **Do you consider that the article ostensibly contributes to the conservation, transmission, expansion or renewal of current knowledge on the subject?**

Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Justify your answer: |
| 1. **Is there any aspect of the work that you consider may be in conflict with regard to intellectual property? (for example: citation of texts, figures, photographs, etc.)**

Yes [x]  No [ ] If your answer is **Yes**, please comment: |
| 1. **Final concept** (use the space provided to supply any desired additional information and in case you recommend the author to make a revision, make the pertinent comments that can help him/her in the process).
 |
| 1. **Do you recommend that the article be approved for publication? (choose only one option)**

[ ]  Yes, as it is.[ ]  Yes, with major modifications.[ ]  Yes, with minor modifications.[ ]  No. |
| **SIGNATURE:** |
| **Reviewer:** We ask you to make corrections, objections and additional comments on the text in the manuscript.**The Editorial and Scientific Committee values and greatly appreciates your review as well as your collaboration with the journal. We look forward to having your concept again.** |