

PEER REVIEW FORM				
MANUSCRIPT TITLE:				
SUBJECT AREA:				
SECTION:	☐ Scientific article ☐ Discussion article			
INSTRUCTIONS				
This form is intended to support the academic evaluation of the manuscript during the peer review stage. The reviewer must provide an objective, independent, clear, and well-founded evaluation. The recommendation is an input to the editorial decision; the final decision rests with the LAJED Editorial Team. Mark: Y = Yes N = No				
QUESTIONNAIRE				
No.	Evaluation criterion	Yes	No	
1	Does the title adequately reflect the content of the manuscript?	☐	☐	
2	Does the abstract clearly present the objective, content, and main results or arguments of the work?	☐	☐	
3	Is the manuscript structure clear, coherent, and appropriate for the section to which it was submitted?	☐	☐	
4	Is the writing clear and suitable for an academic publication?	☐	☐	
5	Is the manuscript length appropriate in relation to its objectives and content?	☐	☐	
6	Are the bibliographic references relevant and sufficient to support the work?	☐	☐	
7	Is the literature used appropriate and sufficiently up to date, considering the nature of the topic?	☐	☐	
8	Does the manuscript present an original contribution or a relevant contribution consistent with the section to which it was submitted?	☐	☐	
9	Where applicable, is the methodology used appropriate to answer the research question or objective?	☐	☐	
10	Where applicable, are the data, evidence, or materials used appropriate to support the results and conclusions?	☐	☐	
11	Are the conclusions or final arguments supported by the analysis developed in the manuscript?	☐	☐	
GENERAL ASSESSMENT				
Criterion		Good	Fair	Poor
Academic quality of the manuscript		☐	☐	☐
Originality and academic contribution		☐	☐	☐
Pertinence and relevance to LAJED		☐	☐	☐
RECOMMENDATION				
The reviewer's recommendation constitutes an input to the editorial decision and does not replace the final decision of the Editorial Team.				
RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDATION <i>Main strengths, weaknesses, and reasons supporting the recommendation.</i>				
COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE AUTHORS				
CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS FOR THE EDITORIAL TEAM <i>Will not be sent to the author.</i>				

INTEGRITY, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AND CONFIDENTIALITY

- ☐ I have no conflicts of interest that could affect my objectivity and independence in evaluating the manuscript.
- ☐ I have maintained the confidentiality of the manuscript and all information received during the peer review process.

Use of artificial intelligence in preparing the review report

Check the applicable option:

- ☐ I did not use generative or assistive artificial intelligence tools in preparing this review report.
- ☐ I used AI-assisted tools exclusively for permitted auxiliary tasks, without delegating the scientific evaluation or critical judgment of the manuscript to them.

If yes:

- ☐ Tool used: _____
- ☐ Purpose of use: _____
- ☐ Brief description of use: _____

I declare that I did not enter into such tools the manuscript, any part of it, confidential data, information identifying the authors, or any other protected content derived from the review process.

REVIEWER INFORMATION FOR EXCLUSIVE USE OF THE EDITORIAL TEAM

FULL NAME:	
INSTITUTION / UNIT:	
DISCIPLINE:	
SUBDISCIPLINE:	
SPECIALTY / AREAS OF INTEREST:	
ACADEMIC DEGREE:	
DATE:	