

Article evaluation form Boletín de Coyuntura

General information:

Names and surnames of the evaluator: Identity Document N.º:

Title of the article received	*				
(English and Spanish):	*				
Date of receipt:	Date o	f return:			
	esented to guide you in evaluating aly one of the options given for each		e. Please an	swer all t	he criteria
1. Relevance of the article			Yes	No	
Is the research topic of scientific-academic relevance?					
s the article a new and origi	nal contribution to the topic being	worked or	1?		
	ent and justified with the data or wi	th the thes	sis(es)		
presented in the article? Comments:					
Comments:	angte of the outigle	Alat	Enough	Little	Nothin ~
Comments: 2. Criteria on formal asp		A lot	Enough	Little	Nothing
Comments:		A lot	Enough	Little	Nothing
2. Criteria on formal aspons the title allow identific	ation of the subject? he structure of the article,	A lot	Enough	Little	Nothing
Comments: 2. Criteria on formal aspons the title allow identific Does the abstract evidence the including the problem and p	ation of the subject? he structure of the article,	A lot	Enough	Little	Nothing
2. Criteria on formal aspons the title allow identification to be abstract evidence to including the problem and problem to the keywords identify the	he structure of the article, articipants? e area of knowledge of the article? by the author to argue in his	A lot	Enough	Little	Nothing
2. Criteria on formal asponses the title allow identifice. Does the abstract evidence to including the problem and poor the keywords identify the state onceptual basis used article serious, topical and a	he structure of the article, articipants? e area of knowledge of the article? by the author to argue in his uthoritative in his area of	A lot	Enough	Little	Nothing



Universidad Técnica de Ambato Observatorio Económico y Social de Tungurahua Av. Los Chasquis, Campus Universitario Huachi Teléfono: 593 (03) 2848487 Ext: 102

3. Criteria on the content or substance of the article		A lot	Enough	Little	Noth	ing
Is the research problem clearly defined and delimited?						
Is there sufficient clarity and synthesis capacity in expressed in the conclusions?						
Do the conclusions presented provide new theoretical or practical knowledge on the subject matter worked on?						
Are the results adequately presented for easy understanding						
by readers? Comments:						
4. Quantitative valuation	5	4		3	2	1
Mark with an (X) the number that best	3			<u> </u>		_
represents the quantitative evaluation for this						
article: 5 = very good; 4 = good; 3 = regular; 2 =						
bad; 1 = very bad.						
5. Qualitative valuation						
Mark with an (X) the most appropriate recommendation as to the publication merit of this article:	Approve the article	Approvarticle the contact that complied the required correct c	, with dition the nor es with uested	Reject the article		

After the evaluation of the article, please sign the form (physical or electronic signature) and send it through the OJS platform of the journal, available at the link.

Note: in addition to the article evaluation form, evaluators must send their evaluation report in Word, PDF, or as a text message in the OJS platform, and they can also make comments in the article itself.

Signature of the evaluator