

External Reviewer's Guidelines
Mirabilia Journal

ISSN 1676-5818

Dear reviewer:

This form is intended to assist you in your evaluation of an article submitted for publication in *Mirabilia Journal*. To ensure that all articles are evaluated using the same criteria, we ask that all reviewers use this form when writing the evaluation. Note that section #5 at the end provides space to discuss aspects of the article that may not be specifically addressed in sections #1, 2, 3, or 4.

Mirabilia Journal follows a double-blind peer review process. As such, we hold both reviewer and author names in strict confidence. However, while names will not be released, it is important to keep in mind that this evaluation form may be sent to the author(s).

Please submit your completed peer review to subm@revistamirabilia.com

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Title:

Reviewer:

Date submission to evaluator

Date evaluator's report

1. RECOMMENDATION:

Accept	
Accept with Corrections	
Reject	

2. GLOBAL EVALUATION OF ARTICLE'S QUALITY:

Excellent	
Very Good	
Good	
Low	

3. ORIGINALITY AND RELEVANCE (regarding the scientific information provided by the article: - new and valuable, already-known results, irrelevant)

Excellent	
Very Good	
Good	
Low	

4. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ASPECTS:

4.1. Structure and Style

	YES	NO	IMPROVE OR CHANGE
Adequate title (clear, concise, informative)			
Adequate summary (clear, includes objectives, methodology, main results, most relevant conclusions)			
Adequate discursive structure			
Appropriate style (clear, concise, follows a logical sequence)			

4.2. Methodology, results, discussion

	YES	NO	IMPROVE OR CHANGE
The main topic, problem, is it clearly identified?			
Bibliography, does it incorporate, utilize, and list the most pertinent and up-to-date items?			
Are objectives clearly indicated?			

5. EVALUATIVE COMMENTARY

PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE ARTICLE. IF NECESSARY, YOU MAY CONTINUE WRITING ON ANOTHER PAGE.