

Pangeas

Review form (v.2024.02.en)

Thank you for acting as a reviewer for *Pangeas. Revista Interdisciplinar de Ecocrítica*.

Please complete this form. Bear in mind that, while your manuscript evaluation report will be shared with the authors, your identity will not be disclosed.

1 Overall quality assessment

1.1 In your opinion, the overall quality is: *

- Excellent
- Good
- Acceptable
- Poor

Justification: *

[Extended text box]

1.2 Does the work make a contribution in its field? (Is it original in the concepts, the results it presents or the interpretation of them? Does it present an adequate proposal, etc? *

- Excellent
- Good
- Acceptable
- Poor

Justification: *

[Extended text box]

2 Structure and style

2.1 Does the manuscript have a suitable title (clear, short and informative)? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

2.2 Is the abstract clear and accurate? Does it include the objectives, methodology, main results and most relevant conclusions from the study? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

2.3 Did the author provide a sufficient number of keywords? Is the selection of keywords useful when searching for the article on databases? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

2.4 Is the text clear, consistent and properly structured? Is it supported by graphics and tables when necessary? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

2.5 Is the style appropriate (clear, concise, a logical sequence is followed)? Is it correctly written?*

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

2.6 Is the manuscript correct in terms of grammar, spelling and textual aspects? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

3 Foundations, methodology, results and discussion

3.1 Are the objectives or hypotheses clear and consistent? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

3.2 Is the theoretical framework well suited to the analysis conducted? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

3.3 Is the methodology employed rigorous and appropriate to achieve the proposed objectives? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

3.4 Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the data supplied? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

3.5 Are the conclusions relevant and related to the aims of the manuscript? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

3.6 Did the author provide a sufficient number of bibliographic references? Are they appropriate and up-to-date? Does the author comply with citation rules consistently throughout the work? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

3.7 Are the sources, citations, quotations, tables, illustrations or figures provided relevant? *

- Yes
- No

Suggested improvements or changes:

[Extended text box]

4 Comments and suggestions to authors

Any other comments or suggestions to authors about their manuscript can be provided here. If you prefer, you can make your comments and suggestions in a separate text file and attach it after completing the form.

[Extended text box]

5 Comments to the Editorial Board

Any other comments to the Editorial Board about the manuscript (especially, whether or not it should be accepted) can be provided here. This information will not be available to the authors.

[Extended text box]