



EVALUATION FORM (ARTICLE)

TITLE OF THE MANUSCRIPT:	Received by the peer reviewer:
	Evaluation date (sent to the journal):

I. FORMAL ASPECTS:			
Please mark with an X where appropriate.	Non-compliance (0 points)	Partial compliance (1 point)	Full compliance (2 points)
a. The title and the abstract are clear and consistent with the content of the manuscript.			
b. The structure of the manuscript is consistent with the argumentation developed by the manuscript.			
c. Appropriate use of language.			
FORMAL COMMENTS: If the rating of any formal aspect is non-compliance or partial compliance, please explain the reasons for that assessment. You may add other formal comments for editorial consideration.			

II. METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS			
Please mark with an X where appropriate.	Non-compliance (0 points)	Partial compliance (1 point)	Full compliance (2 points)
a. It makes a clear presentation of the manuscript's hypothesis and objectives.			
b. It has an adequate methodology: it is coherent, consistent, has a good reasoning and argumentation, good research quality.			
c. Makes contributions that are worth publishing.			
METHODOLOGICAL COMMENTS: If the rating of any methodological aspect is non-compliance or partial compliance, please explain the reasons for			

that assessment. You may add other formal comments for editorial consideration.

III. SUBSTANTIVE ASPECTS:

Please mark with an X where appropriate.	NO (0 points)	YES (1 point)
a. The manuscript develops a legal matter.		
b. Deals with an important or relevant topic.		
c. The manuscript is creative or innovative (as opposed to a mere abstract or synthesis of the relevant scholarship).		
d. It is a scientific and specialized manuscript (as opposed to a mere personal opinion or scientific dissemination).		
e. Makes an appropriate use of the terminology and language that the theme requires.		
f. Considering the work's extension, it addresses properly the relevant aspects of the subject matter.		
g. It makes an appropriate use of sources and bibliography.		

SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS:

If the rating of any substantive aspect is negative, please explain the reasons for your assessment. You may add other substantive comments for editorial consideration.

IV. GENERAL ASSESSMENT:

Please evaluate according to the points you gave the manuscript in the foregoing sections (add the points obtained in sections I, II and III).	SCORE: 1-5: Very bad 6-9: Bad 10-13: Regular 14-16: Good 17-19: Excellent
---	--

General assessment of the manuscript (in points):	
GENERAL COMMENTS: Please provide an explanation of your general assessment of the manuscript. You may add general comments that were not required elsewhere in this evaluation form.	

V. CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTARIES FOR THE EDITORIAL TEAM:			
The commentaries that you have added in the foregoing sections will be communicated to the author of the manuscript. In this section you may add commentaries that you do not wish to be forwarded to the author. In addition, you may recommend the editorial team whether to publish the manuscript or not.			
	Publishable with minor corrections	Publishable with major corrections	Not publishable
In case you wish to say it, you consider that this manuscript is... (mark with an X)			

VI. EXPLANATIONS FOR THE PEER EVALUATORS:
The Journal uses a double-blind peer review system, which means that your name will not be disclosed to the author of the manuscript.
You agree neither to forward the manuscript nor to copy it wholly or partly. You will not use the ideas of the manuscript either. In addition, you must inform the editorial team of the Journal if you have any conflict of interest in the evaluation. In case you are aware of the name of the author of the manuscript (e.g., because you attended a congress or seminar where the author presented about the theme of this manuscript), you must communicate this to the Journal, so that it can find a new peer reviewer.
In case the manuscript is not accepted by the <i>Revista Chilena de Derecho</i> , your peer review may be sent—safeguarding anonymity—to another journal that may be interested in publishing the manuscript (cascading peer review).
Your name, written in the following text box, is understood to be your signature.

Reviewer's name	
------------------------	--

Please send this form to revchider@gmail.com