**EVALUATION FORM FOR SUBMISSIONS**

This evaluation form contains three parts. You can fill it out and send it back via e-mail, as an attachment, to *Meta*’s Editorial Assistant: meta.um.ca@gmail.com. If deemed necessary, attach an annotated version of the article. We would appreciate it if you could submit your evaluation within eight weeks of receiving the article, that is, on the date specified in the email you received.

**Title of the article:**

**1. Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| \*If you experience problems with the checkboxes, use this box ☒ | **Weak** | **Average** | **Good** | **N/A** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| General Appreciation |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Relevance of the subject | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Originality in dealing with the subject | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Importance of the conclusions | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Theoretical scope | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Research Method |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Relevance of the methodology for the object of study | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Originality of the data treated | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Rigor in how the data was treated | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Argumentation / discussion |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of the interpretation of the data | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Logic and structure of the argumentation | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree of advanced ideas | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Links with the specialized literature on the subject | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Presentation |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall structure of the article | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity and concision of the style | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Language quality | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Respect for *Meta* Style Guide | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Respect for *Meta* Bibliographical Conventions | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity and design of Tables and Figures | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** | **☐** |

**2a. Detailed comments and suggestions for the author**

*Please provide a detailed qualitative assessment on both general and specific aspects of the article and, if necessary, address any specific aspect not covered by the table above. In particular, it would be appreciated if any negative assessment, or more or less negative assessment, was backed up with comments and possibly accompanied by suggestions. You can use all the space you may require.*

**2b. Comments in the article**

*Please let us know whether or not you have inserted comments or corrections in the submitted article.*

*If you did, please send us the annotated version with this evaluation form.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| I have included comments | **☐** |
| I have not included comments | **☐** |

**3. Recommendation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Publish without modification | **☐** |
| Publish with minor modifications | **☐** |
| Rework (Major modifications required) | **☐** |
| Reject | **☐** |

*Thank you for your collaboration*