

Form for External Reviewers

This form is divided into two blocks: the first deals with the **formal and structural aspects of the text**, and the second with **the content and scientific rigour**. At the end of the form there is a question that only allows us to select a recommendation from the reviewer, which may be:

- **Accepted:** the text can be published without objections.
- **Accepted with minor corrections:** the text can be published once minor stylistic, grammatical, bibliographical deficiencies, etc., have been corrected.
- **Accepted with major corrections:** the text requires an in-depth revision by the author on aspects related to the approach, methodological rigour, scientific language, manuscript structure, current topics, relevance of sources, etc.
- **Rejected:** the manuscript does not meet the minimum requirements of scientific quality.

The reviewer is advised that the author will be informed of the content of this report. Therefore, along with the use of rigour and the demand for scientific quality, reviewers are requested to make their comments with respect and courtesy.

1. Formal and structural aspect

General comments and assessment *:

1.1. The subject matter is appropriate to the scope of the journal, and the section for which it is proposed*.

- Yes
- It is suitable for the journal, but it is recommended that it be evaluated in another section (See comments section).
- Not in line with the contents and subject matter of the journal (See observations)



ISSN: 1696-019X – e-ISSN 2386-3978 - Depósito Legal: M-5852-2003 - DOI: 10.31921/doxacom

section)

1.2. The manuscript meets the formal requirements of the publication: expressive character, wording, publication standards... *

- Yes
- Yes, although it has some minor problems that would be advisable to improve for the publication of the article (See comments section).
- It has some shortcomings that need to be addressed for its acceptance (See comments section).
- It has important deficiencies in this section (See comments section).

1.3. The organisation and presentation of the contents, as well as the structure of the manuscript, is correct*.

- Yes
- Yes, although it has some small problems that would be necessary to improve for the publication of the article (See comments section).
- It has some deficiencies that need to be addressed for its acceptance (See comments section).
- It presents significant shortcomings in this section (See comments section).

1.4. References and documentary sources comply with APA 7th edition format*.

- Yes, in all cases.
- No, they must be checked.

2. Content assessment*

2.1. Originality of the article*

- Very good
- Good



ISSN: 1696-019X – e-ISSN 2386-3978 - Depósito Legal: M-5852-2003 - DOI: 10.31921/doxacom

- Sufficient
- Poor (see comments)

2.2. Relevance of the issue*

- Very high
- Very high
- High
- Sufficient
- Low
- Very low

2.3. Objectives*

- Very good
- Good
- Sufficient
- Deficient (See comments)

2.4. Methodology*

- Very good
- Good
- Sufficient
- Poor (See remarks)
- The evaluation in this section is not relevant

2.5. References and documentary sources: quality, timeliness, appropriateness...*

- Very good
- Good

Universidad CEU San Pablo | Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Comunicación.

P.º de Juan XXIII, 3. 28040- MADRID

www.doxacomunicacion.com

doxa.fhm@ceu.es

@doxacom

Tfno: (+0034) 914564200



ISSN: 1696-019X – e-ISSN 2386-3978 - Depósito Legal: M-5852-2003 - DOI: 10.31921/doxacom

- Sufficient
- Deficient (See remarks)

2.6. Conclusions*

- Very good
- Good

- Sufficient
- Poor (see comments)

3. Final proposal on the publication of the article*.

3.1. Comments and justification for the report*.

Recommendation:

Please specify your proposal*

- Accepted
- Minor corrections required
- Majors corrections required
- Rejected

* Indicates required field

ISSN: 1696-019X / e-ISSN 2386-3978 / DOI: [10.31921/doxacom](https://doi.org/10.31921/doxacom)