MENTOR
Revista de Investigación Educativa y Deportiva

PEER REVIEW EVALUATION MATRIX

External double-blind peer review

Note for use: this matrix complements the evaluation carried out through the editorial platform. The reviewer may record comments in OJS, in this form, or directly in an annotated manuscript file. There is no need to duplicate comments. When comments have already been provided through the platform or in an attached file, this may be indicated in the corresponding fields.

A. MANUSCRIPT IDENTIFICATION

Manuscript Code		**Evaluation Date**	
Manuscript Title			
Type of Contribution	□ Original Research Article □ Review Article □ Theoretical Essay	**Language**	□ Spanish □ English

B. REVIEWER INFORMATION — FOR EDITORIAL TEAM USE ONLY

This section will not be shared with the authors and must not form part of the anonymous version of the evaluation.

Full Name		**Email Address**	
Institutional Affiliation		**Country**	
Academic Degree / Area of Expertise		**ORCID (optional)**	

C. REVIEWER'S PRIOR DECLARATION

Declaration	Confirmation
I declare that I have no actual, potential, or perceived competing interest that could compromise my independence in evaluating this manuscript.	□
I undertake to maintain the confidentiality of the manuscript and of any information obtained during the review process.	□
I confirm that I will not upload the manuscript, excerpts, data, or unpublished information to public generative artificial intelligence tools.	□

D. RELEVANCE TO THE JOURNAL'S FOCUS AND SCOPE

Does the manuscript clearly fall within one or more of MENTOR's areas: Education and Educational Sciences; Physical Activity, Exercise and Sport; and Health Sciences?

Yes	No
□	□

If the answer is "No", briefly explain the reason in the comments and submit the recommendation to the editor. It is not necessary to complete the detailed manuscript assessment.

E. RATING SCALE

Score	Meaning
0	Does not meet the criterion
1	Insufficient compliance
2	Partially meets the criterion / requires improvement
3	Satisfactorily meets the criterion
N/A	Not applicable

The score is advisory and does not automatically determine the editorial decision.

F. SCIENTIFIC AND EDITORIAL QUALITY CRITERIA

No.	Criterion	Description	Rating 0–3 / N/A	Comments (optional)
1	**Thematic Relevance**	The manuscript is consistent with MENTOR's declared focus and scope.		
2	**Originality and Relevance**	The manuscript presents an identifiable contribution to knowledge, professional practice, or scientific debate in the relevant field.		
3	**Title, Abstract, and Keywords**	They adequately represent the content and facilitate the identification and thematic retrieval of the work.		
4	**Introduction, Problem, and Objectives**	The problem, justification, and objectives are clearly formulated and supported by relevant literature.		
5	**Methodology / Approach**	The design, participants or sources, procedures, instruments, and analyses are appropriate and described with sufficient clarity. Mark N/A where this criterion does not apply to the type of contribution.		
6	**Results / Development**	The results or argumentative development are presented clearly, systematically, and consistently with the objectives and the method or approach adopted.		
7	**Discussion / Argumentation**	The manuscript critically interprets the findings or develops sound arguments supported by relevant scientific literature.		

8	**Conclusions**	The conclusions address the objectives or thesis of the work, derive from the analysis conducted, and do not introduce unsupported claims.		
9	**Tables, Figures, and Supplementary Materials**	They are relevant, legible, correctly cited, and do not unnecessarily duplicate information presented in the text. Mark N/A if not applicable.		
10	**References and Citations**	Citations and references correspond to each other; sources are relevant and sufficient; APA 7 is applied; and DOIs are included when available.		
11	**Ethics and Integrity**	Where applicable, the manuscript reports ethical approval, consent, confidentiality, funding, and competing interests. No concerns requiring additional editorial review are evident.		
12	**Clarity and Quality of Writing**	The manuscript demonstrates coherence, conceptual precision, logical organization, and a standard of writing appropriate for a scientific publication.		

G. INTEGRITY CONCERNS (IF APPLICABLE)

During the evaluation, did you identify any potential indications of unattributed similarity, redundant publication, citation manipulation, data inconsistencies, fabrication/falsification, or any other matter that should be reviewed by the editorial team?

No	Yes
☐	☐

If "Yes", describe the concern in confidential comments to the editor or through the editorial platform. The reviewer reports potential concerns; the determination of possible misconduct is the responsibility of the journal.

H. COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHORS

Optional if comments have already been entered in OJS or provided in an annotated manuscript file. In that case, write: "See comments in the platform" or "See attached file".

Scientific, methodological, and content-related comments:

MENTOR
Revista de Investigación Educativa y Deportiva

I. CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR

Optional. This section may be used to report matters that should not be communicated directly to the authors. If these comments are entered in OJS, there is no need to repeat them here.

Confidential comments:

J. RECOMMENDED DECISION

Recommendation	Select one
Accept without revisions	□
Accept with minor revisions	□
Major revisions required and further review	□
Reject	□

The reviewer's recommendation is advisory. The final editorial decision is made by the responsible editor, taking into account the review reports, the authors' response, and MENTOR's editorial policies.

K. COMPLETION OF THE REVIEW

Date Completed		**Evaluation Recorded in OJS**	□ Yes □ No
Annotated File Attached	□ Yes □ No	**Evaluation Matrix Attached**	□ Yes □ No

M