



## RESEARCH ARTICLE EVALUATION

|                                                         |                 |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|
| Article title:                                          |                 |     |
| Reviewer's name:                                        |                 |     |
| Date evaluation received:                               | Date submitted: |     |
| Would you like us to disclose your name to the authors? | Yes:            | No: |

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for evaluating the scientific merit of the manuscript, taking into consideration the objectives, questions, theoretical-methodological approach and scope defined by the authors, as well as its internal consistency and the strength of its engagement with the disciplines, debates and research traditions it draws upon. Accordingly, your comments and recommendations should be aimed at determining whether:

- a) the manuscript adequately fulfils its stated objectives;
- b) its arguments contribute to support them and are sufficiently substantiated;
- c) its conclusions follow consistently from the evidence and analysis presented.

With regard to the Journal, we ask you to take into account its editorial focus, centred on the *study of the art and cultures of the Indigenous peoples of the Americas, with particular attention to their pre-Columbian visual and material dimensions*. In keeping with this emphasis on the visual, another important consideration is the relevance, technical and artistic quality of the proposal, particularly the inclusion of images and audiovisual material.

Along with your opinion on whether or not the manuscript should be published, we would appreciate any suggestions you may have for further development, expansion or modification which, within the objectives set out by the authors, you consider necessary to ensure the rigour, coherence and scientific validity of the work.

Aspects that go beyond the objectives stated by the authors – for example, alternative approaches, new questions, other theoretical frameworks, extending the analysis to other dimensions, or future lines of research – do not, in themselves, constitute a deficiency in the manuscript and should not be taken into account when assessing its suitability for publication. Should you have suggestions in this regard, however, they are most welcome, as they may contribute to the authors' research. Space is provided at the end of this Review Form for you to include such suggestions.

The use of artificial intelligence in the review process is permitted within the terms established by the *Boletín*, subject to the reviewer’s supervision and critical judgement. The reviewer remains responsible for the evaluation and must safeguard the confidentiality of the manuscript [AI Use Policy].

I. EVALUATION

1. Assessment

Please assess the following aspects of the work according to the criteria indicated.

|    |                                                                     | VERY GOOD | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|------|------|
| 1  | Correspondence between the title and the content                    |           |      |      |      |
| 2  | Clarity of the abstract and its alignment with the content          |           |      |      |      |
| 3  | Clarity and organisation of the manuscript                          |           |      |      |      |
| 4  | Originality of the proposal                                         |           |      |      |      |
| 5  | Relevance of the data or findings presented                         |           |      |      |      |
| 6  | Presentation of the methodological procedures                       |           |      |      |      |
| 7  | Soundness of the interpretations and conclusions                    |           |      |      |      |
| 8  | Adequacy and relevance of the references                            |           |      |      |      |
| 9  | Relevance of illustrations, tables, graphs and audiovisual material |           |      |      |      |
| 10 | Quality of illustrations, tables, graphs and audiovisual material   |           |      |      |      |

2. Comments

Please provide your comments indicating the page and, where possible, the paragraph to which each comment refers. You may also make annotations directly on the text you have received. These will subsequently be anonymised in accordance with the principle of double-blind peer review.

3. Recommendation

Please select one option. If you do not recommend publication, please provide a rationale for your opinion in Section 2, “Comments”.

- ☐ Accept without revisions.
- ☐ Accept subject to minor revisions.
- ☐ Accept subject to major revisions.
- ☐ Reject.

If you have used artificial intelligence, please briefly indicate the purpose for which it was used and which tool you employed. Otherwise, please leave this field blank:

## II. ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS FOR THE AUTHORS

If you have suggestions that go beyond the objectives stated by the authors in the manuscript, we would be grateful if you would include them here. We remind you that the aspects of the work to which these suggestions may refer do not constitute a deficiency in the manuscript under review and should not be taken into account when assessing its suitability for publication.