SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES ARTICLES

CRITERIA	1	2	3	0*
A. Scientific merit of the paper				
A.1. The importance and the actuality of the discussed topic, as well as the relevance of the discussed question upon the research is made.				
A.2. The level of information (e.g. actuality and relevance of the publications from the bibliography) and the quality of the description of the current progress of knowledge in the discussed field on national/international level.				
A.3 The argument and basis of the discussed problem are well clarified and defined (e.g. conceptual clarifications, separating the aspects which shall not be discussed); the central idea of the article is very well drawn.				
B. Potential contributions to developing scientific knowledge				
B.1 The research question is adequately answered, raising conclusions related to the theoretical basis presented in the article and the shared new ideas.				
B. 2 The type and the authenticity level is achieved by the references.				
B.3 The set of conclusions represents a synthesis built on a personal interpretation of the prior exposed results, with references to further developments on the discussed subject. (e.g. open questions to research).				
C. Argumentative procedure				
C.1. The research design is correct, the hypothesis are relevant, the methods and empirical investigation instruments are transparent and the interpretation of data is credible.				
C.2 The affirmations are sustained by credible data from research or current theoretical elaborations.				
D. Structure and presentation of the article				
D.1. A logic sequence/connection (the ideas are logically linked together, the transit from an idea to the other is easy to follow, the order in which the parts of the paper are discussed is inherently correct.				
D.2 The used language is coherent, grammatically correct, meeting the scientific standards of expression and argumentation.				
D.3 The imposed structure of the paper is respected: abstract of approximately 800 characters, relevant key-words, correct quotations.				

EVALUATOR'S CONCLUSIONS:

☐ I recommend the publishing of the article

☐ I recommend the publishing of the article after revise of the author

☐ I do not recommend the publishing of the article

Final comments ♣:

---

* Note: the evaluation scale of meeting the criteria presents itself as follows: 1 – done; 2 – partialy done (requires further revise or annexation); 3- not done, does not fulfill the criterion; 0 – not the case, does not apply.

♣ Please provide explanations regarding the reasons for rejecting the article or list (on a separate sheet) with the concrete revision requirements.