
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision. **ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!**

Date Manuscript Received: 2018-22-05	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 2018-05-27
Manuscript Title: La recaudación del impuesto predial en el municipio de Chihuahua: un análisis de las causas del rezago	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0566/18	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>Missing accents, commas, semicolon, colon</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
The method was properly described, but in my opinion, the validity of the instrument is not sound, since the statistical validity of the instrument is not stated.	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The lack of the explanation of the statistical validity arises doubts of the conclusions.	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	3
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i> <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> References should be listed alphabetically.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I recommend you show of the statistical validity of the instrument.

Since the instrument was developed by the researches, I recommend explaining the method follow to probe the security and validity of the instrument. There are several methods to probe validity like: know groups or cross check questions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This subject and the investigation have a possibility impact on the Mexican public management, however, more scientific rigor is required.

There is a lot of spelling mistakes. In Spanish, it is not the same “ayudo” and “ayudó”.

