

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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. 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 (not perceived the impact). 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: Thursday, 18/may/2017.	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: Friday 19/may/2017.
Manuscript Title: Análisis de la tutoría en el Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Escárcega. Analysis of the tutoring at the Superior Escárcega Technology Institute	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0611/17	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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.	3
<i>The title of the article is concrete and appropriate, however, the content has to relate to it and be more specific when it deals with the concept of mentoring and to the way in which was analyzed.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The summary covers the formality of the APA, as soon as I number it's words, however, does not specify specifically the purpose of the research, as well as the same type.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>They are minimal grammatical errors, and there were misspellings in the Commons of the article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The method not this specified specifically however, manifests a procedure of work performed, need to do more explicit method.</i>	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>The body of the document should be more concrete in terms of the objective of research, your paragraphs are very extensive, care for the relationship between the sub-item and content. Address the validity of the measurement instrument and finally, specify the method of work.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusions has that have relationship with the objective of the research, which in this article not concretizes itself the relationships that were achieved with the investigation. Be more specific. They do not serve reaches that had.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>You should consider the format APA, when it is direct quotation, long appointment, and attend et.al completion for use in his time. In the end, references should contain indent.</i>	

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):

It is important to review the work to improve it, take care of APA format, and the suggestions made.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Thank the opportunity to contribute to your magazine. Thank you. And excellent work of dissemination of knowledge.