

Manuscript: “Análisis Estadístico De La Formación Digital A Partir De La Relación De La Desigualdad Ingresos (Coeficiente Gini) Y El Analfabetismo Digital En Ecuador”

Submitted: 11 February 2021

Accepted: 09 March 2021

Published: 31 March 2021

Corresponding Author: María Teresa Albán Defilippi

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n8p10

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Raul Josue Najera, Autónoma de Chihuahua, México

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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!

Reviewer Name: Raul Josue Najera	Email:
University/Country: Autónoma de Chihuahua, México	
Date Manuscript Received: feb 15	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Impacto de la formación digital para la oportunidad laboral en ecuador	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Sugiero reemplazar la palabra “impacto” por “relacion”	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> recomendando escribir los resultados en porcentajes, índices y valores de significancia	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Si, se recomienda revisar todo el documento en búsqueda de errores	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Presenta información innecesaria, accesoría. Revisar lineamientos de la revista sobre el uso de escritura con subrayado Especificar que tipo de regresión lineal fue utilizada: simple, multiple	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Revisar el formato de la revista sobre los apartados y ajustar su documento. Elegir solo los resultados que respondan a su objetivo del estudio Describir todas las tablas que presenta y hacer referencia a las mismas. En la figura 4 agregar título a los ejes o eliminar en caso de que presente información duplicada. Describir	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Ajustarse a sus resultados. Parece que sí lo hizo, pero en realidad redactó propuestas para los actores sociopolíticos del fenómeno pobreza-analfabetismo digital. Para corregir este error común, sugiero responder a las preguntas: Cuanto mejora la pobreza cuando el valor de analfabetismo es menor, según su ecuación. Que significa el valor de 0.438? y de 0.003? Como preguntas adicionales Ha observado que el porcentaje de analfabetismo se ha reducido? Y además se observa según la tabla 4 una tendencia sobre el índice de GINI a acercarse a 0, lo que significa más igualdad en los ingresos La pobreza es un fenómeno unifactorial?	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Creo que, en términos operacionales, la información presenta solidez sobre todo que el enfoque es establecer la relación entre el nivel de analfabetismo y la pobreza, lo cual socialmente es de suficiente relevancia. Sin embargo, deberá ajustar a nivel científico, ordenando las variables, eligiendo los resultados de mayor pertinencia, y discutiendo los hallazgos principales del estudio

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/02/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/02/2021
Manuscript Title: IMPACTO DE LA FORMACIÓN DIGITAL PARA LA OPORTUNIDAD LABORAL EN ECUADOR	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 89.01.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough 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.	2
<i>El título debería indicar, más ajustadamente, el contenido del trabajo.</i>	
The title should indicate, more closely, the content of the work.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Debe ser reajustado, acorde a lo señalado respecto de lo indicado para el título.</i>	

<i>Así como desde lo gramatical, conectores, autores repetidos, etc.</i>	
It must be readjusted, according to what is indicated with respect to what is indicated for the title. As well as from the grammatical, connectors, repeated authors, etc.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Revisar las estructuras gramaticales, pues no siempre, los párrafos donan claridad de ideas o planteamientos.</i>	
Review the grammatical structures, as paragraphs do not always provide clarity of ideas or approaches.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Revisar lo aportado en comentarios. Algunas explicaciones son claras, otras no tanto.</i>	
<i>Han resuelto relacionar, a mi juicio, dos variables que claramente se sostienen en el modelo de aplicación, pero es débil la relación que hacen a "pobreza por ingreso", porque es un pensamiento abductivo no expuesto en el modelo de análisis propuesto.</i>	
Review what was contributed in comments. Some explanations are clear, others not so much.	
They have resolved to relate, in my opinion, two variables that are clearly sustained in the application model, but their relationship to "income poverty" is weak, because it is an abductive thought not exposed in the proposed analysis model.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>Hay errores gramaticales, mínimos, indicados en el mismo. Ajustar presentación y enunciado de tablas y figuras. Enunciado todo en el documento, mediante comentarios.</i>	
There are minimal grammatical errors indicated in it. Adjust presentation and statement of tables and figures. Stated everything in the document, through comments.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Las conclusiones deben ser revisadas, en tanto y en cuanto ajusten las expresiones de la metodología de estudio. Esto se ha indicado en el documento.</i>	
The conclusions should be reviewed, as long as they adjust the expressions of the study methodology. This has been stated in the document.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>La bibliografía es amplia y rica. Sólo revisar cómo se expone la cita: Ministerio Coordinador de Desarrollo Social. (2017). INFORME DE....</i>	
The bibliography is wide and rich. Just check how the appointment is exposed: Coordinating Ministry of Social Development. (2017). REPORT...	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Estimados autores,

El trabajo es de interés.

Entiendo que he dicho, respecto, de vuestro trabajo lo que creo debe ser ajustado para que el mismo tenga mayor solidez. Desde el título a la relación modélica y la extensión conclusiva, es necesario mirar y ajustar. Así, el foco de investigación se sostiene.

Los comentarios acerca de esto están en el mismo documento insertos.

CUANDO resuelvan los ajustes y re-envíen para su nueva evaluación, DEBERÁN eliminar todos los comentarios del "Revisor" tanto como lo arreglos resueltos mediante el "Control de Cambios" utilizado desde Revisar (Programa de Word). Es DECIR, el trabajo debe retornar a revisión "limpio", sin ninguna marca de la anterior mirada.

Marcas anteriores que dificulten la lectura, implicará la devolución directa sin lectura evaluativa.

Muchas gracias.

Saludos cordiales

Dear authors,

The work is of interest.

I understand that I have said, regarding your work, what I believe should be adjusted to make it more solid. From the title to the model relationship and the conclusive extension, it is necessary to look and adjust. Thus, the focus of research is held.

Comments about this are in the same document inserted.

WHEN you resolve the settings and re-submit for your new evaluation, you MUST remove all comments from the "Reviewer" as well as the fixes resolved by the "Change Control" used from Review (Word Program). That is, the work must return to "clean" review, without any mark from the previous look.

Previous marks that make reading difficult, will involve direct return without evaluative reading.

Thanks a lot.

Kind regards