

Manuscript: “**Prevalencia de lateralidad y lenguaje receptivo en niños de 5 y 6 años del municipio de Corregidora Querétaro, México**”

Submitted: 30 January 2021

Accepted: 08 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Dra. Nadia Edith García Medina

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Eliazar Gonzalez Carrillo, Facultad de Enfermería y Nutriología de la Universidad Autónoma de Chihuahua México

Reviewer 2: María Eustolia Pedroza Vargas, Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro, México

Reviewer 3: M.I.M Verónica Hernández Valle, Querétaro, México

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: Eliazar Gonzalez Carrillo	
University/Country: Facultad de Enfermería y Nutriología de la Universidad Autónoma de Chihuahua México	
Date Manuscript Received: 1 de febrero 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 6 febrero 2021
Manuscript Title: prevalence of laterality and receptive language in children aged 5 and 6	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0251/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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	

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.	5
<i>El título es adecuado al contenido del artículo y contiene menos de 15 palabras</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

<i>El resumen contiene los elementos pero es muy amplio tiene mas de 400 palabras, acortarlo segun la norma de la revista.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>No hay errores gramaticales solo de redacción se realizaron algunos cambios pero requiere de mayor revisión</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>El método se expresa en el resumen pero en este apartado no se describe claramente</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>Si es claro pero requiere de revisión respect a la redacción en el apartado de resultados se pueden exponer más resultados.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>La discusión es demasiado amplia y contiene referencias no actualizadas</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>El 50% de las referencias tienen mas de 20 y 30 años</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Regresar a los autores para corregir las observaciones que se muestran en el manuscrito,

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: María Eustolia Pedroza Vargas	
University/Country: Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro /México	
Date Manuscript Received: 1de febrero 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 8 de febrero 2021
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 51.02.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title matches the objectives, methodology and conclusions	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Presents consistency between objectives, methodology and results	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Grammar and spelling errors are minima	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Mention what type of study, as well as the validity of the tests.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The results respond to the proposed objectives	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusions are clear and precise they respond to the objective	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
References are sufficient and consistent with the topic described	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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: M.I.M Verónica Hernández Valle	Email:
University/Country: Querétaro. México	
Date Manuscript Received: February the 2nd, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: prevalence of laterality and receptive language in children aged 5 and 6	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> 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
<p><i>The title of the article is clear and concrete; however, it is important to specify the region where the study was addressed.</i></p> <p><i>El título del artículo es claro y concreto; sin embargo, es importante especificar la región en donde se realizó el estudio.</i></p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>The abstract is clear and cover all the items. El resumen es claro y completo.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The spelling is acceptable and there are not grammatical errors. La redacción es adecuada y sin errores gramaticales.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Method and instruments that were used for the study are clearly explained but, it is important to indicate what training is required for applying these tests and make clear who should performed them, whether health personnel or teachers.</i> <i>El método e instrumentos que se utilizaron para este estudio son explicados claramente, pero falta indicar qué entrenamiento se requiere para aplicar las pruebas e indicar si lo deberían realizar personal de la salud o docentes.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Results are clear and consistent with the statistical analysis. Los resultados son claros y consistentes con el análisis estadístico.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Conclusions are according to the obtained results. Las conclusiones son acorde a los resultados obtenidos</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>References meet the requirements La referencias cumplen los requisitos de la publicación</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Recomiendo destacar el trabajo multidisciplinario entre a personal docente y personal de salud