

Paper: “Análisis de la Actitud Emprendedora de los Estudiantes Varones del Tecnológico Nacional de México Campus Tepeaca”

Submitted: 20 July 2021

Accepted: 07 September 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: María Luisa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p112

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Pedro Castillo Cedillo
Colegio Interdisciplinario de Especialización, México

Reviewer 2: Raul Rocha Romero
Autonomous National University of Mexico, Mexico

Reviewer 3: Amaya Epelde
University of Granada, Spain

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: PEDRO CASTILLO CEDILLO	
University/Country: COLEGIO INTERDISCIPLINARIO DE ESPECIALIZACIÓN AC./MÉXICO	
Date Manuscript Received: 29/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 4/08/2021
Manuscript Title: ANÁLISIS DEL ESPÍRITU EMPRENDEDOR DE LOS ESTUDIANTES VARONES DEL TECNOLÓGICO NACIONAL DE MÉXICO CAMPUS TEPEACA	
Manuscript Number: 74.07.2021 European Scientific Journal ISSN: 1857 - 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1	
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.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
There is perfect coherence between the title and its content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The exposed objects, methods and results are aligned and coherent	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The grammar and spelling care has been very good and no errors are perceived	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The scientific method used complies and conforms to the explanation.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clear, fit and consistent with the method used, and no errors are perceived.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are accurate and logically backed up with the content, it's an excellent job.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references used are complete, timely and up-to-date for the subject matter, I consider them a robust support for this study.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is a pleasure to review works supported by the scientific method with such good methodological rigor.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Very good coordination work and its very accessible qualification format and complies with the executive format.

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: Raúl Rocha Romero	
University/Country: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/08/2021
Manuscript Title: ANÁLISIS DEL ESPÍRITU EMPRENDEDOR DE LOS ESTUDIANTES VARONES DEL TECNOLÓGICO NACIONAL DE MÉXICO CAMPUS TEPEACA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 74.07.2021	
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.	3
<i>Se emplea un concepto, el de Espíritu, que no es científico. Bien podría utilizarse mayor del de actitud.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>A pesar de que lo que enuncian tiene el formato adecuado, no se entiende bien qué es lo que se presenta en el artículo</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>El artículo tiene algunos errores que hay que corregir.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<p><i>Hay algunos errores fundamentales. El primero es que para la validez de constructo hay que hacer un Análisis Factorial. Lo que aquí se presenta como juicio de expertos, en rigor no es una Técnica de validación.</i></p> <p><i>Por otro lado, aquí se elaboran hipótesis apartir de los reactivos del instrumento. En realidad el procedimiento es: a partir de las variables e hipótesis sustantivas, operacionalizar las variables. Ello, a su vez, consiste en establecer dimensiones, indicadores, e items (obtenidos de las respuestas a los reactivos).</i></p> <p><i>Además, las hipótesis que presentan como validadas, son enunciados bastante simples, de sentido común.</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Como la estructura metodológica no es clara, no se entienden los resultados, La correlación no es una Técnica de validación.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>Es demasiado simple lo que se presenta.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Tienen muchos errores, hay referencias con datos incompletos.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Considerar las observaciones en cada uno de los rubros anteriores.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Amaya Epelde Larrañaga	
University/Country: University of Granada / Spain	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/08/2021
Manuscript Title: ANÁLISIS DEL ESPÍRITU EMPRENDEDOR DE LOS ESTUDIANTES VARONES DEL TECNOLÓGICO NACIONAL DE MÉXICO CAMPUS TEPEACA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0774/21	
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	
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>Rating Result</i>
<i>Questions</i>	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is adequate</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract presents the method and the aims, however it does not present the results and conclusions.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There is some typographical error. I think that the theoretical framework should be enlarged, it remains quite poor. I think it is necessary to talk about the entrepreneurial spirit itself.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>I miss the data collection procedure</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	0
<i>The authors do not present the "Discussion". It is necessary to write the "Discussion", comparing these results with those of other published research on the same subject. The conclusions that the authors have written are not the conclusions of the research. The conclusions must be written.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>References are good references but the authors have not followed the APA Standards when writing them.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See attached document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Important changes need to be made before being published.