

---

# 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!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received:17062016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: PREVENCIÓN DE LA VIOLENCIA: UNA PRÁCTICA DESDE LA PERSPECTIVA DE PROMOCIÓN A LA SALUD MENTAL	
ESJ Manuscript Number: J118	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> <b>Research is about bullying, believes and scholar intervention and nothing about is reflected on the title</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> <b>It is necessary to write the objective of the research, number of the students, random technical to choose the control group and quantitative results have to be mentioned.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

It is important to make a better abstract. Don't forget to mention the objective in there, also at the end of framework and remember it in conclusions.

Explain why is mixed study because is not clear the phases of qualitative part in the method. There weren't any qualitative technique used in the procedure at least is not

clear the reliability of the analysis.

I don't understand if there were 6 workshop or 6 sessions in workshop or 6 activities.

It's very difficult to understand that believes could change in two hours.

It's necessary to explicit the hypothesis since framework in relation with the concepts and the preliminary studies which has the same results or variables in order to understand better research question.

Explain in a better way the decision of statistics test used and which it was.

Check the references, there are old and some of them are not in the final list of references.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

The study is interesting and important in Latin America; I want to read the paper when it has been modified.

