
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: 18/08/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 19/08/2016
Manuscript Title: la discrepancia de género en la aptitud intrínseca de las matemáticas	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0844/16	

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.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> It is suggested to better delineate the title. Mathematics has no intrinsic aptitude, but human beings. The title highlights the discrepancy from the gender perspective, however, does not identify clearly what population (in this case, college students). A proposal could be: La discrepancia de género en la aptitud intrínseca de estudiantes universitarios hacia las matemáticas.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> It is recommended to include a description of the methodological aspects used in the investigation.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

A review of the entire document style is recommended. Certain grammatical syntax errors are identified in exposed phrases in the body text. For example, the last paragraph of the conclusions (end of sixth line and on line ten).	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> There is good detail of the components that describe the type of study design, population and sample considered for research.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Check the amount of sample indicated in the foregoing summary versus in Table 1 and 2.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Include within the claims made in the conclusions , statistical field data to support qualitative statements	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Recognition of ideas from other authors is evident. The bibliographical sources used are relevant.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Consider the proposal to improve the title and a review of orthographic aspects and coherence of ideas in certain lines of text (minimum cases).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Check spelling and grammar in the body of the text.

An integrated the suggestions made once the authors, the publication of this work is recommended.

