

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

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 report. 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. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. 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: Jan. 22, 2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: Jan. 24, 2018
MANEJO DE MIEDO, ESTRATEGIAS DE AFRONTAMIENTO Y CULTURA CIUDADANA PARA PREVENCIÓN DE LA VIOLENCIA	
SOCIAL FEAR, COPING STRATEGIES AND COLLECTIVE EFFICACY FOR VIOLENCE PREVENTION	
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an 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>The title is very appropriate for the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract clearly states the objects, methods and results. Mention of the dates of when the study was conducted is not necessary</i>	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>There are many grammatical mistakes throughout the article. In particular, there are incomplete and run on sentences. There are also sentences the length of paragraphs and difficult to follow.</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>For the most part yes, but there are sections that are better suited for the discussion section. For example, there was a brief mention of available resources or the lack of to promote interventions, but this could be better argued in the discussion section. Additionally, the author mentioned the limitation of using a Quasi-experimental design. This is better suited for placement in the discussion section.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<p>1. The study tests differences within (pre and post) and differences between groups. Two hypothesis rather than one should be offered, at minimum.</p> <p>2. The article mentions a second study. There is actually only one study in two parts that tests within differences in one part and between differences in another.</p> <p>3. It is not clear in Table 4 which is the group 1 and which is group 2. This needs better labelling.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The author use a quasi-experimental design, but suggests causal conclusions. I suggest that the author address the limitations of drawing causal conclusions from the findings, especially those derived from a quasi-experimental design.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	3
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	
<i>They are sufficient</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. The way in which the findings are shared with community are as important as the findings themselves. There were many stylistic and grammatical errors that were distracting and which overshadowed the content of this article. These could easily be corrected. I recommend proofreading the article for grammatical errors, specifically incomplete and run-on sentences.

2. There are sections in the methods section that are better suited for the discussion section. See

comments above. There was also a lengthy section on Cohen and the importance of testing for size effects. Four of these paragraphs could be reduced to one.

3. You test differences within a group and between groups, but have only one hypothesis. You need two hypotheses, one for each test.

4. You mention a study 2. There is no study 2. There is a part 2 to one study.

5. You use a quasi-experimental design that has control issues. You should be cautious about drawing causal conclusions from your findings. I suggest different wording.

6. I also suggest reading about group polarization. Initial leanings in emotions and cognitions tend to be polarized or exaggerated in group discussions. You may have no way of controlling for this because your control group has no equivalent treatment.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The references are sufficient, but I believe that there are more studies about intervention programs and their usefulness in helping people deal with violent contexts. I considered rejecting this article, but I intervention studies from countries that are facing very violent times can be very instructive.

